

Dialogues and Difficulties

Transnational Cooperation in Journalism Education

Kristin Skare Orgeret

Abstract

The profession and pedagogy of journalism are both at a crossroads, and questions linked to how journalism education can best provide skills, knowledge and experiences that enable students to contribute positively to the industry are central. An increasingly globalised world demands global learning that enhances the development of critical skills and facilitates intercultural understanding, especially due to the fact that some of the major challenges of our times – climate change, global inequalities, migration, terrorism – cannot be fully solved or understood solely at a national level. The chapter proposes a closer look at what global learning in journalism through international cooperation may involve. Its findings do not support the idea that in the era of globalisation, a common professional approach to journalism overshadows different cultural worldviews and differences. Furthermore, the findings show that global learning may bring out important cultural differences and make the participants more aware of their own ethical heritage or values than they were before getting involved in the process of global learning. Such challenges to global learning are not often discussed in academic literature. The analysis here essentially suggests that if research within journalism education wants to explain intercultural communication in journalism education, it needs to broaden its horizons and adopt a multidisciplinary perspective.

Keywords: journalism education, journalistic values, global learning, intercultural understanding, Norway

Introduction

At a time of transition for both the profession and the pedagogy of journalism, questions linked to how journalism education best provides skills, knowledge and experiences that enable students to work in the industry are crucial. An increasingly globalized world demands intercultural communication skills on both a global and, progressively, a local level. A global learning that enhances the development of critical skills and facilitates intercultural understanding is core, not least since some of the major challenges of our time – climate change, global inequalities, migration, terrorism – cannot be fully solved or understood solely at a national level. As a result, journal-

ism is increasingly becoming an international phenomenon with global networks, no longer able to operate solely within national or cultural borders (Löffelholz et al. 2008). Concurrently, more news media content becomes global, and it becomes harder to categorize news texts as either solely domestic or foreign news.

A great deal of academic work on global journalism training focuses on how journalism education is uniquely positioned to advance global awareness. This, as Gerodimos reminds us, may happen both directly amongst journalism students, and indirectly – through them – amongst the public at large (Gerodimos, 2013). Global learning is often defined as “the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students acquire through a variety of experiences that enable them to understand world culture and events; analyse global systems; appreciate cultural differences, and apply this knowledge and appreciation to their lives as citizens and workers” (Olsen et al. 2009: 7). Peter Berglez (2013: 97) describes “global journalism” as first and foremost a *mode of communication*. He emphasizes that, despite the importance of technical means, what constitutes global journalism is an epistemological component: it is based on a global mode of thinking about society (cognition) and global language use (discourse). This chapter proposes a closer look at what global learning in journalism through international cooperation may involve. Its findings do not support the idea that in the era of globalization a common professional approach to journalism overshadows different cultural worldviews and differences.

Furthermore, the findings show that global learning may reveal important cultural differences and make participants more aware of their own ethical heritage or values than before they became involved in the process of global learning. Such challenges to global learning are seldom discussed in academic literature. The analysis here essentially suggests that if research within journalism education wants to explain intercultural communication in journalism education, it needs to broaden its horizons and adopt a multidisciplinary perspective. Such a perspective should include both the analysis of national political and social processes in the countries involved, and a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the professional approach to journalism in each single society involved.

Methods

A central aim of this chapter is to discuss experiences from the oldest and largest journalism education in Norway, at the Department of Journalism and Media Studies (IJM) at Oslo and Akershus University College (HiOA), where global learning has been highlighted for many years. Whereas IJM includes global journalism perspectives at different levels of its BA and MA programmes, this study primarily focuses on an ongoing cooperation programme between IJM, the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at Makerere University in Uganda, the University of Juba in South Sudan, and the College of Journalism and Mass Communication in Kathmandu, Nepal

(Norhed, 2013-2018). This project was selected because of its important geographical outreach; it includes partners from journalism educations on three different continents. Serving as a case in point, the cooperation project will illustrate some benefits and challenges involved with including global cooperation in journalism education.

