JOURNALISTS AT WORK – REVISITED

HOWARD TUMBER

Abstract

This article takes the opportunity to look in more detail at one of Jeremy Tunstall's seminal works – *Journalists at Work* published in 1971. It was the first major social science study of specialist journalists in the UK. Tunstall began the research in 1965 at a time when no single social science study of British journalism existed. Tunstall's study of British journalism set out to investigate specialist news gatherers on national newspapers constituting approximately fifteen per cent of the personnel in those organisations and representing about two percent of all British journalists. Three aspects of Tunstall's study are discussed – news organisations and their goals, the source-media relationship, and the occupation of journalism – in addition to some comments about the context and the methodology of the research.

Howard Tumber is Professor of Sociology and former Dean of Social Sciences at City University, London; e-mail: h.tumber@city.ac.uk.

In 2000 I edited a collection of essays in honour of Jeremy Tunstall (Tumber 2000). In the introductory essay to the book I was only able to provide a rather brief summary outlining Tunstall's contribution to media and communication studies.[1] In this article I want to take the opportunity to look in more detail at one of his seminal works – *Journalists at Work*.[2]

Journalists at Work, published in 1971 by Constable,[3] was the first major social science study of specialist journalists in the UK. For Tunstall, at that time, media sociology was "a field of considerable intrinsic fascination, importance and intellectual challenge" (1970, 38). Tunstall began the research in 1965 – hard to comprehend now that this was over forty years ago – and at the time no single social science study of British journalism existed. As Tunstall himself wrote at the time in the introduction to the book: "There was no study of any type of specialist journalist, no study of a communications organisation, and no study of recruitment to the occupation. Nor was there any general history of Fleet Street that could satisfy a sociologist or a social or economic historian. The several scholarly studies of specific historical topics were mainly written by American historians" (Tunstall 1971, 5). Tunstall also pointed to the limitations of the American literature. Most studies dealt with journalism at the local or state level rather than at the national level and there were no adequate organisational studies of typical newspapers or broadcast stations. Tunstall added that there were no satisfactory broad social science studies of the occupation of journalism in the US. Tunstall's influence is hard to exaggerate. In the UK it was largely through his efforts that the academic study of journalism took shape as the expanding field of media studies (Zelizer 2004, 19). In commenting about journalists and their occupational settings, Zelizer adds: "Tunstall, almost single-handedly, developed the literature on the occupational life of journalists, where his examination of the patterns of entry and maintenance among a variety of specialist journalists … showed the shared attributes of occupational and professional life regardless of specialisation" (2004, 56). Stephen Hess, for example, claims that Tunstall became his teacher after he read *The Westminster Lobby Correspondents* and *Journalists at Work* using Tunstall's work as a methodological and spiritual guide for his own study on Washington reporters (Hess 1981; and see Tumber 2000, 9).[4] In this article I want to discuss three aspects of Tunstall's study: news organisations and their goals, the source-media relationship, and the occupation of journalism. But first a few comments about the context and the methodology.

The landscape of the British media in 1965, when Tunstall began the project, was remarkably different to what it is now. The economic and political climate is now unrecognisable from that time when globalisation and the development of new technologies hardly were on the horizon. In 1965 British broadcasting was characterised by the duopoly system of public broadcasting represented by the BBC (two terrestrial channels), financed then and still today by a license system, and ITV (one terrestrial channel but divided into regional franchises) financed then and now by advertising. BBC 2 introduced colour transmissions in 1967 and from 1965 the Intelstat series of satellites enabled satellite transmissions for up to eighteen hours a day. Apart from the brief intervention of pirate radio stations, the BBC enjoyed a monopoly of radio broadcasting. There were nine national newspaper titles in 1965[5] compared with ten in 2006[6] but the ownership structure now with its increase in concentration is very different to what it was forty years