To approach the question of what global learning in journalism may involve, a total of 31 journalist educators both in Oslo and at the partner institutions in the south (Uganda and Nepal) were asked to reflect upon questions related to the era of global learning and the connection to professional values. Twenty-two faculty members from Oslo answered a questionnaire with both open and closed questions at a seminar in January 2015, while a total of four educators from Nepal and five from Uganda answered a questionnaire and were interviewed in September 2014 and February 2015. Questions about how the educators see the role of journalism education in relation to preparing students for an increasingly globalized world are central. What do the educators see as the main advantages and challenges of creating interculturally adept journalists? How can journalism education best provide students with the context and skills they need to fulfil their role as global citizens and critical mediators between the local and the global? A core perspective in the discussions was the issue of conflicting values in transnational journalism education. As this is a relatively limited sample, the findings are used as illustrations opening for discussion rather than as “hard facts”.

A common framework for journalism?

In global education, it becomes imperative to discuss whether it is possible to talk about a set of consistent global values that are core to the journalistic profession (see e.g. Krøvel, Orgeret, & Ytterstad, 2012). It is commonly argued that, since the birth of modern journalism in Europe in the 17th century, some standardized values have become central to the profession (Weaver, 1998; Deuze, 2005). According to Loo, “professional journalism across politico-cultural systems do share common inherent characteristics of news” because human “curiosity and demand for ‘news’ and information transcends culture and politics” (Loo, 2009: 169). Nevertheless, such professional ethics are not static but rather consist of dynamic frameworks of principles and values. Even though some researchers argue that certain values of journalism have universal application, there are legitimate differences in journalistic culture from one country to another that are of importance in issues of ethics and professional ideology (Park, & Curran, 2000; Hanitzsch, 2007; Hanitzsch, Hanusch et al. 2010).

Furthermore, a global-based curriculum is believed to be broader and more comprehensive than simply a number of specific courses with a global/transnational emphasis. According to Patwardhan et al. (2012), a global-based curriculum “focuses on ensuring that students are exposed to structured, first-hand intercultural and international experiences in the major with intentional, facilitated reflection and critical thinking components”. A global journalism approach would stress the need to learn about cultural

differences that play into the understanding of professional journalistic roles within different cultures worldwide (Berglez, 2013). Furthermore, comparing ideals and views of the profession transnationally may enhance our understanding of the national or local “doxa” as it is translated into professional ideals and values in journalism education.

Thomas Hanitzsch’s *Worlds of Journalism* study is interesting in the discussion of possibilities for a common framework for transnational education and research in journalism, as it regularly assesses journalists in 21 countries worldwide and their perceptions of their role in society and how they influence their own work (worldsofjournalism.org). Hanitzsch (2011) describes four journalistic archetypes based on professional values:

Populist Disseminator

Journalists who pay the most attention to their audiences and accordingly are most likely to cover what their audiences consider “interesting news” in order to attract bigger numbers. Not very critical of government or elites. Yet does not intend to take on an active and participatory role in reporting.

Detached Watchdog

Journalists who value both their seemingly contradictory roles as detached observer and watchdog over the political and business elite. They provide readers with interesting and important political information for financial and civic life purposes. Most opposed to supporting official policies.

Critical Change Agent

Journalists critical of the government and the business elite, advocating for social change and work toward influencing public opinion and setting political agendas.

Of the four groups, these are most likely to push their audiences’ desires.

Opportunist Facilitator

Journalists most likely to see themselves as constructive government partners in economic development and political transformation. Of the four groups, these are the least interested in detached observations, watchdog activities and political information and mobilization functions.

The *Worlds of Journalism* study finds that most Western countries view their main journalistic approach as that of the Detached Watchdog, while the Critical Change approach is particularly strong in the Middle East. According to the findings, the Opportunist Facilitator approach is popular in many developing, authoritarian and transitional countries, and Hanitzsch argues that the Populist Disseminator is “the only

truly global journalistic approach since it exists everywhere in the world” (Hanitzsch, 2011). Typologies like those used in the *Worlds of Journalism* study may be helpful tools for critically reflecting on values feeding into different professional approaches within journalism, and not least when developing transnational cooperation in journalism education. However, there is reason to be careful not to pigeonhole countries and media systems, as competing roles might very well exist simultaneously within a specific country and across different media outlets and journalistic genres. Furthermore, on an individual level there might be larger discrepancies as to what roles the journalists in a specific country adhere to than such general findings may give the impression of. There might be great differences between what the journalist educators see as their personal ideal role as a professional journalist and how they see the most practiced role of the profession in general in their country.

The *Worlds of Journalism* findings from Uganda in 2011 stated that 69 per cent of the professional journalists there were Opportunist Facilitators, 20 per cent Critical Change Agents, 8 per cent Popular Disseminators, and only 2 per cent Detached Watchdogs.¹ The Ugandan journalist educators in this sample expressed that they belonged to the two largest of the ideal professional roles presented above: some held the Opportunist Facilitator role as a personal ideal for their professional role, whereas others chose the role of the Critical Change Agent as an ideal professional role (2014 and 2015). When it came to which of the four roles they would say is most practiced in the day-to-day journalism in Uganda, it was argued that this would depend on the media in question; radio and television journalism would mostly practice the Populist Disseminator role and influential newspapers would be Critical Change Agents, while government/public media would be Opportunist Facilitators.

The Nepalese journalist educators stated that their own professional role was that of the Detached Watchdog, whereas they believed the most practiced role in their country was either that of the Populist Dissemination role or the Critical Change Agent. Of the 22 Norwegian educators, 64 per cent believed that the Detached Watchdog was closest to their journalistic ideal, while 18 per cent adhered to the Critical Change Agent role. When it came to which of the ideal forms governed most of the journalism in Norway today, 55 per cent of the Norwegian journalist educators argued that it was the Populist Disseminator, whereas 36 per cent believed it was the Detached Watchdog.

To further define the perceived ideal role of the professional journalist, the journalist educators were given three statements from which they could choose one that best represented their personal view:

- a) Journalists should always try to balance opposing views and should avoid expressing their own views.
- b) Journalists may express their own views, but in a cautious and balanced way.
- c) Journalists should make a stand in important ethical discussions.

Here, all the Nepalese educators and two of those in Uganda agreed that journalists should make a stand in important ethical discussions, whereas the other three Ugan-

dan journalism educators stated that journalists may express their own views, but in a cautious and balanced way. Several of the Norwegian educators stressed the need for genre differences in the media here, and one refused to use archetypes at all. Some 47 per cent believed journalists could express their own views in a cautious and balanced way and 33 per cent found that journalists should make a stand in important ethical discussions, whereas 19 per cent considered that journalists should balance opposing views and avoid expressing their own views.

Hence, the findings from this small selection of journalism educators illustrate that there might be greater variety on an individual level than the findings of larger studies such as *Worlds of Journalism* show. Interestingly, various combinations of one's own ideal professional role and attitudes towards journalists expressing their own views in journalism were found. The findings also illustrate that how questions linked to journalistic professional values are asked may lead to rather different findings; for instance, there is not necessarily any compliance between what the journalism educators see as their own ideal professional role and the one that is most practiced in day-to-day journalism in their home country. Researchers asking questions related to professional values should hence always emphasize whether they are discussing an ideal or a factual professional role. Also, the fact that there might be great differences between media outlets and journalistic genres within the same country should be taken into consideration.

The objectivity ideal in journalism education

The objectivity ideal in journalism is often thought of as a Western export, and hence for some, its universal appeal is tainted by Eurocentrism (Hallin, & Mancini, 2004; Schudson, & Anderson, 2009; Wasserman, & Beer, 2009). It may be argued, however, that objectivity carries several meanings, including being responsible, balanced, reflective of public opinion, neutral, detached and truth-seeking (Knowlton, & Freeman, 2005; Harcup, 2009; Wahl-Jorgensen, & Hanitzsch, 2009). Even in the micro-sample of journalist educators from Uganda, Nepal and Norway referred to here, interesting differences were found when the informants were asked to define objectivity in journalism. The quotes from the interviews reflect a variety of different approaches to objectivity from one close to concepts of “neutrality” and “impartiality”:

Objectivity means that a journalist writes a balanced story; giving all parties involved in the story the opportunity to present their views. It calls for neutrality and requires that a journalist is impartial in their reporting. (September 2014)

Another highlighted the need for “fairness”:

Objectivity in journalism is about being fair to all parties involved in any given story. It is about removing individual biases of journalists from the stories they write. (September 2014)

Whereas yet another opened for the journalist to position him/herself:

Even when the journalist takes a stand on a matter, it should be after presenting all the options and providing a full context of the situation, so that he/she is not seen or thought to try to sway public opinion in a certain direction for selfish reasons. (September 2014)

One of the educators included a “guiding” approach in the definition of objectivity in journalism:

In my opinion, journalism communicates between common people and the government. It raises national issues and gives the floor to describing and analysing different issues. So, it should be fair, balanced and also capable of giving some suggestions to those concerned. (September 2014)

The need to include different interest groups in the reporting was also mentioned:

Objectivity for me is balancing the story by making the opinions inclusive. The stories should not be biased, and a journalist should not be biased and a journalist should not enforce stereotyping. (September 2014)

When asked how they defined objectivity in journalism, around a third of the Norwegian educators also highlighted the concept of “balance”. The need for the journalist to be critical in selecting sources and to include as many perspectives as possible was also repeatedly mentioned, while two of the Norwegian educators mentioned “searching for the truth” as important in the strive for objectivity and one mentioned the need to be transparent about one’s own role in the journalistic process. Among the Norwegian educators several emphasized that “objectivity does not exist” and some added that it was still useful as a (Utopian) ideal to strive for in one’s journalistic work, whereas one argued that it would “bungle a discussion” to use the concept (January 2015). The findings emphasize how the concept of objectivity may carry several meanings. Interestingly, diverging views on the question of journalist detachment became even more accentuated in discussions of issues in which colliding ethical issues were brought to the table.

Experiences from transnational cooperation in journalism education

The journalism educators from Nepal, Uganda and Norway strongly agreed that there were many, and valuable, benefits from transnational cooperation in journalism education. A recurring argument was that it exposed journalism students and educators to different and new ways of looking at the profession, as it enabled them to share experiences, lessons and challenges from their varied settings and backgrounds. Furthermore, they emphasized how such cooperation offers exposure to different

debates they may not have come across as journalists in their own countries, and to the different dynamics of handling/writing about these issues with an open outlook.

The positive effects of hearing the opinion of outsiders about the practices in one's own country were also stressed. It was argued that transnational cooperation helps students and teachers look at a particular topic of journalism from different perspectives (interviews, September 2014 and January 2015). One of the educators from Uganda emphasized how transnational cooperation may help in "appreciating the diverse values that exist in journalism training in different parts of the world, how it could lead to sharing success stories in journalism training as well as linking local perspectives to international environments" (September 2014). Among the Norwegian educators, the aspects of both increased cultural understanding as well as supporting freedom of expression in countries where it does not exist or is weak today were highlighted as important outcomes, as was increasing students' and faculties' perspectives on international issues, and learning about other ways of approaching journalism in both teaching and research. An exchange of experiences, values and knowledge, as well as "expanding our horizons", was also mentioned by several. One respondent stressed the importance of gaining "knowledge about a critical but fundamental universalism". Some talked about solidarity, and how important it is for all students and faculty to be forced to look at their own culture and values from "outside". Through the interviews, it became clear that the educators agreed that transnational cooperation may equip trainers with knowledge of different local contexts that may later be transferred to students, who could then use this knowledge in their future work. The importance of discussing and disseminating awareness and values was also stressed across the national groups.

When worldviews and values collide – the issue of homosexuality

A case in point in which conflicting values became very clear in the cooperation between journalism education institutions on three different continents involved the controversy over the acceptance of homosexuality. Norway, Nepal and Uganda have very different political and historical trajectories, and represent highly diverging views on homosexuality. This had consequences on both the discourse and the cognition of the cooperation.

In Norway

Same-sex sexual activity has been legal since 1972 in Norway, and in recent decades the change toward a general acceptance of homosexuality has been tremendous in Norwegian society (Eide, 2014; Linstad, 2012). Norway is highly liberal in regard to LGBTI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex) rights, and became the first

country in the world to enact an anti-discrimination law protecting homosexuals. Same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples have been legal in the country since 2009. Although there were harsh discussions regarding whether the Church should wed homosexual couples, a great majority of Norwegians see it as a human right to openly follow one's sexual orientation.