ago. At the time of writing Tunstall identified five major features of the national media industry in Britain. The first was the national dominance of provincial media – with provincial media mainly London owned and with the BBC and ITN both London dominated. The second was that national newspapers and TV were the two dominant media in Britain with the specialist correspondents of both found in the groups of nationalist specialists. Thirdly Tunstall recognised that multi media organisations were becoming increasingly important. Fourth was the fact that the daily media dominated the British media industry to an extent not known elsewhere. Tunstall viewed this with concern because it narrowed the number of voices. Lastly he predicted a further decline in the number of national newspapers and a further consolidation of a few multi-media organisations (1971, 281). In the conclusion to *Journalists at Work*, Tunstall warned of these dangers and urged social scientists involved in mass media research to take up the task of redefining the criteria used to judge the level of competition or degree of monopoly (ibid, 282). In the intervening period it has become virtually impossible to ignore the media's role in either public or private life. The media in all their guises has become pervasive and intrusive. They are both global and local and its convergence has led to new areas of research including that related to public policy.[7]

Journalism as a cultural practice has also undergone large changes in the last forty years relating to "shifting notions of work, technological advancement in the workplace, and the predicaments of a volatile market economy, as media interests have merged with the politics of mass society" (Hardt 2000, 210). In what has been called the third age of journalism, from the 1980s onwards – the "information age" – aspects of professional journalism are being challenged with a blurring between the public and journalists. There is a widening of professional practice and an incorporation of new channels of communication and interactive communications enabling the public itself to be a distributor of information. The characteristic features of the "new media" and the changes in political and social processes are having a major impact on the role of journalism in two different ways. Firstly the flow of information from a proliferation of sources involving the public challenges the role of the journalists as "experts" in the dissemination of information. Secondly, journalistic culture itself is transformed in a way that further unsettles the public/journalistic distinction. We may be witnessing the de-professionalisation of the practice in a manner more familiar during the "first information age" from the mid-fifteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century and before the professionalisation of the field from the mid-nineteenth to the 1980s.

Tunstall's study of British journalism set out to investigate specialist news gatherers on national newspapers constituting approximately fifteen per cent of the personnel in those organisations and representing about two percent of all British journalists. The intention behind Tunstall's original proposal for funding from the Leverhulme Foundation was to conduct a study about the occupation and profession of journalism but he then hit upon the idea of looking at specialist correspondents. In planning the study Tunstall was influenced by previous sociological studies of occupations.[8] In particular Tunstall was impressed by Everett Hughes' irreverent approach to medical students in his book *The Boys in White*. This was in contrast to his views of Robert Merton's work on the medical profession which came out at the same time but was much more reverential referring to the doctors as physi-

cians. Tunstall has described his research as an unmasking of an occupation albeit a relatively sympathetic kind of unmasking (Tumber 2000, 13n2). Bernard Cohen's *The Press and Foreign Policy* (1963) was also influential.[9] Tunstall was fascinated by the manner in which Cohen had talked to foreign and diplomatic correspondents in Washington[10]. He was also influenced by the survey studies conducted in the US by Leo Rosten particularly *The Washington Correspondents* (1937) (Tumber 2000, 2). One of the marked features of *Journalists at Work* is the way Tunstall linked it to previous sociological literature. Boyd-Barrett suggests that Tunstall,

> *draws on the tradition of political communication introduced by Rosten, extending this to a range of different journalistic specialisms, retaining Mertonian functionalism[11] but going further with it in looking at how specialist roles are influenced not just by their own "reference groups" of fellow specialists (characterised by intriguing competitor-colleague ambivalencies) and their respective networks of news sources, but also by the different cultures of different news media, the different kinds of contribution which different specialisms make to news media (in terms of their relative importance to media for sales revenue, advertising revenue, or for "prestige" goals) and by their part in a wider journalistic culture with common understanding of the relative status of different specialist groups within that culture. A significant revelation of the Tunstall study, by contrast with generations of journalistic memoirs which had preceded it, was the extent to which news was not an unpredictable and chaotic universe of events but was the steady and reliable prediction, preparation and routine management of "institutionalised" news, a finding which has been confirmed in a number of succeeding studies* (Boyd-Barrett (1995, 273-274).