In Nepal

The Nepalese government legalized homosexuality in 2007 when the monarchy ended, and the government is currently looking into legalizing same-sex marriage. It is believed that the new Constitution, which is currently being drafted, will include protection for sexual minorities. Furthermore, Nepal became one of the world's first countries to officially recognize a *third gender* in citizenship documents, following a 2007 Supreme Court decision. Nepal has been providing more rights to gender and sexual minorities ever since this decision.

In Uganda

The Uganda Anti-Homosexuality Act was signed into law by President Museveni just a few days before three Ugandan educators left for a nine-month PhD research stay in Oslo in February 2014 under the Norhed programme. The legislative proposal criminalized same-sex relations domestically, and further included provisions for Ugandans who engage in same-sex relations outside Uganda. It included penalties for individuals, companies, media organizations and non-governmental organizations that know of gay people or support LGBTI rights. Homosexual acts were already illegal in Uganda, but the bill would increase the penalty for those convicted to life in prison. Those found guilty of "aggravated homosexuality" – defined as such when one of the participants is a minor, HIV-positive, disabled or a "serial offender" – would face the death penalty. In August 2014 the law was declared null and void by the Ugandan Constitutional court on a legal technicality, as an insufficient number of MPs had been in attendance during the vote. During the four months the law was in place, 164 cases of violence against LGBTI persons were registered. People were thrown out of their homes, many stopped attending school, and several lost their jobs. In December 2014, leader of Sexual Minorities Uganda (SMUG) Frank Mugisha told the Norad conference in Oslo that violence against and the persecution of LGBTI persons had radically increased in Uganda. He explained that many had escaped or gone underground (December 11, 2014).

In addition to the strict law proposals, Uganda has one of the highest rates in the world of non-acceptance of homosexuality. Of Ugandan residents, 96 per cent believe that homosexuality is a way of life that should not be accepted, and in contrast to many other African countries, even among people with higher education the percentage of non-acceptance remains high (Pew Global Attitudes Project 2007). The disapproval of homosexuality is further entrenched in the official national memory, through the

celebration of Martyrs' Day (May 3) to honour the martyrs of Buganda who were killed for their Christian faith. Around 1885, the martyrs refused to offer sacrifices to the traditional gods and objected to King Mwanga's homosexual practices². On the other hand, some would argue that this story may indicate that homosexuality is perhaps not as "un-African" as the current dominant discourse would argue.

To cooperate or not to cooperate?

A great majority (68 per cent) of the Norwegian journalist educators interviewed were positive towards continued cooperation with Uganda despite the country's hostilities against homosexuals, as they agreed that "academic and journalistic cooperation could be an important platform for dialogue and possible change" (January 2015). Some 14 per cent felt that IJM should not cooperate with actors in countries not adhering to the UN's Declaration of Human Rights, and believed that that "all academic contact with Uganda should be cut short as a clear message to the Ugandan government". Another 14 per cent agreed that cooperation with Uganda was complicated due to the country's hostility towards homosexuals, but as the cooperation was now underway it should be continued. One respondent felt that a country's main attitude towards homosexuality should not have any impact whatsoever on academic and journalistic cooperation (January 2015).

It was hence widely believed that cooperation within the field of higher education, not least within journalism, could provide unique opportunities for dialogue and change. Several educators argued, however, that it should repeatedly be made clear to the Ugandan journalist educators that most Norwegians were horrified by the proposed anti-homosexuality legislation and the general hatred of homosexuals in Uganda (January 2015).

Shortly after their arrival in Oslo in March 2014, the journalism educators from Nepal and Uganda were invited to the screening of the Ugandan documentary film *Call Me Kuchu*, as part of a lecture course in "Human Rights and Journalism" for first-year BA students of journalism. One of the educators reacted strongly to the experience of a pressure to state one's view on the issue:

There should never be such a situation where learners or instructors are required to state their positions on the subject of homosexuality as a condition of important discussions in transnational exchange journalism education programmes. This would certainly breed conflict. (September 2014)

However, none of the visiting educators from the south believed that such diverging values could be a hindrance to the transnational exchange involving journalism students and educators:

Not at all; as long as homosexuality is not a prerequisite for participating in the activity. The challenge comes when developed countries impose homosexuality

on developing countries. As long as the agenda or topic of the cooperation is not homosexuality, it is not necessary to make homosexuality a big deal. We need to agree to disagree. (September 2014)

The (global journalism education) network is based on values of mutual respect and equality. The diverging values of partners mean that members must seek to understand and appreciate other partners' differing views. (September 2014)

Nevertheless, one of the journalism lecturers from the south stressed that the argument of religion was not a *carte blanche* granting the right to express animosity against homosexuals:

Homosexuality is not easily accepted in many developing countries, and the reason is mainly religious belief. But religious beliefs in one situation can be challenged by religious beliefs from another country. For example, Hinduism is positive regarding homosexuals, and the concept of homosexuality has existed since ancient time. (September 2014)

The fact that the Nepalese educators shared their experiences of the “third gender” with their colleagues from Uganda and Norway was seen as particularly valuable, as they were not part of what could be read as a “Western frame of understanding”. Much of the pressure for both strict religious laws and LGBTI rights in Uganda has its origins in the West, and many argue that the topic of homosexuality is yet another ideological struggle that “the West” is fighting on African soil. Input from another “south partner” certainly had its own value, as it was not part of the old “patronizing discourse of the West”.

Combining standardized professional values with conflicting ethical values

Interestingly, diverging views on the question of journalist objectivity and detachment became much more accentuated when discussing an issue like homosexuality, whereby colliding ethical issues came to the forefront, compared to when the discussion was more “dryly” concerned with general issues of professional values in journalism. Through the interviews it became clear that several interviewees who had initially stated that “journalists may express their own views, but in a cautious and balanced way” believed that when it came to the issue of homosexuality it was important to “speak out”, either from a religious or cultural perspective (speaking out against homosexuality) or from a democratic or human rights perspective (speaking out against violence against human rights). Some of the respondents who had initially argued that journalists should express their views “in a cautious and balanced way” later argued that statements about “the need to fight against phenomena perceived as alien to our culture and ethos as a people”, as it was put in one of the daily Ugandan newspapers (20 February 2014), were considered legitimate in the endeavour to “reduce harm” to

Ugandan society (interviews, 2014/2015). This is yet a sturdy example of how introducing topics of real challenge to transnational cooperation in journalism education may capture interesting tensions that readymade surveys or more superficial discussions excluding issues of cultural value may ignore.

Questions linked to whether it was a responsible act to arrange for Norwegian journalism students and lecturers to visit a country where homosexuality is illegal, and whether homosexual students visiting Uganda should be advised to lie about their sexual preferences, also raised interesting discussions about the ethical obligation of educators to inform students about the situation. Most of the Norwegian educators believed it was acceptable to send a group of Norwegian students to Uganda, but that the students should be well informed in advance and advised to take security measures (January 2015). A few argued that it was not reasonable to send Norwegian students to Uganda in the current situation.

Beyond dialogue?

Although dialogue is often and powerfully asserted as the solution in relation to both processes of democracy and in journalism itself (see for instance Strömbäck, 2005; Moe, 2008; Hornmoen, & Steensen, 2014), this chapter has exemplified processes of democratic exchange whereby dialogue does not necessarily entirely solve every contradiction between the parties. Furthermore, dialogue as such is not necessarily democratic; nor is it in itself better for democracy than a monologic mode of communication (Peters, 1999). Anna Roosvall argues that *solidarity* as a mode of communication better lives up to the allusions of “real dialogue”, and better meets the demands of democratic communication (2014).

Roosvall shows how the development of what she calls *solidaritarian modes* of communication contributes to the improvement of the methods and conditions of debate, discussion and persuasion, which is essential in society as well as in news communication (2014: 63). A solidaritarian mode of communication is signified as dialogic in form, in that it includes an exchange. At the same time it exceeds dialogue in that the exchange is to be equal or similar, and in that it includes an element of action specifically directed towards injustice. Thus it exceeds the idea of dialogue leading to peace and agreement, since it is not necessarily so that the mending of injustice will be agreed upon by everyone (2014: 63).

Roosvall argues that solidaritarian communication – unlike dialogue – is always democratic. According to her, a solidaritarian mode of communication could ensure democratic participation through responsibility and empathy, and thus enable democracy through exchange in not only deliberative but also agonistic forms (2014: 62). She argues that “mode” is an essential element in the suggested concept, as it encompasses *an attitude* in the way of speaking in and to the world. Adapting Roosvall’s solidaritarian mode to the discussion here could involve, in addition to a dialogue between the

cooperation partners, an element of action directed towards the injustice. Just who is to define what this action should be is challenging, as we can imagine that those who believe homosexuality is a human right and those who consider it wrong would have differing opinions on what the injustice in question is.