The study was neither about the whole occupation of journalism in Britain nor about news organisations. Tunstall described it as "primarily an exploratory one" and he set out four objectives. The first was a statement and an affirmation of the sociological nature of the research. The majority of previous mass media research had either a social psychology or political science grounding and Tunstall, himself a sociologist, was eager to indicate ways in which sociology could contribute to this field. Establishing a familiarity with the subject matter was the second objective and the use of more than one research method was employed to exploit this. Developing hypotheses and a conceptual framework for future communications studies comprised the third and fourth objectives (1971, 6).

Methodology

Tunstall decided to concentrate on specialist journalists thereby allowing for comparison of categories. Together with Oliver Boyd-Barrett who joined him on the project as a research assistant, he conducted a survey of more than two hundred journalists employed by national British news media in 1968[12] and undertook direct observation[13] and unstructured face to face interviews with a total of 430 newspaper editors, advertising and circulation managers, sub editors and provincial journalists.[14] The idea was to cover all of the specialists who existed in the selected fields.[15] Tunstall piloted the survey by testing on one person in each of the specialist fields. Despite the length of the questionnaire most of the respondents

completed it although some of them sent it back complaining that it would take up too much time to fill in. Tunstall, as a pioneer, "caught" journalists at a time when they rarely, if ever, received these enquiries. Nowadays of course media workers are inundated with requests for interviews and survey responses from students as well as academics and consequently are not as cooperative as they were forty years ago. Tunstall and Boyd-Barrett chased their respondents relentlessly- writing to some of the recalcitrants three times to elicit a response.[16] For the interviews they used a guide, but did not tape the interviews – instead they provided a commentary onto a tape recorder immediately after the interview. The lack of computing facilities available at the time meant a long and slow process for analysing the completed questionnaires but the advantage was that Tunstall was able to engage in a very close reading of the data. It meant, for example, that he discovered how most specialists swapped material with their competitors. Tunstall related[17] that there were several clues scattered around and by actually reading the questionnaires over and over and then comparing them, in some cases he could do a detective job of discovering the various partners.

News Organisations and Their Goals

One of the important areas of the research project which Tunstall examined empirically was the goals of news organisations. News organisations, he wrote "do not fit neatly into any of the established sociological goal classification systems" (Tunstall 1971, 49). Eschewing Parsons' (1960) fourfold classification (adaptive, implementative, integrative and pattern-maintenance), Etzioni's (1961) dual organisation structure, and Blau and Scott's (1955) "prime beneficiary" approach, Tunstall instead suggested that news organisations should be seen neither as unitary nor dual but instead as having several types of goal: "A continual process of bargaining takes place as to which goals should be pursued" (p. 50). Tunstall combined the approach of Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) who preferred the concept of bargaining within the goal concept together with that of Robert Park's (1922) emphasis on revenue. This led Tunstall to outline three main types of goal that are present in all news organisations - audience revenue, which exists because a news organisation that operates on a commercial basis must have an audience,[18] advertising revenue, which inevitably becomes one of the goals of both news organisations and media organisation, and non-revenue (p. 51). This three fold classification could be applied at a number of levels: popular (revenue goals) and quality media (non-revenue goals); news organisations and journalists (non-revenue goals) as against media organisations and non journalists (revenue goals); news processing (revenue goals) and newsgathering journalists (non revenue goals); and different specialist fields within newsgathering journalism (revenue and non-revenue goals; p. 53).[19] Tunstall's goal bargaining approach emphasised that no type of news gathering is rigidly tied to just one type of goal and that all specialist newsgathering fields include an element of each of the three goals with some fields lacking a predominant goal (p. 54). For this type Tunstall suggested a fourth goal – describing it as a "mixed goal" and involving a mixture of the other three types of goal. He provided the example of aviation correspondence to illustrate his point: advertising revenue goal since there is aviation related advertising, audience revenue goal since aviation is strong in news values and non revenue elements of various kinds are also