However, the point at which real change seemed to take place was when the educators from the south met with Norwegian people who were openly gay, and got to know them as “ordinary people”. It is a fact that in many societies where hostility against homosexuals is high there is also a general lack of awareness of what homosexuality *is*, and tendencies to confuse concepts such as paedophilia and homosexuality are frequent. Hence, the long-term value of actions, here in the sense of encounters with homosexuals who are also “good people”, should not be underestimated in terms of the potential for change. Here, the element of action in this cooperation could possibly be translated into working together with people from the other side of the abyss – be it homosexuals, or those against the right to be homosexual – across the difficult differences. Here we clearly see the potential for transnational cooperation to develop new attitudes in the way of “speaking in and to the world” (Roosvall, 2014: 62). To continuously work to improve the conditions of the debate, give both sides room and time to express their views, adopt a mode whereby listening becomes as important as arguing, and not least clarify what they mean by the different concepts central to the discussion, would certainly help to advance a more nuanced discussion about conflicting values in transnational journalism education and cooperation.

At the same time, the unfolding of social reality can only be explained through the continuous interplay of agents and structures, whereby structures are simultaneously the result of the human agency and a constraint on it (Archetti, 2012: 185). As Archetti further reminds us, if agency and structures always reflected each other, no change would ever occur. Change often lies in the slight disconnection between agency and structures, within the process of their dynamic unfolding over time: structures pose a constraint on individual action, but do not entirely determine it (Archetti, 2012: 185). From this perspective, in an attempt to explain the effects of international exchange on journalism faculty and students, change cannot be explained only through the impact of a new environment on social practice; all students and faculty involved in such an exchange will have to relate to their own original structures *and* the new ones of the exchange partners. Hence, it makes sense to recall Mark Deuze’s argument (2006: 26-27) that issues common to journalism education on a global level should always include an analysis and discussion of how the various ways to organize the training of journalists can be interconnected with developments in society at large. This understanding is based on the assumption that journalism cannot exist independent of community; it is a profession interacting with society in many – and not wholly unproblematic – ways, and should therefore be seen as influencing and operating under the influence of what happens in society (see also Kovach, & Rosenstiel, 2001).

Constructive challenges

When researching journalism educators' ethical and professional values, introducing a concrete (disputed) topic may raise more nuanced and also more difficult discussions about both the professional role and ethical plight of journalists in general, and the professional values of journalism educators in particular. The findings of the small sample analysed here show that the central journalistic concept of objectivity turned out to be a highly polysemic term, with varying definitions across and within geographical regions. In addition, the journalism educators' take on the concept changed when the challenging topic of the (non-)acceptance of homosexuality was introduced into the debate. The professional approach most respondents had to the concept of objectivity, when discussed in a more neutral context, dwindled slightly as antagonism regarding the (non-)acceptance of homosexuality was discussed. Several journalism educators who had initially stated that "journalists may express their own views, but in a cautious and balanced way" turned out to hold that when it came to the issue of homosexuality it was important to make a clear stand; hence, the detachment of the journalist became less important as a value in itself.

It is commonly held that exposure through international cooperation and global journalism may reduce the structural problem of domesticating global issues in journalism (see e.g. Olausson, 2013). The primary findings from this small sample of global journalism educators participating in transnational cooperation show that some topics or areas may be highly contested and perhaps not possible to solve immediately simply through dialogue. However, such contested issues highlight differences in approaches to journalistic professional and ethical values, and may open up for some new perspectives in the discussion of how to renew journalism through education. Such discussions may also provide the first part of an answer to the call (from Harcup, 2011) for an exploration of the impact of globalization on journalism education.

As this chapter's example has illustrated, utterly diverging worldviews may present demanding challenges to global journalism education in terms of both discourse and understanding. However, these challenges within global journalism education may in turn be constructive and contribute to challenging participants to take part in improving the methods and conditions of "global journalism" as such. The element of action is inherent in the cooperation process itself, whereby working together across differences of all types is highlighted as a value and a prerequisite for creating a real democratic dialogue and understanding. As "the public" of global journalism will come to the media with less similar forms of experiences than the (somewhat) more homogenous national publics with more equal or similar understandings, the understandings from intercultural encounters may enhance the participants' knowledge and awareness in terms of developing new ways to reflect on the world, and to communicate with the public.