present (p. 54). One final point Tunstall made here was that despite goal bargaining "the combination of goals pursued by a news organisation will usually alter only a little from one year to the next and that a coalition goal tends to develop – namely the audience revenue goal which tends to receive the greatest support from the various bargaining (or conflicting) interests involved" (p. 54). Tunstall argued that this coalition audience revenue goal is a common denominator to which most agree while bargaining about the other goals continues. The reason for this, he proposed, was because small changes in total audience size are accepted as the prime indicator of a news organisation's success. "Journalists, as well as advertising, circulation and marketing men, accountants and printers – and the national audience – are all broadly united in recognising this as an acceptable indicator. Both news values and total audience size – which may appear to outsiders to receive an irrational and excessive emphasis – assume such importance because, while goal bargaining continues, the audience revenue goal is the only possible coalition goal" (p. 55). That media organisations are characterised by mixed goals "is important for locating the media in their social context, understanding some of the pressures under which they are placed and helping to differentiate the main occupational choices available to employees" (McQuail 1987, 144).

Sources

The source-media relationship has been a feature of the empirical sociology of the media for decades but the emphasis of examination has tended to be from the journalists' perspective rather than that of the source. Recent work on the empirical sociology of news production and journalism has concentrated on or re-emphasised the role of sources in the "manufacture" of news. One of the most interesting developments has been an examination of the relationship between different sources – "official" and "non official" – and between sources and the media. Over the last twenty years source-media analyses have become an important element in understanding the kinds of news we receive. The part played by sources in the media production process has been explored recently in various different representations including crime, the environment, politics, business, and war and conflict (see Anderson, 1997; Bennett, 1990; Ericson et al., 1989; Hallin, 1986; Miller, 1993; Schlesinger and Tumber, 1994; Tumber, 1993).

Various scholars, whether media or source centric, have attempted to generalise about the relationship between journalists and their sources. Tunstall provided a formulation suggesting that journalists and news sources are engaged in an "exchange of information for publicity" (1970, 43-4). A few years later Gans characterised the relationship as "a tug of war" in which "sources attempt to 'manage' the news, putting the best possible light on themselves and journalists concurrently 'manage' the source in order to extract the information they want" (1979, 117). To some extent this view implies an interaction based on an instrumental economic calculation with each side conducting a cost benefit analysis of the activity in order to maximise satisfactions or utilities (Schlesinger and Tumber 1994, 24). In looking at "information subsidies" Gandy (1982) provides the most fully developed version of this position. An explanation in terms of the coincidence of self-interest on both sides of an exchange relationship is of importance, though it is not the complete story. Journalists and sources are engaged in a social process and often

need to appeal to norms other than those of the purely economic. Relations are not just simply conducted between individuals. "They operate at the interface between news organisations and news sources, who almost invariably are themselves members of organisations with collective goals to pursue" (Schlesinger and Tumber 1994, 25; see also Tunstall 1971, 185-6). To illustrate this Tunstall provided the example of the routinised provision of information such as public relations and press conferences. This "is clearly not a simple exchange between an individual source and an individual specialist. There is a strong collective element here – the transactions are between groups of specialists and press relations divisions within news source organisations" (p. 186). Tunstall added that this interaction encompasses contractual and quasi-legal elements with neither side able to withdraw wholly from this "information-publicity" exchange: "There is no open market and no directly alternative suppliers or consumers of the service in question" (p. 186). Overall then, Tunstall eschewed the "simple" exchange model involving an exchange of information for publicity, seeing it as omitting too many variables: "Most exchange models ignore the instability of news, the loosely structured (or chaotic) character of the social interaction, and especially the lack of time for care, gradualness or full communication about the dispositions of different parties relevant to the rapidly changing 'current' story" (p. 201). Finally with regard to critical coverage Tunstall raised questions regarding the kinds of control that sources have over journalists and those that journalist have over their sources (p. 203). In this regard Tunstall linked the goal classification of news organisations with the behaviour of news sources.

Occupation

Classifying the occupation of journalism has always been a difficult endeavour. From the nineteenth century, when the processes of professionalisation began, until the present, debate has reigned about whether journalism is a craft, a trade or a profession. When attempting classifications comparisons are frequently made with the professions of medicine and law. The people working in these occupations are considered to be a select group of high-status practitioners administering specialised services to members of the community. They generally undergo a lengthy period of tertiary training in their speciality and when admitted to practice normally enjoy a share in a monopoly in the performance of their work (Henningham 1979, 15; see also Tunstall 1973, 87).

Unlike the classical professions, the depth of abstract knowledge on which the practice of journalism was based was both limited and less clearly defined, while the emphasis on practical skills brought journalism closer to a craft than a profession. Although journalism has had to face a set of very specific problems inherent in its practice, the sociology of professions and occupations has juggled with providing some stable guidelines on how to characterise professions in general (Tumber and Prentoulis 2005, 58).

Jeremy Tunstall described journalism as an indeterminate occupation. Comparing it with both law and medicine which are relatively compact, uniform, and sharply defined, he described "journalist" as a "label which people engaged in a very diverse range of activities apply to themselves" (Tunstall 1973, 98; Tunstall 1971, 69). This diversity has increased considerably in the last thirty years and Tunstall's

suggestion that "only occupations which are fairly determinate have any chance of becoming professions" (Tunstall 1973, 98), probably relegates journalism's position even further nowadays from professional status. Using Greenwood's five attributes of a profession – systematic theory; authority; community sanction; ethical codes; and a culture – as a yardstick, Tunstall writing thirty five years ago, doubted that journalism "could ever acquire professional attributes to the extent of, for instance, medicine. A more realistic objective, if the occupation wished to pursue it, would be to make journalism into a semi profession – in the way that teaching, for instance, is a semi-profession" (Tunstall 1971, 69).[20] At the same time Tunstall pointed out that law and medicine, while scoring much higher than journalism, might well score below full points (Tunstall 1973, 89).

Finally in regard to this question of occupation Tunstall characterised journalism as weak but that certain categories (four) of journalist do appear to have very considerable influence – the first group are leading individual figures in national journalism (for the US – columnists and commentators; for the UK – editors of major publications. The second group are the senior executives who in Britain comprise night editors of national newspapers, those in charge of major factual television programmes, and the editors of a few influential magazines. The third category is the news gatherers particularly the Lobby correspondents who play an important part in the evolution of rivalry within the British cabinet and in the definition of political crisis. The fourth are what Tunstall defined as journalist/politician/public figure (1971, 276). Overall though, these categories taken together add up only to a few hundred *men*.[21]

The Legacy

Tunstall's work since the publication of *Journalists at Work* has concerned itself primarily with media power, industries, organisations and occupations (see Tumber 2000, 1-15). At the same time he has always been fascinated about the relationship between social scientists, particularly sociologists, and journalists.[22] He argued that despite differences between places of work, conceptual frameworks and methods of gathering data, and time perspectives there is more in common between sociologists and journalists than either side admits (1971, 277). Noting the mutual suspicion (based on ignorance) between the two groups, he has often emphasised the dependency they have on each other. Journalists' dependency is exhibited through the frequent use of stories and news items reporting on or based on surveys, studies, reports and investigations produced by social scientists (ibid). But, as Tunstall wrote in *Journalists at Work*: "journalists who produce the stories sometimes show a startling ignorance of the simplest conventions of such work, and a failure to search for the most easily available published sources. Many journalists – despite their professed hostility to government organisations – when faced with government publications and statistics often accept them with complete credulity" (1970, 278). He argued that journalists would be less dependent on public relations (spin as we often now term it) and major source organisations (spin doctors) if they knew how to find and use social science evidence. Tunstall was even more scathing about sociologists' ignorance of journalism criticising them for their lack of curiosity of how news gets into newspapers or onto television screens: "When sociologists do venture opinions about journalism these opinions often reveal

ignorance of the most elementary details" (ibid). Tunstall, in effect, was offering a challenge to both groups to engage more fully. For the academy he issued a call: "Within social science during the last decade or two (1950s and 1960s), research on the mass media has tended to carry low status. In the case of journalism little recent sociological research of a reasonable standard exists. In consequence several broad areas of sociological theory and research have not taken the media into account. The existing sociological literature in such areas as organisations, the professions, and small group exchange is the weaker for this neglect" (ibid). In particular Tunstall was concerned that future mass media researchers should continue to benefit from importing theoretical perspectives from neighbouring fields and offered organisational theory, conflict theory, linguistics, disengagement theory, and collective behaviour, as examples of those with the potential to offer something.

Tunstall also called for the use of additional research methods alongside those of laboratory experiments, content analysis, and random sampling already in vogue (1970, 37). Forty years on from *Journalists at Work,* the landscape (and the research agenda) has changed considerably, not only has the world of journalism been turned upside down through changes brought about by the globalisation of the media industries and the development of new electronic communications technologies but the academic setting for communications research and teaching has changed as well. The "old" discipline producers – sociology, political science and social psychology – of communication research have been displaced and replaced in the main by "new" departments of media, communications, cultural studies, and journalism. At least in the present day academy, media, communication and journalism research have achieved some degree of respectability – at least with students. Sniping at so called "Mickey mouse" courses still occurs at regular intervals from sections of the media industry, politicians and also from some elite universities who are at pains to distance themselves from these new endeavours. Columbia University's well established School of Journalism, Media at LSE and the recent setting up of the Reuters Institute for the study of journalism at Oxford University suggest there are pockets of enlightenment taking a differing view. It took the academy, though, until 2000 to establish concrete forums for the study of journalism. Two new journals were set up – *Journalism* (see www.sagepub.co.uk); and *Journalism Studies* (see www.tandf.co.uk) providing forums for debates around the theory and practice of journalism. In addition, reflecting the increasing autonomy of journalism as a field of enquiry as well as of education, a new interest group (*Journalism Studies*; www.icahdq.org/divisions/JournalismStudies/jsigweb4/index.html) was set up in 2004 (and given divisional status in 2006) within the International Communications Association with the intention of promoting journalism theory and research as well as professional education in journalism (Tumber 2005). Thus, in many aspects Tunstall's challenge was accepted and run with by social scientists and humanities scholars.

So what is the legacy of *Journalists at Work* – or indeed that of the whole body of Tunstall's work? The reflections of James Curran sum it up better than I could: "He will be remembered primarily as a sociologist and one of the founding fathers of British media studies whose many books became key texts for teaching and research. But he has also a wider public significance. Jeremy Tunstall is one of the very first people to examine systematically the organisation, public policy and content

of the British press. He is a pioneer of that critical tradition whose absence has been one of the reasons for the failure of press reformism in Britain. His importance lies not only in what he has achieved but it also lies in what he has begun" (2000, 51).

Notes:

1. For a discussion and details of Tunstall's other works see Tumber (2000, 1-15.)

2. Before proceeding I should confess a personal interest. I was fortunate to be appointed as a research assistant in 1979, by Jeremy Tunstall and David Morrison, at City University, London to work on a study of foreign correspondents based in the UK.

3. This was the first book in a new (and what turned out to be influential) series, Communication and Society, edited by Jeremy Tunstall which ran from 1971until 1984.

4. It is important and worth recalling here that a series of studies were conducted in the UK and US in the 1970s and 1980s following Tunstall's *Journalists at Work*. This period is sometimes referred to as the golden age of media production studies. Some of these studies were based on PhD research or research grants and involved interviews with news organisation personnel and observation in newsrooms. They provided insights and observations of the production of news with the emphasis on the operation of organisational constraints and the social construction of reality in social systems. See Sigelman 1973; Burns 1977; Tracey 1977; Schlesinger 1978; Tuchman 1978; Golding and Elliot, 1979; Gans 1979; Gitlin 1980; Fishman 1980; Hetherington 1984; Silverstone 1985; Hallin 1986; Ericson, Baranek and Chan 1987.

5. *Daily Mail, Daily Sketch, Daily Express, Daily Mirror, Sun, Daily Telegraph, The Times, Guardian, Financial Times.*

6. *Daily Mail, Daily Express, Daily Mirror, Sun, Daily Star, Daily Telegraph, The Times, Guardian, Financial Times, Independent.*

7. It is worth noting that Tunstall was one of the first UK academics to look at comparative media policy (see Tumber 2000, 5 & 13).

8. For a good account of the sociology of journalism see Zelizer 2004, ch. 3.

9. Cohen conducted over 150 interviews with people in staff or policy positions in the Executive branch, and in the Congress and also with former holder of these positions (1963, 11).

10. Tunstall was critical of the studies by US political scientists Cohen (1963), Warner (1968) and Nimmo, (1964) because of their concentration on overtly political areas of news. For sociologists like himself, interested in a wider range of news, including 'non-political news, this was a serious weakness. He saw these political scientists as having ignored the complexity of news, of journalism and of news organisation goals. 'By concentrating on overtly political areas of news, the revenue goals of news organisations – more apparent in areas such as sport or fashion – are excluded (1972, 261).

11. Tunstall's work on Television producers (1993) abandoned Merton's functional approach in favour of one 'which develops its categories largely in terms which the participants themselves would recognise and which are grounded in the evidence of interview and observation' (Boyd-Barrett 1995, 275).

12. This was a mailed questionnaire of some twenty two pages long which Tunstall designed.

13. These varied from a day to ten days in length and were carried out inside seven national and four provincial news organisations (1971, 292).

14. Tunstall seemed proud to remark that the interviews together with the direct observation sessions, produced approximately one million words of typed notes (ibid, 295).

15. The research intended to collect data from all the full time specialist journalists who worked in certain selected fields for all twenty three general news organisations at the national level in the UK. These included Politics, Aviation, Education, Labour, Crime, Football, Fashion and Motoring. Foreign correspondents working for London news organisations but stationed abroad in Bonn, Rome, New

York and Washington were also included (Tunstall 1971, 1). Tunstall wrote a separate book about one of these groups of specialists – see the Westminster Lobby Correspondents (1970).

16. The overall response rate was 70.2 per cent comprising London based specialists 76 per cent (207 respondents) and foreign correspondents 58 per cent. In the great majority of cases the mailed questionnaire was preceded by an unstructured interview. In addition direct observation took place inside eleven news organisations (Tunstall 1971, 8).

17. In conversation with author 1999.

18. Tunstall included daily and weekly newspapers and broadcast organisations whether financed by advertising or licence fee.

19. Foreign correspondence would emphasize non-revenue; motoring correspondence would emphasize an advertising revenue, and crime correspondence an audience revenue (p. 53).

20. For further discussion of journalism and professionalism see Tumber and Prentoulis (2005, 58-74).

21. It is interesting to note that in defining these categories Tunstall refers to men who of course were the overwhelming majority of specialist correspondents working in Britain at that time. It is interesting to note here that, in his introductory essay to the Media Sociology reader he edited in 1970, Tunstall advocated research on women and the media as one of three areas he identified for future research and exploration (p. 36).

22. The relationship between journalists and social scientists was a topic taken up later by a number of scholars including Golding and Elliot (1976 Ch. 1), who reviewed some of the contemporary debate between newsmen and sociologists and Schlesinger (1980) who discussed the reception of his own and others' work in an article entitled 'Between Sociology and Journalism'.

References:

Anderson, Alison. 1987. *Media, Culture and the Environment.* London: UCL Press.

Bennett, W. Lance. 1990. Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication* 40, 103-125.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. 1963. *Formal Organisation.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Boyd-Barrett, Oliver. 1995. The Analysis of Media Occupations and Professionals. In O. Boyd-Barrett Oliver and C. Newbold (eds.), *Approaches to Media.* London: Arnold.

Burns, Tom. 1977. *The BBC: Public Institution and Private World.* London: Macmillan.

Cohen, Bernard. 1963. *The Press and Foreign Policy.* Princeton University Press.

Ericson, Richard V., Patricia M. Baranek and Janet B. L. Chan. 1989. *Negotiating Control: A Study of News Sources.* Open University Press.

Cantor, Muriel G. 1980. *Prime-time Television*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1961. *Complex Organisations.* New York: Free Press.

Fishman, Mark. 1980. *Manufacturing the News.* University of Texas Press.

Gandy, Oscar Jr. 1982. *Beyond Agenda Setting: Information Subsidies and Public Policy.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World is Watching. Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Golding, Peter and Philip Elliot. 1979. *Making the News.* London: Longman.

Hallin, Dan. 1986. *The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Henningham, John. 1979. Journalists and Professionalisation, *Australian Journalism Review,* July, 15-20.

Hess, Stephen. 1981. *The Washington Reporters.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Hetherington, Alastair. 1984. *News, Newspapers and Television.* London: Macmillan.

McQuail, Denis. 1987. *Mass Communication Theory.* London: Sage.

Miller, David. 1993. Official Sources and "Primary Definition": The Case of Northern Ireland. *Media, Culture and Society* 15, 3, 385-406.

Nimmo, David. 1964. *Newsgathering in Washington.* New York: Atherton.

Park, Robert E. 1922. *The Immigrant Press and Its Control.* New York: Harper.

Parsons, Talcott. 1960. *Structure and Process in Modern Societies.* Glencoe: Free Press.

Rosten, Leo. 1937. *The Washington Correspondents.* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Schlesinger, Philip. 1978. *Putting "Reality" Together.* London: Constable.

Schlesinger, Philip. 1980. Between Sociology and Journalism. In H. Christian (ed.) *The Sociology of Journalism and the Press*, 341- 369. (*Sociological Review Monograph* 29).

Schlesinger, Philip and Howard Tumber. 1994**.** *Reporting Crime: The Media Politics Criminal Justice.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sigelman, Leon. 1973. Reporting the News: An Organisational Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 79, 1, 132-51.

Silverstone, Roger. 1985. *Framing Science: The Making of a BBC Documentary.* London: BFI Publishing.

Tracey, Michael. 1977. *The Production of Political Television*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making the News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.

Tumber, Howard. 1993b. Selling Scandal: Business and the Media, *Media Culture and Society* 15, 3, 345-362.

Tumber, Howard, ed. 2000. *Media Power, Professionals and Policies.* London: Routledge.

Tumber, Howard and Marina Prentoulis. 2005. Journalism and the Making of a Profession. In H. de Burgh (ed.), *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues.* London: Routledge.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1970. *The Westminster Lobby Correspondents.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1970. Introduction. In J. Tunstall (ed.), *Media Sociology: A Reader.* London: Constable.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1971. *Journalists at Work.* London: Constable.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1972. News Organisation Goals and Specialist Newsgathering Journalists. In D. McQuail (ed.), *Sociology of Mass Communications*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Tunstall, Jeremy. 1973. Journalism as an Occupation. *The Medico-Legal Journal,* Part Three, 87-101.

Warner, M. 1968. Decision Making in TV News. *Television Quarterly* 7, 60-75.

Yuchtman, Ephraim and Stanley E. Seashore. 1967. A System Resource Approach to Organisational Effectiveness. *American Sociological Review* 32, 891-903.

Zelizer, Barbie. 2004. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.