Notes

1. (worldsofjournalism.org).
2. <http://www.ugandamission.net/aboutug/histimeline.html>

References

- Archetti, Cristina (2012). The Impact of New Media on Diplomatic Practice: An Evolutionary Model of Change. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 7(2), 181-206.
- Berglez, Peter (2013). *Global Journalism. Theory and Practice*. Peter Lang Publisher.
- Deuze, Mark (2006). Global Journalism Education. A conceptual approach. *Journalism Studies*, 7(1).
- Eide, Elisabeth (2014). Bekjennelser og kompromisser. Homofile/lesbiske/skeive medieerfaringer [Confessions and compromises. Homosexual/lesbian/queer media experiences] *Norsk Medietidsskrift*, 3.
- Gerodimos, Roman (2013). Journalism students as global citizens and mediators: incorporating global current affairs into the journalism curriculum. (pp. 70-86), *Journalism Education*, (1)1.
- Hallin, Daniel C., & Paolo Mancini (2004). *Comparing media systems: three models of media and politics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas (2007). Deconstructing journalism culture: Toward a universal theory. *Communication Theory*, 17(4), 367-385.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas (2009). Comparative Journalism Studies (pp. 413-428) In Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, & Thomas Hanitzsch (Eds.) *The Handbook of journalism studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas, Folker Hanusch, et al. (2010). Mapping Journalism Cultures Across Nations. A comparative study of 18 countries. *Journalism Studies*, 12(3), 273-293.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas (2011). Populist Disseminators, Detached Watchdogs, Critical Change Agents and Opportunist Facilitators: Professional Milieus, the Journalistic Field and Autonomy in 18 Countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 73(6), 477-494.
- Harcup, Tony (2009). *Journalism: principles and practice*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Harcup, Tony (2011). Questioning the 'bleeding obvious': What's the point of researching journalism? *Journalism*, 13(1), 21-37.
- Hornmoen, Harald, & Steen Steensen (2014). Dialogue as a Journalistic Ideal. *Journalism Studies*, 15(5), 543-554.
- Knowlton, Steven R., & Karen L. Freeman (2005). *Fair & balanced: a history of journalistic objectivity*. Northport: AL: Vision Press.
- Krøvel, Roy, Kristin Skare Orgeret, & Andreas Ytterstad (2012). Objectivity and Advocacy in Global Warming Journalism. Scientific Knowledge, Local Experiences and Concern Among Students in Nicaragua, Nepal and Bangladesh. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 22(1), 15-28.
- Linstad, Siri (2012). *Når det personlige aldri blir politisk* [When the personal never becomes political]. Master thesis. University of Oslo/HiOA.
- Loo, Eric (2009). *Best Practices of Journalism in Asia*. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.
- Löffelholz, Martin, David Weaver, & Andreas Schwarz (Eds.) (2008). *Global Journalism Research: Theories, Methods, Findings, Future*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Olsen, Christa R., Rhodri Evans, & Robert F. Schoenberg (2007). *At Home in the World: Bridging the Gap between Internationalization and Multicultural Education*. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education.
- Patwardhan, Padmini H. (2012). Think Global, Act Local Integrating Global Learning into the Curriculum. in *American Academy of Advertising*. Vol 8, No. 4.
- Roosvall, Anna (2014). Beyond dialogue: Exploring solidarity as a mode of communication through a debate on readers' comments to online news. *Northern Lights. Film and Media Studies Yearbook*, 12(1).
- Schudson, Michael, & Chris Anderson (2009). Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism (pp. 88-101). In Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, & Thomas Hanitzsch (Eds.) *The Handbook of journalism studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Tom W. (2011) Public Attitudes towards homosexuality. NORC/University of Chicago. www.norc.org
- Wasserman, Herman, & Arnold S. de Beer (2009). Towards De-Westernizing Journalism Studies (pp. 428-438). In Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, & Thomas Hanitzsch (Eds.) *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. New York: Routledge: