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1. INTRODUCTIONS

JOURNEYS TOWARDS AN APPROACH

In January 1992 I loaded my car with a suitcase full of some clothes, a box of books and my Apple Mac (Classic) and headed for Northern Britain. My goal for the following six months was very clear; as a British Institute paid guest-researcher at the Glasgow University Media Group I intended to study British journalism culture to be able to make a comparison with a study on Swedish journalists, in which I had been involved (cf. Weibull, 1991; Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c). It did not quite happen the way I had planned. Both my life and the study took turns I never foresaw. It was only much later I realised that leaving Göteborg that January morning was the start of a long journey for me both personally and professionally.

In place at the Glasgow University Media Group (GUMG), I realised that I was not in Northern Britain at all, but in central Scotland. Issues of nationality, religion, class, diverse cultures, gender, sexuality, became overwhelmingly obvious to me, and I spent most of my visit mapping out and trying to understand the new world that had opened up to me. That meant fundamental theoretical and methodological changes to the project I had started. An eon later, and a universe away, sitting in a beautiful studio at Malmö University, over-looking the Öresund, tapping on my neat little G4, visiting the web to download journal articles, I realise how much
that Glasgow visit meant to me – again personally and professionally (one can never distinguish fully between the two).

The reason this text is in existence is the possibilities hindsight has given me. By looking back at these journeys I made, by looking back at three studies I made in three countries, over a period of thirteen years, I am able to see patterns not obvious to me when in the midst of the process. Hindsight furthermore enables me to draw conclusions from comparisons in space and over time. And perhaps most importantly, I am able to move from an analysis of a specific study to an analysis of studies, i.e. to move more onto a meta-level of analysis.

1. A THESIS OF GENDERED JOURNALISM CULTURES

*My aim with this thesis is to seek an understanding of the way fields of journalism work. I seek an understanding of journalism cultures and I explore the gendered nature of them. I do this by looking at two fields of journalism – that of Sweden and the UK – over one time period – the 1990s and the first years of the new millennium.*

I base this thesis on three studies. One, in Sweden, 1989, that I have already published findings from in several texts, and two, in the UK 1992 and again in 1998-2002, that I have only partly previously written about.

Three texts will constitute the foundation of this thesis: this book and two previously published texts. The first of these, *Pedagoger och spårhundar. En studie av svenska journalisters yrkesideal (Educators and Bloodhounds. A Study of the Professional Ideal amongst Swedish Journalists)* (Melin-Higgins, 1996a), is based on the study of Swedish journalists made in 1989, with the aim to study the professional ideal of Swedish Journalists. The second text, *Coping with Journalism. Gendered Newsroom Culture* (Melin-Higgins, 2004), is based on the two studies of UK journalists made between 1992 and 2002, with the aim to understand gendered news room culture (in the UK) and tactics employed by women journalists to survive it. As the latter only is a chapter in a book, there was not given enough space to fully present and analyse the British material. The book you are presently reading therefore consists of a fuller presentation and interpretation of the British studies, as well as of a re-analysis of the previous Swedish study. It also places all three studies in coherent framework.¹
2. THE STUDIES – THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

For a better understanding of the comparative results, in the following section I will describe the Swedish and British studies, particularly their theoretical and methodological foundations.


The aim with this first study was to look at the professional ideals of Swedish journalists, and to see how the ideals were influenced by individual characteristics, by media organisations, and by Swedish culture. Theoretically, the study was done from a traditional sociology of journalism perspective.

The analytical model guiding the work is presented in Figure 1 (Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 52, Figure 3.4.).

![Analytical Model of Journalist Ideals](source)
The professional approaches taken by journalists are explained by individual, organisational and societal factors, all interconnected. They have four components, covering professional ideal conceptions, and conceptions of reality, between which there is a discrepancy, i.e. ideal and reality does not meet. The ideal conceptions consist of journalists’ motives for joining journalism and their professional ideals. The reality conceptions consist of journalists’ views of the stereotypical journalist (colleagues) and their views of the audience. The professional position taken by a journalist may be understood by taking into consideration a person’s sex, educational level and social class. The societal culture of the nation that is studied, structures all relationships.

The model is functionalist, and the method was chosen accordingly. A large study, *Journalist ’89*, was conducted in co-operation between The Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Göteborg (JMG), and the Swedish Journalist Union (SJF). The aim was to highlight the social build-up of the Swedish body of journalists, its ethical values, and its professional ideals (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b). A large questionnaire (28 pages, 62 questions, that took about an hour to answer) was sent to 1500 Swedish journalists, drawn randomly (and anonymously) from the membership register of the SJF. 59 percent (851 persons) answered, which is a rate a few percentage points lower than equivalent surveys addressed to the general public at the time.

Fundamental to any journalist-study is the question of *what is a journalist*, or rather *who* is a journalist. In *Journalist ’89*, the criterion we chose was similar to that of membership of the SJF, i.e. someone who is employed by newspaper, news agency, radio, or television – in Sweden – as photographers, film-photographers, reporters, editors, proof-readers, producers, editors, graphic designers, tele-printer workers. This includes freelancers (SJF, 1989; Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a).

Amongst the huge survey material, five questions were asked covering the four indicators of my model: professional ideal and motivation (ideal world) and perceptions of the “typical Swedish journalist” and the audience (real world). The answers were given through a provided battery of statements, which had a five-graded scale attached. In other words, the informants were forced to respond to given wordings. Furthermore, I had access to a substantial number of background questions (e.g. sex, class, age, work-place). (For further methodological reflection, see Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 139-148).
2.2. Studies Two and Three: British Journalism Culture in the 1990s – Theoretical and Methodological Foundations

The research-process of *Journalist ’89* can be described as a classical Popperian deduction process: theoretical framework gives birth to hypotheses, which are tested, using an appropriate method, and then falsified or not. This is not at all the case with the British studies, but nor can these be said to be the result of an induction process (theoretical conclusion is the result of an empirical study). The best way to describe the research process is a theoretical and methodological journey (as I started off this chapter explaining), or a fuddle-duddle-muddle (*Fox in Sox*) of deduction and induction, fuelled by theoretical and methodological frustration. This process, where “the analytical interpretive process is the detective-like element of creativity and imagination that research needs in order to produce new insight” (Schrøder et al, 2003:46) is called *abduction* and can be described as “a kind of empirically based quantum leap performed by the creative researcher who is capable, with inspired insight, to reconceptualize a phenomenon in a new way” (Schrøder et al, 2003:46; see also Andersson, 2006).

As a way to move from traditional journalist studies towards cultural theory – strongly influenced by Raymond Williams’ (1976; 1981) work on *culture* – I applied the concept *journalist culture*: the production and reproduction of meaning and ideology for a particular professional group – journalists (Melin, 1991b). Whilst at the GUMG I was furthermore strongly influenced by discussions I had with John Eldridge about the power play in the media, and Brian MacNair’s ideas of a cultural journalist perspective (cf. McNair, 1994; 1998). My aim with the 1992 study was, thus, to study, and mainly to achieve an understanding of, British journalism culture.

I wanted to approach my subject from a very different perspective than I had in the Swedish study, as I felt I did not reach the result I wanted to – did not reach into the journalists’ heads. This frustration made me look elsewhere (other than traditional sociology of journalism studies) to find other methods and approaches. Feminist epistemological discussions informed me, particularly of reciprocity, reflexivity and the recognition that knowledge is always political. As did media ethnographic studies in constructing a method, which, I believe, gave me an understanding of both the individuals I met in interview situations and the culture of which they were part and which they reflected.

A concrete methodological problem I had was that of the sample frame, or rather the problem of finding suitable journalists in my study. If making a quantitative
study, a rigorous (and randomised) sample is vital for statistical validity, and one would need a solid sample frame. In some countries (e.g. Sweden) this is possible through the availability of central lists of trade union members (cf. Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins 1996a; 1996b; 1996c). In Britain, however, such lists are not easily accessible. Renate Köcher (1985, 1986) used the snowball method and Henningham and Delano (1998) used (full-time) staff lists from national media.

The sample frame problem is connected with the third problem, namely the fundamental question of what is a journalist. Using membership of journalists’ trade union as a criterion works in a country like Sweden, where the majority of practicing journalists are union members (Weibull, 1991; Lindberg, 1990, Petterson & Carlberg, 1990). On the other hand, Löfgren Nilsson (1999) has criticised this use, as both news journalists, graphic designers of weekly press, and press officers are members of the Swedish journalist union. It is particularly problematic, she argues, if one wants to study a unitary journalism culture. Another definition of ‘journalist’ that has been used is based on journalists’ practices: listing a number of tasks that the journalist is assumed to do (Johnstone et al, 1976; Lindberg, 1990; Köcher; 1985; 1986), for example defined as all “full time reporters, writers, correspondents, columnists, newsmen, and editors /...but not.../ photographers, librarians, cameramen, or audio technicians“ (Johnstone et al, 1976: 9). Henningham and Delano (1998) use news organisations’ staff lists as a criterion. But then not all journalists are full-time employees (freelancers) and not everyone working in a news organisation is a journalist.

From a culturalist perspective all of the above journalist definitions have limitations. They are static and do not encompass the process of becoming and remaining a journalist. Identifying oneself as a journalist means acknowledging a professional identity. Through some formalised learning process (e.g. education organised by trade union, media organisation or university), ideals, values, world-views, ethics and practices of journalism are learnt. The journalist has thus acquired a way of (professional) life. And has been introduced to – and internalised – a professional (journalism) culture (Melin-Higgins & Djerf-Pierre, 1998). Capturing this way of seeing a journalist empirically is, however, more difficult. In the British studies, my view of a journalist is that of someone who is involved in the process of producing news or factional texts. This includes various positions, or work titles, such as correspondents, reporters, producers, editors, news-readers, columnists, news-photographers, directors, and it includes various forms of media, such as local and national broadsheets, tabloids, local and national radio and television, magazines, and the web.
Studying British Culture in 1992

When choosing my sample I wanted to find representatives for national media in Scotland and England, which in effect narrowed the study geographically down to London, Glasgow and Edinburgh. I also sought representatives of television (BBC, ITV and Channel 4), radio (BBC and BBC Scotland), broadsheets (the Times, the Observer, The Guardian, The Financial Times, The Herald, The Scotsman, Scotland on Sunday), and tabloids (The Sun, The Daily Record, The Mirror). Thus, it is primarily news- and current affairs media that are represented in the study, albeit some journalists also work on magazines on a freelance capacity. I tried, furthermore, to find journalists covering a variety of beats; news- and current affairs, women’s issues, social affairs, crime, law, foreign news, financial news, political news, sports, music] and holding various positions (editors, deputy editors, correspondents, reporters, columnists, free-lancers, producers, presenters, photographers). And of course, I tried to find journalists of both sexes and of a variety of ages.

The sample was chosen using two principal methods. One was through deliberative sample in an effort to find men and women working in different media and covering different beats. The other method was the “snowball method” (cf. Köcher, 1985; 1986; Lachover, 2005), where one journalist would give me the name of others who might be interested in taking part and interesting for my study. All in all I interviewed 33 journalists: 16 women and 17 men, or 16 Scots, 14 English, two Irish (working in Scotland/England) and one American (working in England).

I arranged the interviews by phoning first and then sending a written confirmation. The interviews were held in a place the individual journalist suggested, which meant in the newsroom or office, in a café, restaurant or pub, or even in someone’s house. Two interviews were held via telephone, one of these as the interviewee cancelled a meeting, but offered a telephone interview instead, and the other because the interviewee was too ill to see me. The interviews held in newsrooms took often several hours as I was offered to observe the newsroom situation. During these I also took field-notes.

The interviews were informal and discussions ranged across a number of themes, including why the interviewees became journalists, what they wanted to achieve in their jobs, what good journalism is, what other job/profession they think is similar to journalism, examples of a good job they had done, their approach to objectivity and the personal background of the journalist. When discussing objectivity and approaches to journalism, as a starting point I used the batteries of statements I had used in Sweden. Apart from these themes each interview led in different directions.
The interviews lasted everything between one hour and five hours depending on what time available the individual journalist had.

**Following up in 1998 and 2002**

After writing up the 1992 study my curiosity arose over what had happened to the journalists who I had interviewed. I read in the newspapers that one of the interviewees had become editor of a tabloid, another had lost his column, and a third had left the radio to start working for a broadsheet. So, driven by my curiosity, I decided to revive the study and do follow-up interviews. I used a deliberative sample, and chose to interview nine journalists from the 1992 study that were particularly interesting in light of the analysis I had done. They were either extremely good examples of the pattern I found, or they went against the pattern (Melin-Higgins, 2000; 2003: 55-56; Melin-Higgins, 2004).

The method I used was the same as in 1992. I met the English journalists on their jobs, and in two cases carried out observations (they took a whole working day). The interviews I held in Scotland took about three hours, and were done in restaurants, or in someone’s house. Each interview started with the question *Tell me the story of why you became a journalist.* From there on, I covered different themes; approaches to journalism, the career and family-life the past six years, what is specific about English/Scottish journalism, pub-culture, newsroom culture, and the significance (or not) of gender issues.

When in 2002 I received a research grant, I had the opportunity to continue my investigation into the lives of all the journalists I interviewed. This turned out to be detective work. The interviews were done in the same way, using the same themes as in 1998, but I put a stronger emphasis on the journalists’ life- and career turns (why they had stayed in journalism – or not), and the changing nature of British journalism over the past decade (Melin-Higgins, 2003: 55-56, Melin-Higgins, 2004; see also Appendix 1).

**3. MY APPROACH**

Getting to grips with three studies that have previously been written about in other texts in a time frame of over a decade has been a tricky balancing act – rather like solving a three-dimensional jigsaw puzzle. If I found it tricky, then so will my readers, and I must therefore clarify some issues to do with my approach to this work.
3.1. Characterising Journalism Cultures

As I have previously stated, my aim with this thesis is to understand the cultures of the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK during the 1990s. I do this by characterising the Swedish and British cultures. I will also attempt to compare and contrast the two cultures. On this, a note of caution is necessary. The studies have been done in different places, at different points in time, using different methodological instruments. Even the two British studies are different, albeit the questions put to journalists were similar – I myself (as the main methodological instrument) had changed over the ten years between the studies, as I outlined in the initial paragraph. I set out to do comparisons, but that in itself is not the main point. The most important point to me is to capture the characteristics of each culture at each point in time, and then lift the analysis to a more general level. And to do so, I need to set my finger (or eye) down on particular points in space or time. But that allows no exact comparisons (and nor do studies using identical methods). The analysis I will do, again based on a position of hindsight, is on a meta-level, and will cover empirical, theoretical and methodological aspects of the results. There are, for example, issues for which I have no comparative material, because of the methodological aspects – and because of time and place. However, as my aim is not to make exact comparisons this is not crucial. Instead I use the material available to me and interpret the two journalism cultures on their own terms.

3.2. Handling My Studies and the Studies of Others

The analysis of the Swedish and British journalism cultures are, as stated, based on three studies, one quantitative and two qualitative. To make my analysis understandable to the reader of this text, I will use excerpts from the studies to exemplify and clarify the outcome of my analysis. Concretely this means that I will use the statistical outcome of Journalist ‘89, and citations from the British journalists I interviewed. The nature of the statistics, often presented as tables, the measurements, as well as the reliability of the study are discussed in the book Educators and Bloodhounds. A Study of the Professional Ideal amongst Swedish Journalists (Melin-Higgins, 1996a). A few citations from the British study can be found in the second text of this thesis (Melin-Higgins, 2004; see also Melin-Higgins, 2000; 2003). The British studies are, however, not at all presented to the extent of the Swedish study. To allow for a better understanding of my analysis it is vital to give a fuller insight into the British studies. I will therefore substantiate the discussions in chapter three with citations from those studies.
The Swedish study enables me to generalise statistically. The same does not apply to the British studies. Although I believe it is possible to theoretically generalise based on the interviews I have made in the UK study (see also Kvale, 1997), my aim is to characterise the cultures, not to count how common a characteristic is. No study is, however, so good that it cannot be better. In the analysis, I will also lean on various other studies done on Swedish and UK Journalism cultures. I will in other words triangulate my results with the help of other studies. The other UK studies are therefore mainly of statistical nature (eg. Köcher, 1985; 1986; van Zoonen & Donsbach, 1988; Donsbach & Klett, 1993; Christmas, 1997; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003). To enable a statistical comparison of the Swedish journalist over time, I have used the texts presenting Journalist 2000 and Journalist 2005, two follow-up studies to Journalist ‘89 (JMG Granskaren, 2-3 2001; Jöns- son, 2005; Asp, 2007). Statistics tell something about structures, and patterns, but very little about the thought-processes of the individual journalist. To balance the plethora of citations from British journalists, and to give the Swedish statistics more life, more meat on the bone, I have also turned to other studies done in Sweden (e.g Ekstrand, 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2005; 2007a; Djerf Pierre & Löfgren Nilsson, 2004; Olovsson, 2006).

4. THE REST OF THE TEXT

My intention with the following chapter, Expositions: the Field, the Position, the Concepts, is to reflect upon how the academic field studying journalism cultures, has evolved during the last couple of decades. The chapter will end in an explanation of my main theoretical concepts.

In chapter three, Interpretations: The Results from Studies of Two Cultures, my main task is to characterise the two cultures based on the results of the three studies I have carried out. Following the line of the clarification of my approach above, the descriptions and analyses lie within the two separate journalism cultures in the first part of the chapter, as in the four texts of this dissertation (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 2003; 2004). In the major part of the chapter I will, however, twist the analysis and also look at differences and similarities between the journalism cultures of Sweden in the late 1980s and of Britain in the 1990s (see also Melin-Higgins, 1996c).

Chapter four, Reflections: On Gendered Journalism Cultures will have a more analytical approach. I will delve into those issues that I found the most interesting
when looking at the entire material and attempt to answer the *why-question*, by reflecting – on more of a meta-level – on the differences and similarities, again in space and over time, and results in the light of the theoretical models I have used over time. In order to contextualize the analyses, I will interweave explanations of the Swedish and British media situations with my analyses of the same.

In the final chapter, *Conclusions – Creating and Upholding Gendered Journalism Cultures* I will summarise my main findings of the thesis. Conclusions tend often not to be final points, full stops, but instead tend to look forward to the future. They are openended statements... This is the case also in this book, with its thesis. My statements turn into questions that turn into ponderings, reflections and suggestions. I will look ahead. The theoretical becomes personal and political.
2. Expositions

The Field, the Position, the Concepts

This is the traditional theoretical chapter that one finds in most academic texts. As such it contains a brief description of the academic field of journalism studies, within the time-period of around 1990 until the present date. In other words I sketch the field as it looked during the time period of this project. I do this, however, mainly as a backdrop to the approach to the field that is the fundament of this research project. Thus, the other issue that this chapter entails is the positioning of this project on the field of journalism studies. In the, perhaps, most important part of the chapter, I will present and discuss the theoretical concepts I have used in the re-interpretation of the Swedish study and interpretation of the British study.

Situated Knowledge

First, I would, however, like to give the reader some indication of how to read this chapter. Placing this book, and myself, in the theoretical crossroad between feminism and cultural theory brings with it epistemological consequences, of which the reader must be aware.

Feminist scholars have for decades placed their work in opposition to traditional science. This is not difficult to understand, as they bring with them an awareness of the dichotomised gendered nature of academia. For example, women (and other subjugated groups, e.g. people of colour, ethnic and religious minorities) have
been in the passive position of research objects, having had research done on them, whereas (white, middle-class) men have been in the active position of research subjects, with power and control over nature and woman.

As opposed to the emphases in traditional science on distance, neutrality and impersonality as indicators of true science, feminist scholars have put an emphasis on experience as a knowledge-base, which reflects recognition of the importance of personal reflexivity in research. After all, we are all human beings with feelings and thoughts and values. Sandra Harding (1987; 1991), the feminist philosopher, argues that taking a subjective stance in research reflects a recognition of oneself as a human being (with feelings and thoughts and values), and as a necessary medium through which the research is being done. It entails being open about oneself, and about one’s feelings and thoughts and values, but also about one’s ethnicity, religion, class and sexuality, et cetera. It is also about putting oneself (the researcher) in the focus of the research, and on the same critical plane as the overt subject. This way the researcher becomes a real historical individual, and not a passive anonymous voice, and this way the (feminist) researcher achieves reflexive objectivity.

We need to avoid the “objectivist” stance that attempts to make the researcher’s cultural beliefs and practices invisible while simultaneously skewering the research objects beliefs and practices to the display board. Only this way can we hope to produce understandings and explanations, which are free (or, at least, more free) of distortion from the unexamined beliefs and behaviors of social scientists themselves. /.../ Introducing this subjective element into the analysis in fact increases the objectivity of the research and decreases the “objectivism” which hides this kind of evidence from the public (Harding, 1987:9).

With reflexive objectivity Harding does not reject being critical, rigorous and accurate. It is, she argues, about making interpretative schemes explicit (see also discussion in Gelsthorpe, 1992). Donna Haraway (1991) brings the idea of reflexive objectivity one step further. She introduces the concept of situated knowledge, which seems to me a more useful concept. To Haraway no knowledge is free standing. Knowledge is always placed somewhere. In time, in space, in body. Every thing carries with it knowledge.

To me, reflexivity is vital to the research process. Making my standpoints clear, bringing my own experiences into academia, into my research project, means that I carry with me an understanding of the complexity of the social world I will analyse. This will strengthen my research project, and make it and my analysis of it more valid, but only if I also have a reflexive and self-critical stance. By making my inter-
pretative schemes explicit, I enable self-criticism, and facilitate a better understanding of my analysis.

Situated knowledge is, however, more than stating that I am a heterosexual, white, upper-middle class, protestant mother-of-two, who loves textile design, gardening and crime-novels. It carries with it a critical potential. And not only self-critical. Haraway suggest that apart from linking my knowledge to my body in self-reflection, we (as scientists) need to practice connection, to connect my subject to other subjects (human or non-humans). By doing this, we achieve a position of objectivity, not only of identity.

Situated knowledge is a good and useful concept, but the ideas are not new, and do not belong to a solely feminist context. Similar ideas are found in different interpretative methodologies. The Norweigian psychologist Steinar Kvale (1997) argues along the same lines when he discusses how to validate a interpretative research project. To validify through solid craftsmanship is more than to control, to question, to communicate. It is also to theorise, and to communicate one’s theoretical standpoint, i.e. validating is not just a question of method. “To decide if a method investigates what it is supposed to investigate demands a theoretical notion of what is being investigated” (Kvale, 1997:220, my translation). This is what I would call the consistency of a study (cf. Jansson, 2001), and it has been central to the design of this entire project, albeit in the fashion of a methodological and theoretical journey.

In this chapter, then, I will situate my knowledge and communicate and discuss my position in the field of journalism studies. That is, where in the academic field is this dissertation located? The chapter should therefore not be read as simply a necessary theoretical background-chapter, but as an integral part of my research process, and a necessary exercise to provide the reader with an understanding of my (re)interpretation of the results.
I. THE FIELD OF JOURNALISM STUDIES

Amongst the plethora of research on journalism, there is research that mainly focuses on the journalistic product, the content of news – research that aims to show that news can never be but a distortion of reality, and then aims to explain what causes this distortion. Another type of journalism research focuses mainly on the journalistic process: the production of news. This type of research (sometimes called sociology of journalism) tends to study the newsroom, or journalists, and often aims to explain, in a wider context, how journalism works. It is within this latter perspective on the field that I place this work.

When sketching out a field map one needs some kind of framework, and in previous work I have used a rather traditional model based on levels of analysis, inspired by, for example, Hirsch (1977), Ettema et al (1987), Schudson (1991) and McNair (1994; 1998). Seen from this framework, research can be made, or approached, on societal/institutional, organisational or individual levels (see Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 51, figure 3.3). This does, however, hide the ideological dimensions to the study of journalism. Indeed, looking at the field over the past few decades one can see that there has been a substantial shift in what approaches are present on the field, which is visible only if ideology, and also epistemology, are taken into account.

1. FROM FUNCTIONALIST HOMOGENEITY...

The first to note about the field of journalism studies (with a production focus) over the past few decades is its homogeneity. In America the field has long since been established, but it took to the 1980s for the field to have recognised departments, full professors and PhD education in Europe, which naturally made for a strong American influence on the field (Dahlgren, 2004). And for the dominance (not to say hegemony) of a functionalist and mostly liberal approach (McQuail, 2005). Again, the amount of research from this approach is vast, but it can broadly be divided into two types of research, that of looking for explanations outside the media organisation, and that of looking into the newsroom for explanations.
1.1. Looking Outside the Media Organisation

The historic economic landscape in which the media-institutions are situated have been of interest to a great number of scholars. Each country seems to have had its media structure mapped out and described. The historic perspective is seen as important in understanding also the present day’s production of news. These studies are thus done with the aim to contextualise, but rarely to criticise the system.

Apart from the structure of the media system, there are mainly two issues dealt with by journalism researchers looking out. The first is journalists’ relationship (or not) with their audience and the second the relationship with their sources. The former has been an issue for more effect oriented media research, like the agenda setting approach. The whole agenda setting approach has since the beginning of the 1970’s argued for media’s power over its audience, and how the media (through the message transmitted) can control the audience’s values and actions (cf. McCombs and Shaw, 1972; Asp, 1986).

There have, however, also been more sociologically oriented studies made (large surveys). Journalists’ unwillingness to get to know its audience has been documented, as has their tendency to write for a substitute audience consisting of family, friends, colleagues and sources (cf. Windahl, 1975). The ideological consequences of this are, however, not discussed. Focus lies instead on the relationship between journalists’ audience-views and their role-perceptions or ideals (Windahl, 1975; Köcher, 1985; 1986; Weibull et al, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a).

Perhaps the best example of this approach to journalism can be found in the way of studying the relationship between journalists and their sources. An example is Kent Asp’s (1990, see also Asp, 1986) discussion of the three concepts medialisation, media logic and mediocracy. His starting point is media’s power over its audience, and through an exploration of David Altheide’s and Robert Snow’s concept Media Logic, he discusses the medialisation of political power. Journalists have increased their power over politicians the past couple of decades, because of the media’s increased power over its audience. And, as politicians need to reach their electorate (equals media’s audience) the search for publicity makes them compete with other publicity seeking politicians and adapt to the conditions and the logic of the media. Vanity has become a symbol of power. To bee seen (in the media) is to be powerful.

This is, however, not a one-way street of influence. There have been discussions of journalists and sources constantly negotiating control, i.e. whether the relationship was like a tug-of-war, or an amicable tango (Galtung & Ruge, 1973; Asp, 1986; 1990; Ericson et al, 1989). And how this have influenced journalists’ way of thinking, their professional approach, i.e. their value-systems (Galtung & Ruge,
1.2. Looking Into the Newsroom

The importance of the organisational structure for the making of news has been emphasised by a number of scholars. News, from this perspective, is seen as the order that the organisation brings into a multitude of events. The world is tamed by the media to meet the demand of the bureaucratically organised news-system. The epitome of this approach is, perhaps, Edward Jay Epstein’s classical study from 1973 of an American national television network. He argues that to be able to analyse the news output, one has to study the organisation. Since Epstein’s study, there have been a series of similar studies done, most of which focus on the various bureaucratic limitations and constraints that hinder the journalist from producing unbiased news. But there has also been more sociological studies carried out of how this is internalised and handled by the journalists (e.g. see Furhoff, 1986; Lindberg, 1990; Löfgren-Nilsson, 1993; Alström & Östlund, 1994; Norstedt & Ekström, 1994).

The assumption of how news is produced, and thus the focus of research, is as follows. First of all, the production of news has to be bureaucratically organised, just as any other production process. In order that the newspaper/magazine/program will be produced in time it is vital that news are planned, and this is normally done in a morning newsroom meeting, when deadlines are decided. The consequence is that the events that are planned, i.e. expected or wanted, are more likely to become news (cf. Galtung and Ruge, 1981; Deuze, 2005). On the other hand, in the market oriented media system, it is vital to find a rare and, more importantly, exclusive news-item in order to beat competition from other media. It is therefore essential to be fast and efficient in the hunt for news. This affects the choice of and reliance on sources. Lack of time cause need for efficiency, which forces the journalist to choose the most efficient and reliable sources; these are often also the most powerful (cf. Furhoff, 1986; Galtung and Ruge, 1981; Ekström, 2002). Lack of time, thus, causes both conformity and competitive news-hunt. It further causes a routinisation of the news production process, which has become more like an industrial assembly line production than an analytical and creative art or a craftsmanship (Klausen, 1986).

This leads in to the second important bureaucratic limitation. Routinisation leads to an emphasis on format rather than content. The aesthetics of the medium becomes more and more important, e.g. an event might become news because it
Expositions renders good photo-opportunity. In other words, some events become news because they fit the routines of the medium — or the media logic — rather than being seen as interesting or important to the audience (Asp, 1986; 1990; Klausen, 1986; Furhoff, 1986; Ekström, 2002).

The third bureaucratic limitation is the hierarchical structure of the organisation. The planning that is forced by lack of time is met by editorial morning meetings, a method where the news-day is directed by news editors. Above the editors, the media owners loom large. Although they do not directly run the newsroom, they are omni-present and have created a culture, which is fixed to the walls (Furhoff, 1986). Journalists are socialised into the particular culture of the medium, which is vital to the efficiency. They learn the values and norms of the newsroom, and how to be journalists. Furhoff (1986) argues that this is nothing that is forced on them. New journalists are mainly driven by a wish to be accepted in the newsroom. They therefore employ self-censorship, both consciously and sub-consciously. The reason is that journalists are in an underdog position compared to editors, owners, and sources. This underdog-position, coupled with a firm belief amongst journalists that they are (and should be) free and autonomous agents, cause tensions within the organisation. Feelings of suffering because of poor management, stress, awkward working hours, hard competition and lack of support amongst colleagues are part of the problem of the media organisation, or of journalism itself (Lindberg, 1990; Löfgren Nilsson, 1993; 2007b). The stress caused by lack of time can also be something positive — if it is connected with something creative, e.g. with finding a scoop, rather than producing quantity. Stress is part of the glamorous sides of being a journalist, and has become a fetishism in the mythology of journalism (Lindberg, 1990; Furhoff, 1986).

1.3. Focusing on the Individual Journalist

On the individual level, news is not explained by organisational structures and processes, but by the individual members of the media organisation. The behaviour and values of (fairly autonomous) journalists are in turn explained mainly by the social background of the journalist. As Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman state:

Who and where the people are who gather and assemble the news, can significantly influence what is portrayed as newsworthy by the media (Johnstone et al, 1976:185).
The focus of all studies on this level is the individual journalist her/himself. There are book titles like *The American Journalist* (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986), *Swedish Journalists – a Group Portrait* (Weibull et al. 1991), and *The Global Journalist* (Weaver, 1998). These indicate just that, the focus on the individual journalist, though often seen (or studied) as a member of a group. There are «portraits» of journalist bodies from various countries around the world. Most of them seem to have an unspoken theory of autonomous journalists whose social background influence the news, although this relation is very rarely empirically shown, which, as Lennart Weibull (1991) argues, is a shame as that would perhaps generate the most interesting results of this kind of research. What is shown is the constitution – and change – of journalist bodies through a number of interrelated factors. Bourgeoisement, education, professionalisation, and political values are factors that are studied and often used as explanations of each other and of the change in the structure of journalist bodies that has taken place the last few decades.

The education of journalists is one factor that has been studied, and generally, these studies have found that the education level of journalists have increased substantially the last few decades. One reason has been the growth of university level journalism education (c.f. Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, 1976; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986; and Weibull et al., 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a;c; Edström, 2007). The possibilities of higher education through university level journalism schools have meant that new groups of people are attracted to journalism, mainly from the middle class. There has, thus, been a process of bourgoisement taken place the last few decades, and journalism is now a middle class profession (c.f. Weibull et al., 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a;c) with middle class values (Lichter, et al., 1986; Palme, 1990; Broady et al., 2002). Contrary to this argument, Keplinger and Köcher (1990), argue in a discussion of professional standards of journalists that they cannot be counted among the professional class due to their ethical orientation as “journalists will only occasionally allow their actions to be guided by the foreseeable consequences, and will nearly always deny a moral responsibility for unintentional negative consequences of their reports. /.../ In contrast to members of the professions, journalists can behave in an extremely selective manner toward themselves and toward third parties” (Keplinger and Köcher, 1990:307).

Selectivity of journalist values has also been a theme of studies. It seems that in most countries journalists tend to have more left wing views than the general population. Sweden is one example (Pettersson, Carlberg, 1990; Asp, 1991). Kent Asp (1991) shows that journalists and politician are more alike value-wise on a left-right scale than politicians/journalists and the general population (read electorate/audience respectively). He argues that it is the close-knit friendships and symbiotic
relationship between the two groups that have developed this similar world-view. Lichter, Rothman and Lichter (1986) argue on similar lines in their book The Media Elite. America’s New Powerbrokers. They draw, however, the argument further and argue that there is a direct link between the bourgoisement and liberal values of American journalists and their news product.

Studies that look at journalists’ professional values of journalists are the most common of the studies done on individual level. In fact, Monica Löfgren Nilsson (1999) names these types of studies “profession studies”. The type of professional values that are being studied varies, however. The importance put on news values, or considerations of everyday practice, are one type of values (Löfgren Nilsson, 1991). Nohrstedt and Ekström (1994) let journalists value authentic cases and then discuss the norms and moral of journalists, which is similar to Köcher’s (1986;1986) comparative study where she lets British and West German journalists take a stand in fictional cases and then discuss their professional approach (see also Kepplinger and Köcher, 1990). Ethical values are perhaps studied in the most depth by Len-nart Weibull’s and Britt Börjesson’s ongoing project (started 1988) about the nature of journalism ethics in Sweden (cf. Weibull & Börjesson, 1995). And by Yvonne Wigorts Yngvesson (2006), a theologian who starts from her own experiences of mistreatment by journalists and journeys into the realm between ideal and reality, between journalists professional ethics and their own morale. Unlike Weibull’s and Börjesson’s large and longitudinal quantitative studies, Wigorts Yngvesson did fieldwork in three news-rooms and following on from that in-depth interviews with ten journalists.

Yet another type of values that have been studied is the approach to journalism, often called role-perceptions or professional ideals. And again, there is a plethora of studies done on this topic, mainly published as reports or as conference papers on the roles of journalists in different countries, which shows a strong homogeneity of roles amongst journalists within one country. It is, for example shown that British journalists have a very strong belief in neutrality and have what is called a ‘Bloodhound role’, where the adversarial role against the powerful elite is important, as is the hunt for news (Köcher, 1985; 1986; Henningham and Delano, 1998), whereas journalists in other European countries, although adopting different roles, do not believe as strongly in the ‘myth of objectivity’ (Donsbach and Klett, 1993). German journalists, for example, have a strong ‘missionary role’, which emphasise journalism as a political and intellectual profession, which makes it possible for involved publicists both to influence society and to express their own creativity in the production of news (Köcher, 1985;1986; Kepplinger and Köcher, 1990; Schoenbach et al, 1998). American journalists have an educational role, but with a strong ob-
jectivist slant to it (Johnstone et al, 1976; Weaver et al, 1986). Swedish journalists have changed their role perception from being more of a craftsman (Fjaestad et al, 1974; Windahl, 1974; Thurén, 1988) and then to a modern day cowboy (Thurén, 1988; Melin, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c; Wiik, 2007a), only to change more into an empathetic educator. This means that they want to have a free and exciting job, with the possibilities of creatively expressing themselves, and also to scrutinise the powerful elite at the same time as they should explain issues to the audience, which they also believe they should influence (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c; Wiik, 2007b).

What lie behind these descriptions of journalists’ role perceptions are quantitative survey questionnaires, which provide the journalist with a set of statements about different approaches to journalism. With statistical methods it is then possible to give a description of types of approach most common amongst a body of journalists, e.g. British bloodhounds. As the other functionalist studies, these also aim to describe and explain journalism, but rarely with a critical view. These types of journalistic values, or journalist roles, are explained with structural factors. Different countries’ history, political and legal structure, culture, traditions, et cetera, influence the type of media system that has evolved. This, in its turn, attracts different kinds of people, which then form a body of journalists, which is, then, necessarily different than the body of journalists in another country (Köcher, 1985; 1986). Arne Martin Klausen (1986) argues on similar lines when he discusses the fact that professionalisation and commercialisation amongst the Norwegian media since the 1970s necessitate a development amongst Norwegian journalists towards adopting a channelling role. These kinds of inherent explanations (although rarely discussed

Figure 2:
The two dimensions of journalists’ professional ideal.

openly) are found in comparative role studies (e.g. Donsbach and Patterson, 1992; Johnson and Weaver, 1994; Wilke, 1994; Patterson, 1998), the best example of which is the book ‘The Global Journalist’ edited by David Weaver (1998), that describes the generalised characteristics and roles of journalists in 21 countries.

These role perceptions (or ideals) have often been described in terms of opposite dichotomies (e.g. passive-active, bloodhounds-missionaries). Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) did, however, suggest a widening of the dichotomised role concepts and showed three American journalist roles: adversary, interpretative and disseminator. They also pointed out that less than two percent of American journalists were exclusively one-role oriented. Following on from this I compiled the various studies on journalist roles and made a typology (Melin, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996c: 45), which takes into account two dimensions of journalist roles: relationships to the newsgathering process with an active-passive continuum, and the relationship to news message (dissemination) with its participant-neutral continuum.

The journalist roles from different countries can thus be mapped into the typology. The Spokesperson role is what most journalists in the late 19th and early 20th century would adhere to, the Craftman is more in line with what Swedish local newspaper journalists perceive as their role (Fjaestad et al, 1974; Windahl, 1974; Thurén, 1988). The Bloodhound is more akin to the Anglo-saxon ideal (Köcher, 1985; 1986; Henningham and Delano, 1998) that also became common in Sweden during the 1970s (Thurén, 1988; Melin, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c). Finally, the Educator is what American journalists perceive as their ideal, as do Swedish journalists that are university graduates (albeit not in journalism).

**Figure 3:**
Role Positions of Journalists in Five Countries.

Thomas Patterson (1998) has also followed on the problematisation of the dichotomised journalist-role conception. Based on the results of a comparative study of western journalists (the US, the UK, Italy, Germany and Sweden) he devises a graph, which, like mine, consists of two dimensions. One is based on journalists’ autonomy as political actors (passive-active dimension), and one on journalists’ positioning as political actors (advocate-neutral dimension).

The active-passive scale is based on five survey items indicating to what degree the journalist holds a critical, adversarial position or a supportive, mediating position toward political leaders; the advocate-neutral scale consists of five items indicating to what degree the journalist prefers an advocacy or detached type of reporting. Positions are based on deviances for each country’s journalists from the grand mean for all five countries (Patterson, 1998:29).

There are clear differences between Patterson’s graph and my typology. Patterson’s objective was to analyse the political role of journalists, and the survey questions he and his colleagues used obviously reflected this and were thus substantially different from mine. Also, only news journalists were included; sports, feature, and entertainment journalists were excluded from his sample. But despite these clear differences, it is interesting to note that similar role patterns do emerge, which strengthens the results of the respective studies.

Patterson’s (1998) main result is worth noting. He agrees with McQuail (1994 sic, see also 2005) that the defining norm of modern journalism is objectivity, as he shows that all journalists in his study found objectivity very important for journalism. However, what objectivity actually is to journalists in different countries under different contexts varies. Thus, objectivity might be subscribed to by “all Western journalists”, but it is not the universal doctrine McQuail makes it.

2. ...VIA POCKETS OF DISSENT

Stating that the field of journalism studies was hegemonic does not mean that research from a functionalist, liberal approach was the only research made. No, but it means that research with other kinds of approach was fighting for space on the field (cf. McQuail, 2005). One of these (research from a political-economic approach) was particularly strong in the UK.

The political-economic approach, in its most narrow form, follows a strict marxist line. The object of analysis for e.g. Antonio Gramsci, Lois Althusser, and
Nicos Poulantzas is the structure of the capitalist system, where the press (media) is one of several ideological state aparatuses (ISA’s) that disseminate ideology in order to engineer consent amongst the dominated. This Gramcian view, does, according to Ralph Milliband (1977), result in a structural super determinism, and ignores the complexities in the relations between class and power. He argues that there is too much emphasis on the “political” and not enough on the “economic” side of the equation. Instead, he argues, it is important to analyse the capitalist system focussing on its dominant ideological view, which is purveyed by the media. At the same time one must not lose sight of the media’s competitiveness (and relative freestandingness), and there must therefore be room for the social actions of individual men [sic] in a politico economic-analysis. Milliband argues, for example, that newspaper proprietors have ideological power because they directly control the editorial lines (Milliband, 1977).

In this kind of analysis, ownership of the media is important to study – particularly the concentration of ownership, and this has been done in several studies (c.f. Murdoch, 1980 and Murdoch and Golding, 1978; Burnett, 1990; Goodwin, 1995; Sarikakis, 2004; Wasko 2004) also in a new-media setting (cf. Ursell, 2001; Jenkins, 2004). In the beginning of the 1990s (when my first British study was done) it was shown that only four corporations own 80 percent of the British press and only a handful own the British broadcasting industry (McNair, 1994). By looking at the individual owners, what schools and universities they went to, to what clubs they belong, et cetera it is clear that they have very similar social patterns as the elite in business and in politics. This shows then, Murdoch (1980; 1982) argues, that the press owners have social and economic links that provide the basis for common views and values between the media owners and other parts of the British elite. The media is part of Big Business, and part of the political hegemonic system. As Murdock (1980) argues:

The press is therefore regarded as operating on behalf of the capitalist class but not necessarily on its behest (Murdock, 1980:57).

Another focus that stresses the economic side of the politico-economic approach is the advertising system. The rationale for this is that the capitalist system does not only have an indirect influence on the editorial line through the media owners, «Big Business» also exerts direct influence through the commercial media’s reliance on advertising. Advertising becomes a patronage system (Curran, 1980) where the control lies in withdrawing adverts from the media if the editorial line does not comply with the value of the company. McNair (1994) argues, however,
that although this has happened occasionally, it is mainly a constraining factor and should not be overstated.

In his theoretical overview of the Sociology of Journalism, Murdock (1980) claims that liberal pluralists argue that the nature of the press is ultimately determined by its readers, as a strong market force. Politico-economists therefore tackle the problem of consumer sovereignty. Murdock argues that newspapers are not sustained because of broad readership, but because of the political interest of owners. The audience that matters, and whose views are considered, is a small group with enough capital to support the big advertisers. The audience with lack of capital is silenced. Another way of explaining the lack of contact between journalists and the majority of their audiences, is lack of interest on journalists’ behalf. They are simply not particularly interested in their general audience, and create instead a substitute audience. They write/talk to people that are important to them, e.g. their family, friends, and colleagues, and — politically more important — their editors, the media owners and their sources. This obviously has ideological consequences and is yet another way to sustain the hegemony of the capitalist system (Tunstall, 1970; 1971, Schlesinger, 1978, Gans, 1979).

In terms of the political-economic approach to the field of journalism studies the Glasgow University Media Group’s (GUMG) and their way of looking at the relationship between journalists and their sources, have had great impact. Their theoretical roots are clearly placed in the works of Marx, Engels, the Frankfurt school, e.g. Adorno and Horkheimer (cf. Eldridge, 1993a and b; Davis, 1993). By looking at a series of case studies, e.g. the minors’ strike, the Falkland conflict, the Northern Ireland conflict/war, HIV/AIDS information, they are trying to uncover the relationship between truth and power in news (e.g. GUMG, 1976; 1980; 1985; Eldridge, 1993; Miller, 1994). The assumption, and the conclusion in the various studies, is that media owners and the higher echelons in the media, along with propagandists and public relations men, act as servants to the economic and political elite in our society. There is no competition for publicity amongst the elite i.e. the news sources, as Asp (1990) argues. Instead they know they have the information in their hand that journalists need to create news. It is therefore in the power of the sources to control (read: censor) what information will be given to the media. Journalists (who might think they are free actors) are controlled by media owners and editors. Even the BBC, a non-commercial media organisation, is functioning in the same way (cf. GUMG, 1980).

There is a yet another, perhaps more balanced, view of the relationship between journalists and their sources. Ericson et al (1989) discuss the relationship as a negotiation of control and Gans (1979) likens it to a tug-of-war, or a dance:
The relationship between sources and journalists resembles a dance, for sources seek access to journalists, and journalists seek access to sources. Although it takes two to tango, either the sources or journalists can lead, but more often than not, sources do the leading (Gans, 1979:116).

Seen from the media’s side, access to sources is not as easy (as e.g. Asp, 1990, argues). Since time and staff is in short supply, journalists will have to use strategies to find as efficient a source as possible. Availability and suitability are important, and a journalist tends to use the same (already tested) sources again and again. So as to beat the deadline, the best source from a journalist’s perspective, is an eager and agreeable person in a powerful position that need publicity but not money and therefore supply suitable information, and that lives close to the journalists, and preferably is a personal friend or acquaintance. Obviously this will increase the power of the already powerful (Gans, 1979). There is, however, a fight for access to the media amongst sources, and that access does not come as easy as some would argue (c.f. GMUG, 1976; 1980; 1985; Hall et al, 1978; Eldridge, 1993). To win over competitors, sources have to employ a variety of media strategies (Ericson, et al, 1989; Schlesinger, 1992).

Journalistic values, particularly that of objectivity, has been a topic of study for a politico-economic approach over the decades. As discussed in the sections above, the main consequence of a capitalist media system is seen by this approach to be ideological. The outcome of the concentrated media ownership, of sources’ power over journalists, and of a commercial view of the audience is that the media production (news) reflects the hegemonic ideology, i.e. that the media support the dominant elite. For example, Hartley (1982) and Hallin (1986;1987) argue that impartiality and objectivity are necessary for the production of dominant ideological meaning, i.e. required if news is going to naturalise the dominant ideology. Likewise, Philip Schlesinger (1978) and The Glasgow University Media Group in their 'Bad News' series (1976; 1980; 1986), observed that the BBC’s commitment to impartiality is crucial for its credibility in the eyes of the audience, and is used as an instrument to disguise partisanship. Schlesinger (1987) argues that public service broadcasters occupy the space of the “ideological division of labour” within the (British) capitalist system, and the GUMG shows through a series of case studies how the BBC reflect the dominant ideology as much as commercial media through being tied to the state apparatus.

Herman and Chomsky (1988/2002) take the structural determinism of the politico-economic approach arguably the furthest. In their so called propaganda model they argue that the US media is manufacturing consent, that the US media
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in fact is as authoritarian and as much controlled by the dominant elite as Pravda was in the Soviet union. They prove their point, that both media system function to maintain the existing power structures and the hegemonic ideology, through a series of case studies. Herman and Chomsky’s model has, however, rendered a lot of critique even from within the political-economic sub-field. Philip Schlesinger (1992) argues, for example, that a) the generalisability of the case studies given is questionable, and b) the model is limited to the US, and that other Western media systems are not comparable. Schlesinger also points to the limitations of the powerful effects model, and structural determinism, which was used, but not really discussed.

2.1. More Dissent: Interactionism

Apart from research made from the political-economic approach, there were other interesting studies done. Some were made with a more holistic approach, with phenomenological or symbolic interactionist views of society, as discussed by Jensen and Jankowsky (1991). These types of studies look at the entire organisation, and see how news is socially constructed within the system (i.e. the media). Examples of these studies are Tuchman’s study of the construction of reality in news (1978), and Puijk’s study of Norwegian television (1990). It could, however, be argued, as indeed Löfgren Nilsson (1999) does, that some studies with a politico-economic approach made on the organisational level also had a holistic view, and certainly used qualitative methods, like observation and in-depth interviews. These studies are aimed at critically studying the economical and political structures of the media organisation, but the surrounding society is also studied. Examples are studies of the BBC done by Burns (1977), Schlesinger (1978), and Helland (1995). Also, yet others, like Gaye Tuchman’s study from 1978, have a feminist perspective. Thus, interactionist studies may be in opposition to functionalist studies regarding methodological issues, but mesh ideologically into the other forms of dissent on the field of journalism studies. Let me therefore continue the mapping the ideological dissent of the field and turn the gaze towards feminism.

3. ...AND FEMINIST OPPOSITION...

Looking back at the previous two sections, there is a blatant omission of gender in most studies, albeit some of these admittingly have taken gender (or sex) into account. These are mainly done on a functionalist individual level and focusing on the values or roles of journalists. Fjeastad’s and Holmlöv’s (1974) study on Swed-
ish journalism and Johnstone’s et al’s (1976) study on American journalists show that gender is a deciding factor for journalists’ role perceptions (function). None of them, however, analyse these facts and only discuss this briefly. That you “see what you want to see” is unfortunately an old truth, and there are numerous other examples. It is indeed surprising that Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) in their study of American journalists, which they based on Johnstone’s et al’s previous study choose not to further investigate the gender dimension of role perception and news-values (Robinson et al, 1998). Another interesting (or flagrant) absence of gender can be found (or not) in Renate Köcher’s (1985; 1986) study on German and British journalists, an absence that is particularly interesting in the light of van Zoonen’s and Donsbach’s (1988) secondary analysis of Köcher’s study, which found that gender was indeed the most significant factor to explain the differences within the countries studied. There are of course in-house gender-political reasons for this within academia, into which I shall not delve deeper – in this text.

There were, however some feminist studies made during the 1970s with the aim to reveal women’s situation in journalism. As pointed out, Gaye Tuchman’s (1972) classical study from the early 1970s aimed at showing how sexist the routines of the newsroom were and how these played an important role in colouring the reality constructed by news. GJ Robinson (e.g. 1980, 1998; 2004; 2005) has for decades mapped out and discussed female journalists’ numbers and work-situations particularly in the Canadian media. It was, however, not until the 1990s that feminist journalist studies took off.

So then, how could I describe a feminist perspective? The first thing to note is that it is not a unitary perspective. There is not one type of feminist with one way of seeing the world. In fact, feminism is today extremely widespread. In an exhibition of What is Media and Culture Studies at the School of Arts and Communication, Malmö University that the final year students made in 2001, the feminist perspective was portrayed as an umbrella, the idea being that it stretches over basically every type of academic disciplines. This wide-spreadness has led to a diversification of the perspective, or fragmentation as some would argue. To theoretically understand this diversification, a number of typologies have been used. The most common of those, at least during the 1980s, is based on political and ideological distinctions (cf. Mitchell, 1971; Jónasdóttir, 1984; Steeves, 1987; Holmberg et al, 1989; Walby, 1990; van Zoonen, 1992; Kleberg, 1993). This way of describing the feminist world has been criticised as dated and ill-representative. Liesbet van Zoonen (1994) thrashes this commonly used typology (and her own use of it), and then chooses in her overview of Feminist Media Studies to present feminist media studies topic by topic (e.g. Media text and gender, media reception and gender and
media production and the encoding of gender). In similar ways the editors of News, Gender and Power (1999) seek in an introductory essay to give an overview of eight “problematics” studied within the context of news, gender and power'. The advantage of doing a review this way is to stay focused on the topic of the study, whilst, perhaps losing the ideological and political overview of the field. I will, however, follow these examples, and bring to light some discussions and studies done from a feminist perspective on issues in the media production process, but at the same time connect to the more ideological debate in feminist thinking discussed in the first two sections. I will focus on two of the characteristics of feminist research (van Zoonen, 1994): gender and power that also characterise the development of feminist journalism research.

### 3.1. Studying Gender

There is a chronology in the types of feminist research done on the field of journalism studies, which is not surprising as fields (any field) develop theoretically. From the 1960s until the 1990s the starting point for most feminist researchers was the lack of gender perspective in other studies, and they thus tried to correct this by looking at gender differences in journalism. These feminist researchers did the necessary basic work of mapping out the gendered nature of journalism. A lot of the studies were therefore quantitative in nature: heads were counted. The results of these studies done over the past four decades, from various parts of the world, have shown that the share of female journalists invariably vary between countries but lie somewhere between 20-49 per cent in the mid 1990s. The former is the share in France and Britain (McMane, 1998; Henningham and Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003) and the latter the share of female Finnish journalists (Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997). Another result is that the numbers of female journalists have grown dramatically since the 1970s. A gender-switch has taken place. The outcome is, however, claimed to remain the same; journalism is a man’s world.

**A Man’s World**

One reason for this gender-switch is argued to be the development of journalism courses on university levels, which in many countries have replaced the traditional way into journalism, that of personal contacts and the informal recruitment procedures that have characterised the media industry up until the 1980s (in the UK until the 1990s). When university level journalism courses were established (varying in time from the beginning of the 20th century in the US to the end of the century in the UK), these courses have become the main road into journalism in most Western
countries. In the US, Germany and the Nordic countries this has been a particularly noticeable trend. And on these schools of journalism women have been in majority amongst the students, and this has therefore led to an increasing number of women in the journalism workforce in these countries (Beasley, 1989; Holz-Bacha and Frölich, 1992; 1994; Melin, 1993; 1995b; Melin-Higgins, 1997; van Zoonen, 1994; Wadbring, 1996; Robinson, et al, 1998; Robinson, 2005; Edström, 2007). The reason is that university degrees have given women the possibilities of a formal and professional recruitment system, as compared to the former more craftsman like, resting almost totally on the subjective decision of an editor (Chambers et al, 2004). Despite this, the numbers have perhaps not risen as much as could be expected given the large number of journalism students (Weaver et al, 1998; Chambers et al, 2004), which suggests that these student hit a so called glass ceiling and are forced to look elsewhere for work (Grünig, 1989; Chambers et al, 2004; Robinson, 2005).

The result of the gender-switch is argued to be a more balanced news-content. With more women comes less sexist media (Abrahamsson et al, 1984; Baer, 1980; Chambers et al, 2004). The presumption behind these studies is that male journalists create a man’s world – a news world by, for and about men, and that women have a possibility of changing journalism into a place of better work-conditions and better news-content if they reach a critical mass. This is said to be one third of the work-force (Robinson et al, 1998; Smith et al, 1989; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Chambers et al, 2004). The problem – in hindsight – is that the share of women has in many countries surpassed 33 percent, and the changes foreseen have not taken place (van Zoonen, 1991; 1994). Rush, Oukrop and Sarikakis (2005) problematise, what they call, the Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum (R3), i.e. that the communication industries (and communication academy staff) will have a residing ratio of 1/4 up to 1/3 women. Going through world-wide data from the 1990s they find that only the Nordic, Baltic and some Eastern European countries have challenged the R3 ratio, and that the expected boom, or breaking of the critical mass, has not happened.

As to emphasise this doom and gloom, Maria Edström (2006:146) shows in a study of gender and power in Swedish television (content) that despite increasing number of female journalists (more than 40 percent – Sweden being one of the countries that has broken the R3), the share of women in power-positions seen on screen (as guests, experts or interviewees) were on average one fifth (with next to no woman from sports, church – or the academic elite).

Furthermore, despite the growing number of women since the 1970s, the situation for these women is very much the same in the 1990s as in the 1970s. In-
numerable feminist studies have pointed to *vertical and horizontal hierarchies* in which female journalists end up at the least favourable positions, with little hope of advancing. This is manifested in a number of ways. One is that there are very few female editors and women in decision-making positions in the media. Female journalists hit the infamous glass-ceiling – all over the world\(^3\). Swedish studies show that the share of women in decision-making positions remained more or less the same between 1969 and 1989 (Journalistkåren i Sverige, 1970; Melin-Higgins, 1996c; Weibull, 1991). There has, however, been an increase during the 1990s to women holding one fourth of the power-positions within Swedish media (Edström, 2006; Djerf-Pierre, 2006; 2007a), presumably a result of the large increase of women reporters. In Britain, women have gained access to the managing echelons during the 1990s, but as in Sweden it is in the less status filled positions or areas (Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004). Despite increasing in both share and numbers as reporters, British women tend to a far lesser extent than their male colleagues to apply for promotion due to the long work-hours and lack of family support (Christmas, 1997; Ross, 2004). It is interesting to note that despite robust equality legislation in most European countries, Europe has the lowest glass-ceiling in the so called developed world; female journalists do not make it past the lower management rungs to the top, whereas female Canadian broadcast journalists do comparatively well (Robinson, 2005).

Gertrude J Robinson (2005) sees the *glass ceiling* as something more than barriers to advancement. Women are also lagging behind men when it comes to speed of promotion. There is furthermore an economic side to these gender inequalities; just as female reporters, female editors are paid significantly less than their male colleagues. The monetary side to gender equalities can of course be explained by lack of promotion and lower positions, but it is more than that; even at the same position women are paid less than men\(^4\).

As argued above, there are not only vertical gender hierarchies. Another manifestation is that female journalists tend to work in types of media with the lowest status, e.g. magazines, organisational media or as freelancers, whereas men tend to a higher degree work in higher status media like television, national radio and national newspapers (e.g. Weibull, 1991; van Zoonen, 1994; 1998; Melin-Higgins, 1996c; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Robinson, et al, 1998; Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004; Robinson, 2005; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). The gendered status-separation continues within the media. There is a hierarchical distinction between *hard* and *soft news*. The former, the most status-filled, is considered male and is the area dominated by male journalists, and consequently, soft news is female *unimportant* news, and thus female journalists dominate the area. As a consequence this area
sometimes receives nicknames like velvet-ghetto (Beasly, 1989; Creedon, 1989) women’s feld or female ghetto (Smith, 1980; Schlesinger, 1978). Soft, female news is the other, whereas hard important news is real journalism.

Needless to say, equally numerous studies show how frustrated female journalists are over the state of the matter. Few are given the opportunity to work in high-status positions. There is also a frustration amongst those female journalists who want to work with soft news, but resent its low status and thus hindering their career possibilities (and higher pay) (Eide, 1985; Beasly, 1989; van Zoonen, 1989; Löfgren-Nilsson, 1994; Melin-Higgins, 1995; 1996c; Steiner, 1998; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1993; Chambers et al, 2004). Being damned by tradition – which ever way you want to turn is what Elisabeth Eide (1995) terms the Catch 22 situation of female journalists.

Dichotomisation

A very obvious presumption in the studies I sketched out above is the dichotomisation of the world of journalism. This world consists of male journalists, with high status, possibilities of choosing positions, of having a good career with good pay, and thus being pretty happy with their professional lives. On the other side of the demarcation line are female journalists – the others – with little to enjoy in journalism. They always end up in the least favourable positions and are generally put in the roles of female journalists, a continuation of the traditional role of females, i.e. they are seen as nurturing, family oriented, passive et cetera. The hope then is that female journalists will reach high enough in numbers to make a difference, to change everything bad into something good. Obviously underpinning these presumptions is an essentialist view of gender. The gendered enlightenment dichotomy has turned into research result in journalism studies.

Very good example of this dichotomy underpinning feminist journalist research are the number of studies during the 1980s and 1990s, which looked at journalist values from a gender perspective. The findings of these studies from different countries are strikingly similar. Male journalists tend to see their job as pretty special, and see the hunt for news as the most important. They also tend to have stronger beliefs in news values like objectivity and neutrality, and tend to care less about the ethical side of journalism. Female journalists are consequently of opposite opinions. They tend to see their job as a way to help people, support democracy or indeed as a strategy for personal development. They criticise the traditional news value of objectivity as an impossibility and tend to emphasise ethical aspects of journalism. In other words, male and female journalists are on opposite sides of the fence!
In a study of Finnish radio journalists, using secondary sources from other Nordic countries, Henrika Zilliakus Tikkanen (1990; 1993; 1997) has shown that journalists tend to distinguish between ordinary journalism and female journalism. This latter, female journalism she identifies as having seven characteristics. Female journalists tend to (1) prioritise soft, or female subjects, (2) put more importance onto context rather than single events, (3) at the same time make events concrete, and account for consequences for people’s everyday lives (4) have a personal involvement, and an empathy for the people that are treated in the news, (5) strive for a non-hierarchical editorial structure and informal leadership, (6) have a combination of personal and professional identity, and finally (7) experiment with form and content. Male journalism is seen as normal journalism.

In a critical summary of these dichotomies, Monika Djerf-Pierre presents a table of the dichotomised gender logic, which is highly useful as it clearly puts a name to the «norm», namely “masculine journalism”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine journalism</th>
<th>Feminine journalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sphere/Elites</td>
<td>Private/intimate sphere/Every day life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sources and perspectives</td>
<td>Female sources and perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance/neutrality/objectivity</td>
<td>Intimacy/empathy/subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (“professional criteria”)</td>
<td>Audience orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the audience’s needs/interests)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

van Zoonen (1988) twists the critique of the essentialist notion about women one step further. She argues that the presumption that women are by nature nurturing and collectively the same and that they therefore seek the same objective is a far too simplistic and naive way of seeing women, and women as journalists. There are other factors involved. The increases of women in journalism does not mean that women as a collective is represented. Those women that have chosen to become journalists tend to be white upper middle class, career minded, (Baehr, 1981; van Zoonen, 1988; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; c; 1997) and with a strong wish to express themselves and develop their personalities (Löfgren Nilsson, 1994b; 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; c; 1997; Palme, 1992). Thus, this is obviously a representation of only a few women in society.

Put together, these problems make it necessary to find new ways of studying women in the news production process. Again, already in 1988 van Zoonen argued:
The study of women and news threatens to get bogged down in repetitions of research on sex stereotypes in news contents and occupational roles of female journalists. Those kinds of research produce an overflow of empirical material, but use too simplistic theoretical assumptions to catch a complex ‘reality’ (van Zoonen, 1988:41).

On the same note, Marjan de Bruin (1998) suggests that it is time to move ‘beyond body-counting’, beyond descriptive research and towards social and cultural aspects of media practitioners’ behaviour (see also de Bruin and Ross, 2004). Both de Bruin and van Zoonen are amongst those feminist researchers who have been involved in bringing feminist journalist studies beyond body counting to take into account a more complex reality in their analysis of the media production process and have developed more sophisticated theories.

### 3.2. Studying Power at Work

If one wants – in Marjan de Bruin’s (1998) words – to go beyond the body count and look at the gendered power structure of journalism, then the numbers *per se* are not interesting. It is the analysis of them, something, which has been lacking in the statements about journalism as a man’s world, as I showed in the previous section. Indeed «who is in power» is an important question and can in parts be answered with statistical figures. Another question must, however, be asked, namely «how is power retained». Thus, power should be the focal point for feminist research. In Liesbet van Zoonen’s words:

> The issue for feminism therefore, is not who is ‘in power’ and who is not, for this will inevitably lead to rather cynical contest of who is ‘most oppressed’ in contemporary society. Rather, the challenge is to ‘theorize the multiplicity of relations of subordinations’ and to analyse how in these relations of subordination individual and collective identities, such as gender and ethnicity, are being constituted. Gender and power then, although both very much in debate, form the constituents of feminist theory (van Zoonen, 1994:4)

Bob Connell (1987) offers an interesting way of analysing gender and power in his discussion of the duality and unity in gendered power. It is, he argues, often difficult in everyday life to see beyond the individual acts of force or oppression to a structure of power with scope and permanence. That is, however, necessary:
Particular transactions involving power are easy enough to observe. Mr Barret the Victorian patriarch forbids his daughter to marry; parliament makes homosexual intercourse a crime; a bank manager refuses a loan to an unmarried woman; a group of youths rape a girl of their acquaintance. It is often difficult to see beyond the individual acts of force or oppression to a structure of power, a set of social relations with some scope and permanence. Yet actions like the ones just listed are not intelligible without the structure (Connell, 1987:107).

Power is, then, a “set of social relations with some scope and permanence”, and the male manifestations of power work on every level, from the political and the ideological to the most private. Connell gives the example of rape, which is presented in the media as an individual deviation, but this person-to-person relationship is embedded in a social and cultural construct, which is built on power inequalities and ideologies of male supremacy. So, in effect far from being a deviation from the social order it is in a significant sense an enforcement of it. Furthermore, the structure of power is an object of practices as well as a condition (Connell, 1987: 242f).

When discussing power, one must, Connell argues, distinguish between the global (macro) and the local (micro) relationship to power. In the global relationship women are subordinated to men in the society and culture as a whole, and in the local, where particular settings, households, workplaces might depart from the global pattern or even contradict it. Such departures and contradictions immediately provoke a response, policing, i.e. attempts to establish the global pattern locally as a norm. And that force is strong. On the other hand these structural tensions might lead to large-scale change in the long run (Connell, 1987).

As Connell, Catherine MacKinnon (1989) equals inequality with power. Inequality, she says, is about dominance and subordination, not sameness and differences. Inequality is about power and hierarchy, “which as power succeeds in constructing social perception and social reality — derivatively becomes categorical distinctions, differences” (MacKinnon, 1989:242). It is, thus, necessary to find concepts and analytical tools that offer an understanding of the gender-power relations.

**The Gender System**

Gender as a system of power is, perhaps, one such analytical tool, which the Swedish feminist Yvonne Hirdman (1988; 1990) discussed in the Swedish quango-report on power. She problematises gender as a social and cultural construction, and sees gender-construction as a system. Hirdman suggests that men and women should be understood as changeable figures of thoughts, whose biological differences create
imaginations and social practices, which in turn can influence biology. Man and woman enter a series of gender contracts on different levels (an abstract societal level, a concrete institutional level, and a private individual level) all of which are organised into a social pattern, a gender system.

This system is defined by two laws: 1) The segregation of sexes and 2) the primate of the male norm. This reads that one gender figure A (the man) has impregnated cultural and institutional worlds with its humankind, and this normality will — in our more and more complicated societies — be institutionalised into a neutral law. That this (rock hard) law is not visible, is because of the separation of sexes, which means that gender figure B (woman) is kept out of any areas where the primate of the male norm is in power. For example, if women start to dominate a previously male dominated area of work, salary and status tend to fall, and vice versa. If men start to dominate a previously female profession, salaries and status tend to increase. In this system, then, the oppression of B (women) is signified by limited physical and mental space, and limited and controlled ability to move in psychological and physical space. A’s (men’s) actions must be seen from their deep-rooted interest to keep the space clean from B according to their gender rationality. In other words, when women threaten men’s space (mental and physical), and move into a profession previously dominated by men, salaries and status tend to decrease. This must be understood as men’s wish to keep their space clean of women and thus seek to control women’s movements in mental and physical space. The gender system is, then, a system of power and hierarchy (Hirdman, 1988; 1990).

Principle of Segregation and Primate of the Male Norm

Hirdman’s (1988; 1990) principle of segregation and primate of the male norm fits neatly in with the distinction between soft and hard news; the “real” hard news must be kept clean of women, who are condemned to do the unimportant soft news, and thus be equally condemned to lower status positions and lower wages. And soft vs. hard news has indeed been discussed as a power issue (cf. Beasly, 1989; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1993; 1997). Examples from the world of journalism are that female journalists generally do not reach top positions in the media so easily or generally have lower status jobs, with lower pay. Following from that, as other studies show, female journalists are generally not as happy with their work situation as their male colleagues. And then, when women reach a higher share of the journalist corps, this actually leads to a decline in status and pay for journalists.
Principle of Preservation

The Icelandic political scientist Anna Jónasdóttir (1991a) adds an epistemological dimension to Hirdman’s Gender system. She argues that any theoretical analysis is never innocent, but always innately ideological and political. Those who benefit from the system therefore always see any analysis where the spotlight is put onto the gendered power relations as a threat. Jónasdóttir therefore argues that a third logic must be added to Hirdman’s Gender system, namely the Principle of Preservation, with its imperative that sex (or gender) must be hidden at all cost from every causal potent contexts.

That is why no one has heard of masculine news. Female journalism and female news have been discussed, as shown in the previous section, and have even been mentioned in some traditional journalism textbooks, though then often presented as an alternative to “real” journalism (Steiner, 1992; Melin, 1993; 1995; Chambers et al, 2004). The omission of masculine journalism from any such discussions is therefore not at all surprising, as this omission is built into the very core of the gender system. To make the system work means to hide the system from any insight or analysis. And with that follows that also masculinity must be hidden at all cost (MacKinnon, 1989; Hirdman, 1989; 1990; Jónasdóttir, 1991a). That way femininity will be defined as ‘the other’, just as ‘female journalism’ is. Masculine journalism is, according to this principle seen simply as journalism, i.e. the norm. And masculine news values, as defined by male journalists, are seen as neutral news values, possibly admitted to being the news values of Western societies by traditional researchers with no feminist perspective, even if they do a power-analysis of journalism e.g. Gans (1979) or Galtung and Ruge (1981).

From Jónasdóttir’s perspective, it is therefore folly to think that women being more than one third in the journalism force would make a difference (one third being the claimed magic number being able to make a difference, as is claimed for example by Robinson et al, 1998; Smith et al, 1989; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; van Zoonen, 1991; 1994). Lana Rakow (1988) discuss this fundamental inequality in relation to new technology and her conclusion is that presently men are what she calls tool makers and women are tool users. To be able to make a difference, women must themselves be tool makers, and define technology (or news) for their own purpose – or as Smith, Fredin and Nardone state:

Our findings suggest that sexist attitudes persist. Until women acquire equity with men at the highest levels of management, it seems likely that these attitudes will continue to affect the working lives of women in television news (Smith et al, 1989: 244).
Principle of Precedence

In a further critique of Hirdman’s Gender system theory, Gro Hagemann and Klas Åmark (1999) point to the problem of seeing the gender system as a historically stable system. Although trying to show different historical phases where gender contracts have developed, Hirdman’s theory none the less fails to take the historical changes and cultural differences into account. However, if the gender system with its gender contracts is seen as basic norms that play an important part in a particular time-period, and change slowly, the theory can be a fruitful analytical tool in historical and social analysis. But what about men who do not recognise their own supposed superior position, and all the women who fight the feminist equality struggle? Hagemann and Åmark argue that a third (fourth) logic – the Principle of Precedence – must be added to the system as it would give an answer to this question. There is, namely, also a hierarchy amongst men and women respectively. The authors take marriage as an example. Historically married women have had higher status than unmarried women, and male breadwinner has had higher status than bachelors. This explains why some women defend the system, as it is beneficial to them.

The critique of Hirdman’s Gender system as too rigid could be turned, in that she creates a concept of stability of the gendered power-pattern that can be seen in Icelandic sagas, as well as in the game patterns in my daughter’s school, or in Taliban Afghanistan as well as in Scottish highland-games. None the less, Hagemann and Åmark (1999) point to the importance of not forgetting historical dynamics and cultural differences. Ulf Boëthius (1991) argues that the advantage of using gender, particularly in the way Hirdman defines the gender-system, is that it necessarily places gender as an as important analytical category as race and class in any social analysis, and that it moves away from any essentialist thinking, plus encourage the analysis of both sexes at the same time. However, gender should not be analysed alongside these other categories, but, as Hagemann and Åmark (1999) show with their added Principle of Precedence: gender, race and class – and of course sexuality – are part of the same system.

In a discussion on a similar topic ten years earlier, but referring to the field of journalism, Lana Rakow (1989) tried to challenge the present beliefs about journalism through a series of questions. She asked why we train women through journalism education to just take their place instead of training them to change the world of communication, and in doing so, change the world. And she challenges the idea of feminisation:
That which has been called, pejoratively, the feminization of journalism education and the feminization of the media could be made to take on a positive, political connotation if we commit ourselves to collective social change (Rakow, 1989:306).

She points to the importance of recognizing that both journalism education and journalism are fundamentally masculine and political institutions, i.e. a collection of social practices, politics and economics that trains certain people to take up certain visions of the world, which means that these institutions already serve certain interests. However, one must not forget, she points out, that we are living in a hierarchical, pyramid-shaped society, where there are only so many places at the top, and if we encourage female journalists to make it there, and take the places of the white middle class men that sit at the top now, the changes might not be so large. The chances are great, in our present society, that the beneficiaries, the new top figures, will still be white and still be middle class, albeit women.

**The Political Economy of Masculinity**

More in line with Hagemann and Åmark’s call, Bob Connell (1987) makes another organisation of the gender system (or gender order as he terms it). He sees two major principles or organisation of the gender division of labour. One is the *gendered logic of accumulation*, which can be understood as a distribution of economy along gender lines; accumulations and benefits in one (male) direction, and economic losses in another. This ties neatly in with Hirdman’s law of the segregation of sexes, and Connell points to the demarcation issues between men’s and women’s work. In other words, the segregation between sexes in workplaces gives financial benefits to men. These demarcations are, though, far from absolute, as many jobs and professions are both male and female. Indeed, Connell argues, the fact that not all women are major losers is of strategic importance to feminist activists, as it makes the overall benefits and opportunities worth fighting for (compare this to Hagemann and Åmark, 1999). He further argues that the nuclear family must be seen as an important restraint on sex inequality, as commercialisation of domestic work (e.g. the growth of fast food outlets) increases the economic inequalities of gender. An argument that seems to take him far from the idea that the root of gendered power lies, not only in materialist structures, but very much in the construction of sexuality and gender, that is manifested in the nuclear family. And this is what his second principle is about. He adds and expands upon the traditional cornerstone of feminist theories, that the public and the private are never analytically separated. Indeed, the concrete consequence of this is that professional journalism life spills over into and defines the private lives of journalists. For example, numerous studies
from different parts of the world show the great difficulty female journalists have to combine family life and motherhood with journalism due to the way the work hours and news work is organised.

Connell’s second principle of gendered organisation of labour is the political economy of masculinity. Again, he draws a link between economic profits and gender. The definition of masculinity, he argues, has direct implications for the sexual division of labour. As men have more control over the division of labour, they have a collective choice of what to do and not to do, like child care.

The patterns surrounding women’s part-time employment are a familiar example. The conventional division of labour in working class families in Western cities assigns most child care and house-work to the wife-and-mother; and femininity is constructed in a way that defines the work of caring for other family members as womanly. The labour market constructed by capitalist industry and the state offers some low-paid, low status part-time jobs; and curiously enough most of the people recruited to these part-time jobs are married women. This pattern of recruitment is justified by employers on the grounds that married women only want part-time work because of their domestic responsibilities and only need low pay because theirs is a ‘second wage’. At home the much heavier domestic work of women is justified by husbands because their wives can only get part-time jobs. The dovetailing is neat, and is anything but accidental (Connell, 1987:134-135).

Similarly, in a critique against abortion laws, Catherine MacKinnon (1989) discusses the importance of women taking control over their own lives, which applies to every level. The problem now is that definitions of sexuality and gender works thus, that women do not control intercourse, contraception and pregnancy, whilst being allocated the primary responsibility for intimate care of children. Yet, women do not control the conditions under which they rear them, hence the impact or these conditions on their own lives, private and professional.

Hirdman, Connell and indeed MacKinnon can be criticised for being too structuralist and seeing only the stability of a gender system. To me, this is in fact one of the advantages with their theories, that one is able to compare and contrast gender systems at different points in time and space. Moreover, the real appeal is that, unlike van Zoonen (1994), they do not make a distinction between gender and power. Indeed, gender is power.

To my knowledge there has been no appropriation of Connell’s power-theories in feminist analysis of the field of journalism. That is unfortunate as he manages in his theories to combine a feminist approach with a political-economic analysis.
With his term *the political economy of masculinity*, he manages to embrace a metstructure with a micro-structure. Now, take the political-economic discussions of ownership as one way of being in control of the media. They show that power through ownership goes further than profit making. Whether government or commercial ownership, this has implications for the content of the media, which is discussed by e.g. GMUG (1976; 1980; 1985), Murdoch (1980; 1982), Murdoch and Golding (1978), Eldridge (1993a; 1993b) and Miller (1994). But their discussions miss important consequences of this, and indeed (as well as organisational theory) have a tendency to neglect gender issues (Alvesson and Billing, 1997; de Bruin, 1998). Ownership and management of media institutions also has an impact on the construction and reconstruction of the organisational structure and the everyday practice of journalism. These processes of power are gendered, as indeed Gay Tuchman showed as early as 1978. With his *political economy of masculinity* Connell (1987) adds a feminist analysis to this and shows that by being in control of the organisational structure and division of labour men have the choice of what to do, how to do it, and more importantly what not to do. By controlling, segregating and choosing, men can limit women’s mental and physical space. This is then a political analysis of the power-structures behind the results that other feminist journalist researchers have found (that the gendered logic is reflected in the organisation of the day, everyday newsroom routines, work hours and meeting agendas). In other words, made by men to the advantage of men.

A continuation of this, of course, is the construction of news, as Angela Pace states

The big problem is that television news is still being run by white males. This means that the white male fantasy is going to be played out on television every day (Angela Pace of WCMH-TV quoted in Smith et al, 1989:243).

Angela Pace’s statement can be seen as a concrete example of the consequences of what Connell (1987) terms the *gendered logic of accumulation*, or what Yvonne Hirdman (1988; 1990) theoretically describes as *establishment of the male primate* through the *principle of segregation*. If men have been in control of the media institutions then they have thus had the choice of defining not only how these institutions should be organised, but also, as a consequence of that, what journalism should be, i.e. what is journalism, what is newsworthy. Again, this puts theoretical light on the results discussed by e.g. Smith et al (1989), Tuchman (1978), and Zilliaokus-Tikkanen (1997).
Liesbet van Zoonen is, however, one journalist scholar who discusses the power of masculinity similarly to Connell when arguing that female journalists have problems with their definitions of identity as female journalists because the present definition of news is naturally closer to the present definition of masculinity. Obviously, as in every profession the members of it define their identity through this membership (i.e. identity as journalists). For female journalists, this is not enough; they might also need to (re)define their identity as women. On the one hand women are expected to be “real women”, i.e. feminine, good looking and heterosexual. On the other hand, this definition of femininity (as it is today in western societies) is at odds with what is considered professional journalism (as it is today in Western societies) (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a). The consequence of this is that women have to have double identities as women and as journalists (De Bruin, 1998; 2004; Egsmose, 1998; Steiner, 1998; van Zoonen, 1996/1998a). In this light, the fact that female journalists have a larger gap between their values and practice as journalists (as discussed by Löfgren, 1995; 1999; Melin-Higgins, 1996c, Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998, de Bruin, 1998, van Zoonen, 1996/1998a) is hardly surprising.

Liesbeth Egsmose (1993; 1998) shows in a study of Danish and British female television workers that gender identity is a central issue to these women. The women did however choose different strategies to get on career-wise. According to Egsmose having feminine looks, and charm was advantageous to female British media worker’s careers, whereas Danish media workers need to have more androgynous, or masculine ways to get on in journalism. Again, in the current gender system, identity changes are a problem for women, not for men. As Lisbet van Zoonen argues:

Given such very strong prescriptions and restrictions on femininity, and by omission on masculinity, the almost stereotypical self-perceptions of female and male journalists make more sense (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a:37).

As the masculine ideal is, in current society, much more in tune with the current definition of journalism, then men’s professional identities as journalists and as men are much less fragmented and problematic than those of women in journalism (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a).

Van Zoonen (1996/1998a) has furthermore problematised the dichotomised assumption that news are masculine and thus female journalists victimised, and puts a political and economical analysis onto gendered news-construction. She enters into the discussions that commercialisation is supposed to have taken place in the media as a process partly due to structural changes. The consequence of media commercialisation is an increasing awareness of audience needs and wants,
which the media quickly responds to. Examples of this are the increasing numbers of magazines, the change of broadsheets to tabloid format – with everything that connotes – and the increase of television channels (Klausen, 1986; Sparks, 1991; Hallin, 1986b; van Zoonen, 1996/1998a). This also affects the news content in both print and broadcast media and makes it more market-driven, e.g. through an increasing amount of human interest stories in tabloids (Klausen, 1986). van Zoonen (1996/1998a) goes one step further with her feminist analysis and argues that the commercial logic of journalism (which entails human interest stories, audience needs and desires, emotional investment and sensationalism) is (apart from sensationalism) in fact what has been termed “feminine news”, and that news, far from being a masculine bastion, has become feminised. What is wanted in news today is “a woman’s touch”. The popular status of soft (feminine!) news amongst the audience has been understood by media’s market department, and soft news has thus been given more space (Smith, 1980; van Zoonen, 1996/1998a). Pair-wise Ken-and Barbie television presentors have also spread from America over to Europe (Pedersen, 1999) although still fought against in Britain as it is seen as “Americanisation” (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a). In other words, commercialisation has lead to an increase of women in journalism (Smith, 1980; van Zoonen, 1996/1998a; Pedersen, 1999) and a raise in status for so-called feminine news (Smith, 1980; Zillikus-Tikkanen, 1997; van Zoonen, 1998).

There is, however, a backside to this. Pedersen (1999) concludes in her and her Nordic colleagues’ comparative study of television hosts (-esses) that women in television have gone from being marginalised in public service television to being trivialised in commercial channels, e.g. through being pretty assistants to older and more experienced male colleagues. Also, van Zoonen (1996/1998a) points to the backside of more and more women entering journalism – it might become yet another “pink collar ghetto”, like PR. Furthermore, it is women with traditional feminine identities that are wanted in commercial media, and there are still women that are being fired for being too old both in the US and the UK. This, of course, is “indicative of the patriarchal system in which female journalists work” (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a:46), which is no less true in commercial journalism:

It is not the popularization of news that is on trial in these debates; implicitly it is women and femininity as crucial components of this popularization as well. In our patriarchal societies most things women do and like are not valued very highly, and the contempt for marker-driven journalism should surely be seen as part of this general patriarchal scheme (van Zoonen, 1996/1998a:46).
4 ...TO A CROSSROAD OF APPROACHES.

There was a lot of revising, revisiting, rethinking, reappraising going on amongst media scholars in the 1990s. What these reflections had in common, apart from being born out of the dissident approaches, was an attempt to revitalise theories of the news content and news organisation and find new theoretical paths through the media production process (cf. van Zoonen, 1996/1988a; Curran, 1990; Schlesinger, 1990; Schudson, 1991; McNair, 1994; 1998; 2003a; 2003b; Dahlgren, 2004).

Today, in the 21st century functionalism is still going strong, particularly in Sweden and in America, as is political economy, with a stronghold still remaining in Britain. Political economy, with its media critique, has grown so strong that there is even a call (by Roger Dickinson, 2007) to revive the 1970s type of sociology of journalism, or to re-vitalise this through the help of new concepts (e.g. Ekström, 2002; Deuze, 2005; Boyer & Hannerz, 2006). Feminism has taken off and is growing stronger and stronger with more and more published books, journals and articles. Feminist journalism studies took help from the feminist strand in cultural studies for methodological input, and the merging of political-economic and feminist analysis have been very successful. Indeed, the most fruitful research in this century has attempted to combine different perspectives, to cross boundaries.

4.1. Intersectionality

What Hagemann and Åmark (1999) and Connell (1987) aim to do is to trash the enlightenment dichotomy and expand the feminist research agenda. Such continued expansion of the analysis of gender systems can be found in the substantial debate the past few years on conferences and in journals focussed on the new academic concept of intersectionality. The development of the concept has been an attempt to develop feminist theories (Lykke, 2005; Fornäs, 2005) but is also an epistemological critique of traditional (positivist) science, as well as a critique of the theoretical, empirical and political shortcomings of the feminist project (de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005).

The word intersection is American for junction, crossroad, i.e. the point where two or more roads meet. In academic terms, it is a place where different components meet, not in isolation, but in constant dynamic interplay in which they weaken or strengthen each other, compete with or complement each other (Fornäs, 2005). Intersectional analysis adds significant components to the feminist analysis as not only “race” or class, but also other power structures, like religious systems (Appelros, 2005) and ageism (Krekula, Närvänä & Näsman, 2005) are analysed. Nina Lykke argues that the concept of intersectionality has been used in feminist theory:
...to analyse how socio-cultural hierarchies and power-systems interact and create inclusion/exclusion around discursively and institutionally constructed categories like gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age/generation, nationality, et cetera (Lykke, 2005:8, my translation).

The economic historian Paulina de los Reyes and her colleague the sociologist Diana Mulinari (2005) have a different approach to intersectionality, which is made obvious in the very first sentence of their book Intersectionality:

How can power-relations in the post-colonial world be made understandable? (de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005:7, my translation)

They aim to re-think intersectionality, away from visualising the interaction of separate power-structures. Away from the hegemony of white feminism. Away from the lukewarm political actionism of most Swedish feminists, like Nina Lykke. Instead, to them an intersectional perspective asks questions of how inequality and power are interwoven with whiteness, maleness, heterosexuality, et cetera, through a constant recreation of new markers that make up the differences between them and us and turn this into social codes. These processes create specific power positions and specific ways of suppression. What de los Reyes and Mulinari specifically point to is the constant construction of power and suppression. And also the fact that gendered, racial, class-processes (et cetera) are so embedded in each other that they are impossible to separate in any feminist analysis.

Lykke (2005) recognises the critique directed towards her, and admits that intersectionality can indeed be used as a comfy cushion for white middle class feminist to rest their head upon, in order to avoid thinking about the power our position gives us. But used in a respectful way, intersectionality could become a new Cyborg, Haraway’s (1991) famous de-gendered figure that in fact has always been used as a mainstream macho figure in mainstream media, and not at all as the critical figure Haraway discusses in her Cyborg-manifesto. None the less, Lykke argues, the Cyborg might be conventional, but has a critical potential, and that is what feminists should strive for and use.

My interpretation of both Lykke’s and de los Reyes and Mulinari’s arguments is that in order to use complex concepts, we need to acknowledge the feminist position of self criticism – reflexive objectivity in Harding’s (1987) or situated knowledge in Haraway’s (1991) words, which indeed is the very first argument I made in this chapter.
4.2. Walking Onwards

What is clear to me having travelled through functionalism, political-economy and feminism is that there are a number of questions that need to be answered to gain understanding of the field of journalism. I bring with me a political power-perspective and thus questions like ‘Who is in power’ is obviously the starting point. Using Yvonne Hirdman’s theory of the gender system, where the media is seen as one institution (amongst others) that is permeated by the gendered logics of segregation, hierarchy, and preservation (Hirdman, 1988; 1990; Jónasdóttir, 1991a; 1991b), gives me a solid understanding of the structure of the gender system. With Connell’s (1987) added political economic approach to the gender system (order) I will be able to deepen the political power analysis.

But I need to go beyond that. Femininity and masculinity implies creation of identities (de Bruin, 1998; van Zoonen, 1998b), which means looking beyond male and female, to see gender as intertwined with other identity creating factors, such as class, ethnicity, religion and nationality (cf. Boëthius, 1991; Hill-Collins, 1991; de Bruin, 1998; Hagemann and Ámark, 1999; Lykke, 2005; de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005). To do this, and indeed to answer the question of ‘how power is retained’, I must find more useful tools of analysis. For this, I will turn to cultural theory.

In my review of research of the field of journalism, one perspective was lacking. There has been new ways (I mentioned in the beginning of this section) that has studied journalism from a culturalist perspective, which I have not discussed. That is because it is where I end up. Or rather, it is the road I have chosen to walk with this project, albeit still bringing with me my feminist way of seeing the world.

Indeed, the process of how I have theoretically walked towards the concept of journalism culture could be visualised as a spiral movement between three main theoretical fields: with the starting point in functionalist sociology of journalism, walking towards the more political economic part of sociology of journalism, towards feminism, towards cultural studies, but continuing to be informed and inspired by all three theoretical fields at the same time studying and bringing research confirmation and refutation into these fields.

Figure 5: Studying Journalism Culture: A Process of Theoretical Abduction.
II. MY POSITION: JOURNALISM AS CULTURE

The “new way” called for in the beginning of the 1990s was primarily a culturalist approach to the study of news, as opposed to the more traditional, functionalist and political-economic approaches, sketched out above (cf. van Zoonen, 1988b; Curran, 1990; Schlesinger, 1990; Schudson, 1991; 2003a; 2003b; McNair, 1994; 1998; 2003a; 2003b; Ekström, 2002; Dahlgren, 2004; Deuze, 2005; Boyer & Hannerz, 2006). In fact, the culturalist approach is an attempt to combine a political-economic approach with an organisational, and a materialist approach with a pluralist – leaving behind the major drawbacks of the respective approaches, such as conspiracy theory, detailed accounts of organisational life, over focus of economic processes, and ideological naivety (Schudson, 1991). Just like the intersectional approach to the understanding of gender, the Culturalist approach is thus an attempt to understand the news process through a variety of factors and contexts.

As Brian McNair argues:

> From the culturalist perspective, journalistic conduits are shaped primarily by a combination of ideological, economic, and cultural influences acting on the news organisation from without. Journalists themselves are relatively autonomous from direct proprietorial and editorial control, but never the less reproduce preferred accounts and interpretations of social reality by internalising the dominant value structure of their society (McNair, 1994: 49).

In a critique – or reappraisal – of the culturalist perspective, James Curran (1990) argues that the assumption of autonomous journalists comes close to the naivety of the popular perception of British journalists about their own importance for news content, i.e. that the media is a mirror of society, and journalists themselves neutral and dispassionate mediators of information. Journalists, he argues, are allowed to be independent, but only as long as this is exercised in a form that conforms to the requirements of their employing organisation, and the owners of this. Through a case study of the media coverage of local government in London, he shows that:

> Always present, in some form or other, are the influences exerted by the cultural patterns of society, the repertoire of images and meanings readily available to journalists, and the wider context of ideological contest to which they are ex-
posed. These influences are mediated through the structures and values of news organizations. However, it is the way in which these structures and values are shaped by internal processes of control within news organizations, which require more critical attention. In short, what is needed is a new synthesis combining political economy and culturalist insights (Curran, 1990:133).

When, in the early 1990s, I had analysed the Swedish material (written up in Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b) I became aware of the limitations of my theoretical framework. It was limited, and limiting, because with its help I could not properly understand my material. In my search for a fruitful theoretical framework for the study of media production processes, I have been greatly influenced by this «new way» of journalism studies.

Walking the «new way» was, however, not easy. Raymond Wiliams’ famous quotation “culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (Williams, 1976:87) suggests this, as the fact that the debate over the meaning of culture is a subject of a plethora of academic volumes (cf. Reimer, 1994). Nonetheless, Raymond Williams (1976; 1981) and Stuart Hall’s (1980a; 1980b) texts greatly influenced me in my way of seeing journalism as culture. And I am not alone in that. In a recent book Gertrude J Robinson (2005) shows a new direction in her work, from a traditional sociology of journalism to a Raymond Williams’ inspired cultural approach to journalism. As I will show in the next section, it is not suffice to rest there. A cultural approach demands specific tools in order to study the field of journalism.

1. SEARCHING FOR A USEFUL CONCEPT

Several scholars have answered the call for a new way of studying journalism, i.e. from a culturalist perspective. What most of them have in common is an attempt to find a useful set of theoretical tools to do just that, mainly by inventing or re-inventing concepts.

Instead of inventing a new concept, Mark Deuze (2005) re-visits old theoretical territories. He returns to traditional sociology of journalism and criticises apparent consensual body of knowledge (e.g. that the core of journalism is objectivity), and their lack of explicit definition of what is meant by concepts used, and then he pushes for a holistic approach. In conceptualising journalism as ideology Deuze wants an inspiring approach to look beyond infrastructures and representations
to see the occupational ideology of journalism at work. This he defines as the way journalists give meaning to their newswork:

In the particular context of journalism as a profession, ideology can be seen as a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular group, including – but not limited to – the general process of the production of meanings and ideas (within that group) (Deuze, 2005:445).

The problem, as I see it, with Deuze’s way of re-defining traditional concepts, is that he rests on traditional sociology of journalism at the same time as he moves towards a culturalist approach. Standing with one leg in each camp, the re-defined concept becomes fuzzy and thus difficult to use.

Mats Ekström (2002) goes, in an attempt to create a theoretical framework to the study of television journalism, back to theory of knowledge. With the concept journalism epistemology he means:

“rules, routines and institutionalized procedures that operate within a social setting and decide the form of the knowledge produced and the knowledge claims expressed (or implied). It also refers to the question of how these claims are justified, both within the organization and vis-à-vis the public and other social institutions” (Ekström, 2002:260, italic in original text).

With this definition he is quite close to Deuze’s definition of ideology and like Deuze he is based in traditional sociology of journalism, particularly Gaye Tuchman’s (1978) work, whilst at the same time criticising the same. Unlike Deuze, Ekström has an organisational approach and is inspired by McLuhan’s and Postman’s ways of seeing technology as the meaning-carrier. Thus to Ekström, it is a theory of television journalism he attempts at.

Paul du Gay (1997) is also grasping over two theoretical areas. He argues that production of culture (e.g. news) must always be understood in the light of the culture of this production. This play with words is reflected in the concept of Media Culture, which has two distinct meanings. Media culture is, on the one hand, seen as the interplay between the cultural product that the media produce, and the media audience (Skovmand and Schroder, 1992), in other words an example of what Stuart Hall (1980b) defines as the encoding-decoding process, which is studied in the culturalist paradigm of cultural studies (Hall, 1980a). On the other hand, any production process must be organised, and indeed the other meaning of Media
Culture entails the media organisation as a culture itself (Morgan, 1986; du Gay, 1997).

Monica Löfgren-Nilsson (1999) makes a valuable contribution to the theoretical and empirical development of this latter line of thought and indeed to a culturalist perspective through her discussion of the concept *Newsroom Culture*. She explains that this promotes certain values, which are to be understood as abstract ideals (e.g. autonomy, integrity, accuracy, critical examination, and actuality) shaped through interplay with the surrounding society. In the newsroom culture, everyday work is guided through a framework composed of norms, which are practical applications of values (e.g. how autonomy or actuality can be implemented in everyday practices). Turning values into norms into everyday practices as efficiently as possible is done through organisational principles. Rather than being simply the structure of the newsroom, these organisational principles must be seen (from a culturalist perspective) as “an interpretative framework essential for how the journalistic enterprise will be understood and discussed” (Löfgren-Nilsson, 1999:200).

Whilst these concepts give insight into the interplay between the media text and its audience, and into the cultural production process on an organisational level, they bring too limited an understanding of the overall cultural processes of journalism. Löfgren-Nilsson (1999:46/200) argues herself that newsroom cultures are developed in historical, economic, political and organisational contexts. In her analysis (of three local newspapers), she moves, however, on an organisational level. To move beyond the organisational level, and to develop a concept that can move across, and be useful for analysis on individual, organisational institutional and societal levels, and thus understand the cultural process of journalism, has been a theoretical aim for me. For that purpose I will discuss the concept of *journalism culture*.

1.1. Searching for Journalism Culture

A decade and a half ago I defined *journalist culture* as the production and reproduction of meaning and ideology for a particular professional group – journalists (Melin, 1991b). This definition is, however, too wide and difficult to use empirically.

Henrika Zilliakus-Tikkanen (1997:41) has also used the concept ‘journalist culture’, but gives it another meaning; synonymous to «discourse» the concept is “a model in the journalists’ head, which is realised in the work process”. Zilliakus-Tikkanen’s definition is too vague, as she gives no acceptable explanation as to how this model ended up in the journalists’ head in the first place, and how it remains there.
Löfgren Nilsson (1999:45) criticises the concept of journalist culture for being too all embracing, and for not taking into account the different external conditions, which for example, a local newspaper and a weekly magazine live under. I have two arguments against this. One is that by seeing journalist culture as a dynamic system of power, by which variances within the culture (e.g. subcultures, oppositional cultures) are enlightened, the differences Löfgren-Nilsson points to would thus be naturally accounted for. The second argument is that journalist culture goes beyond organisational cultures and policies, goes beyond the individual media organisation. What determines journalist culture is mainly on higher levels, institutional and societal. That does not mean that all media organisations are the same, nor that all journalists think alike. It does, however mean, that (despite different working conditions and personal backgrounds of individual journalists) there are ideological similarities that stretches across media organisations and their employees. There is recognition of what journalism is and how it should be done. To avoid any misunderstandings such as too narrow definitions (what goes on in journalists’ head) and meeting Löfgren Nilsson’s critique I suggest a re-naming of the concept to journalism culture, which would encompass what I have discussed above.

This, I argue, better explain differences within the culture, as they are in fact highly interesting and vital in order to understand the culture as a whole. What I mean is that there are obviously groups of journalists that disagree with the common understanding of what journalism is. This causes conflict. To enable an understanding of the nature of these differences and conflicts, and indeed the inherently gendered nature of journalism, I need, however, finer instruments. For this I shall explore Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of social field and apply it to the field of journalism. Whereas I do believe that journalism culture is a, theoretically, most fruitful concept, enabling me to draw from a rich theoretical field, I also believe that it is – notoriously – complex and difficult to study empirically. From this perspective Löfgren-Nilsson’s (1999) critique of the concept journalist culture is fair. I thus make a distinction between journalism culture and social field. Journalism culture signifies a way of seeing journalism as culture. It signifies a theoretical standpoint, whereas social field makes journalism easier to study.

2. THE SOCIAL FIELD OF JOURNALISM

Through his studies of the Kabuli society in 1950s Algeria and his mapping of French social society from the 1960s-1990s, Pierre Bourdieu has created a theory of social space and analytically sophisticated and empirically productive concepts
(Broady, 1990; Gripsrud, 2000; Prior, 2000). His theory is (like that of Raymond Williams), in essence, a massive critique against materialist (Marxist) class-theory, with its singular focus on economic power as the determining factor of individual class positioning, but also a frontal attack against both essentialism and idealism, with its civilising and elitist perspective on culture (Bourdieu, 1984; 1986; 1998a, see also Broady, 1990; Garnham and Williams, 1986; Gripsrud, 2000, Orr, 2000).

2.1. From Journalism Culture to Journalism as a Social Field

The jump from journalism culture to journalism as a social field is not especially difficult. In fact, Pierre Bourdieu discusses himself journalism as a field, mainly in his later essays. He is interested in the supremacy of the field and discusses journalism in relation to other fields in society; in *Homo Academicus* he talks of the increasing overlapping between the academic and journalistic field, and how players in both fields use various strategies to accumulate their “parasitical power of consecration” by mutual beneficial consecration of each other (e.g. journalist interviewing academics, academics being interviewed by journalists). In the later essays the perspective is different. In *Sur la télévision*, he discusses the increasing colonisation of journalism by the field of economy; how the demands of the market forces (audimat) permeates every part of journalism (Bourdieu, 1998a)\(^1\).

Although he himself is mostly concerned with the interactions between journalism and other fields, and other fields (notably the economic and political field, see Bourdieu, 1998a; 1998b; 2005), I argue that Bourdieu’s theories are concretely and theoretically useful to the study of the field of journalism. As Rodney Benson and Erik Neveu say in their introduction to *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*: “Field theory offers a new paradigm for the sociology of news, yet one that in many ways supplements rather than entirely supplants existing approaches” (Benson & Neveu, 2005: 7). To exemplify that citation I would argue that what political economic scholars have discussed the past three decades, for example that the media tends to act as servant to the political and economic elite, is theoretically neatly explained by Bourdieu in his later essays\(^1\). Equally neatly fits what functionalist media scholars, who focus on the increasing power of the media, point to in their discussions of value-similarities (e.g. political values) between journalists and politicians\(^1\).
In sum, field theory positions itself precisely between those approaches (political economy of cultural) that commit the “short-circuit” fallacy and link news production directly to the interest of broad social classes or the national society, and those (organizational) that focus too narrowly on particular news producers. Field research thus calls for the examination of “institutional logics”: the simultaneous analysis of social structures and cultural forms, as well as the complex interplay between the two (Benson & Neveu, 2005:12).

As for the social field of journalism itself, Bourdieu states that:

... the field of journalism rests, like every other field, on a number of starting points and convictions (beyond differences in positions and views). These conditions that consist of a certain system of cognitive categories, a certain relationship to language, everything that for example is included in concepts like “television suitability”, creates the foundation for the selections journalists make from the social reality and from the wholeness of symbolic production. No discourse (scientific analysis, politic manifestation, etc.) no action (demonstration, strike, etc.) slip away from this sifting through the journalistic selection process, i.e. that incredible censorship journalists practice without even being aware of it, through only accept what interest them, what “catches their attention” (i.e. is in accordance with their categories, their screening) and overlooking, and thereby making invisible other symbolic expressions that would be as deserving to reach a large audience (Bourdieu, 1998a: 69, my translation).

2.2. Doxa in the Field of Journalism

Journalism is a micro-cosmos with its own inherent logic. When entering into the field, journalists put on their own professional spectacles. These are perception categories, or invisible structures that organise perceptions (Bourdieu, 1998a). What Bourdieu refers to is journalists’ way of seeing the world, thinking about reality, thinking news – i.e. the doxa (Bourdieu, 2005). In the previous part of this section, I discussed the plethora of research done on journalists’ news values, role perceptions, ethical codes, etc. Translated into Bourdieu’s language and applying his concepts, this is all part of the doxa (or doxas). Thus, there is a doxa common for Western journalism, and it is characterised by a strong belief in objectivity (McQuail, 1994; 2005) (which is not only the most common ideal, but also the most profitable role for journalists to take (Gans, 1979; Ekström, 2002)), time as a fetishism and the hunt for deadlines as a way of life (Schlesinger, 1978; Ekström, 2002; Deuze, 2005), competitiveness both towards other media and to-
wards colleagues (Schlesinger, 1978; Bourdieu, 1998a; 2005), and anti-intellectualism (Bourdieu, 1998a). The *doxa* also comprises of enduring values of what is good and bad in society (Gans, 1979) and as a consequence of that and a consequence of the structure of the media process, what should become news (Galtung and Ruge, 1981; Ekström, 2002).

I would argue that the professional roles or ideals, as studied by a number of mainly functionalist journalist scholars\(^{18}\), are comparable to Bourdieu’s *doxa*. They show, as I have previously discussed, that there are differences on a national level between the *doxas* of journalism in various countries. So, for example, amongst German journalists, there is a strong belief that they have something of a missionary role, in which journalists, similar to politicians and intellectuals, should use their intellectual powers and creativity to influence their audience in a certain direction, i.e. what is good for the people and democratic society (Köcher 1985; 1986; Schönenbach et al, 1998). This is different from the *doxa* of Swedish and British journalists’, which I show in this dissertation (see also Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004).

*Doxa* is not only about thoughts, attitudes and values – but also about prescribed behaviour patterns, i.e. how journalism is actually done (Bourdieu, 2005; and compare discussions in Bourdieu, 1998a; Rosengren & Arvidsson, 2002). Indeed, I would argue that the *doxa* of (Western) journalism has many behavioural ingredients. The hunt for news, the hunt for time, and the fact that news (papers) is both an economic and ideological project, creates a need for a hierarchical structure and highly routinised production processes with a strong focus on competition with other media. The consequences of this for the prescribed behaviour of news people is an extreme planning at daily (morning) meetings, a high degree of stress, a constant comparison with other media, a hunt for *scoops* in races to beat competitors, and to win the audience\(^{19}\). The pressure of all this (the *doxa*), makes finding a reliable and efficient news source central to the newsperson’s everyday working life. The lack of time, and reliance on routines, encourages the journalist to seek up sources that are geographically and socially close, trustworthy, suitable and willing. This tends to be people that belong to the professional middle class, quite like journalists themselves. Pierre Bourdieu’s discussions of the mutual consecration of journalists and academics can be compared to the discussions by journalist scholars who point to the mutual benefits elite persons and journalists enjoy by co-operating\(^{20}\).

In his article *What is Journalism?* Mark Deuze (2005) attempts to re-define journalist ideology, and notes that journalism in all elective democracies share similar values, but apply them in different ways. He therefore argues that it is possible to speak of a *dominant occupational ideology of journalism*. He also talks of power
in a professional context equals power to define this dominant ideology, or what real journalism is. This is quite clearly close to Bourdieu’s concept of doxa. According to Deuze, dominant journalism ideology have five values, which are in many ways a summary of what I above described as the doxa found in previous research:

- Public service: journalists provide a public service (as watchdogs ro ‘news-hounds’, active collectors and disseminators of information);
- Objectivity: journalists are impartial, neutral, objective, fair and (thus) credible;
- Autonomy: journalists must be autonomous, free and independent in their work;
- Immediacy: journalists have a sense of immediacy, actuality and speed (inherent in the concept of ‘news’);
- Ethics: journalists have a sense of ethics, validity and legitimacy (Deuze, 2005: 447).

In *Sur la television* Pierre Bourdieu is highly critical of (mainly television) journalism. Its dominating doxa makes news more homogenous; competition in the field actually enforces this. A scoop is, for example, exceptional because it is exceptional to the journalist and to her/his competitors. And whilst fighting to stay in touch, journalists read every newspaper, watches every newscast – news-production thus becomes a collective act. When journalists think they adapt to the audience, they actually adapt to their colleagues (competitors). This inbreeding is a particular field-effect of journalism. Bourdieu thus dismisses any claim of objective reporting, or news being a representation of reality. In fact, (television) news has become representation for reality, an instrument for creating events rather than mirroring the same (Bourdieu, 2005). Bourdieu argues that the effect of the doxa of journalism is a kind of censorship, as effective as and even harder than political censorship (which Western journalists fight so hard against). It is effective because it is invisible (Bourdieu, 1998a). This line of thought can be easily compared to politico-economic ideas of the media sustaining the hegemony of the capitalist system. The perhaps strongest invisible censorship that takes place in the field of journalism is, Bourdieu (1998a) argues, self-censorship on journalists’ part. They are not aware of the professional spectacles they are wearing, and not aware of the terrible pressure of the doxa to conform. The former principle of the Stockholm Journalist College, Lars Furhoff (1986), noted that students on work-placements and (former) students just entering their careers were by no means forced to socialise into new roles and practices. They chose to adapt to their perceived expectations, to better
fit in and to – hopefully – further their career. A carrot, not a stick, in other words. The problem with the field of journalism in this respect, Bourdieu argues, is that there are no sanctions, positive or negative. The positive sanctions could possibly be a repeat (of a documentary or bit of news) or having one’s story as a lead, but there are few career advancement possibilities and even fewer possible punishments.

2.3. Conflict within the Field of Journalism

The absurd competition between journalists is built upon objective collusion, which is built on their position within the space of symbolic production, i.e. on common cognitive structures, on common perception categories that are tied to their social background and education, i.e. to their habitus. This agreement, or collusion, does not mean that the field is homogenous and tension free. Quite the contrary, there is a strong tension within the micro-cosmos that is journalism. The main tension within the field is between those that want to keep a certain degree of commercial autonomy and freedom, and those that bow to the necessity of commercial forces, i.e. between advocates for autonomy and advocates for audimat. This is clearly visible in the stardom of certain journalists (moving into the visibility of television) on the one hand, and hard-working reporters slaving away behind the scenes in television newsrooms (Bourdieu, 1998a).

Bourdieu does, however, mention other tensions apart from those between autonomy and audimat. There are, namely, those journalists that see through the terrible necessity of modern journalism, and become disappointed, unsatisfied, rebellious or cynical. These could, one would assume, become a centre for resistance in the battle of what should be journalism. No, says Bourdieu (1998a), there is still far from a substantial opposition within the field of journalism (and he would get support from scholars like Herman and Chomsky, 1988/2002). In his Lyon lecture (Bourdieu, 2005) he explains this when he argues that “these struggles are always based on the fact that the most irreducible adversaries have in common that they accept a certain number of presuppositions that are constitutive of the very functioning of the field. In order to fight one another, people have to agree on the areas of disagreement” (Bourdieu, 2005:36).

I would, however, argue that there is a substantial amount of research done that shows substantial tension within the field of journalism, and enough common ground of disagreement in order to create open conflict. To understand that, I need to put on my feminist spectacles and take a critical look at Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts.
3. LOOKING AT SOCIAL FIELDS WITH FEMINIST SPECTACLES

I put a large emphasis on Pierre Bourdieu’s thoughts in the theoretical framework I have built for this study, and I am not alone as a feminist researcher to do so. Indeed, in the wake of the application of his theories in subjects of sociology, anthropology and cultural studies, feminist scholars have the past decade started to take a deeper interest in his theories. Amongst the more interesting discussions of his work I find Margareta Järvinen’s comparison between his work and that of feminist scholars, Terry Lovell’s comparison between Judith Butler’s and Bourdieu’s theories, and Torild Moi’s comparison between him and Simon de Beauvoire. Järvinen (1999) sees the strength of Bourdieu as a “radical feminist thinker who has gradually become more and more resolute (and perhaps uni-dimensional) in his critique of masculine dominated structures” (1999:18) and argues that his book *La domination masculine* is a truly gender-political book, a camera which focuses sharply on power, counter-power and reproduction and change. Lovell (2000) argues that Bourdieu’s insistence on the significance of class (in the formation of an individual’s habitus) is an important and winning point (particularly against post-structuralist and post-modernist feminists). He also has, she argues, a powerful way of understanding both the arbitrary and contestable nature of the social (including gender) and its compelling presence and effectiveness. Moi (1999) continues on that note and argues that Bourdieu’s particular strength is that he has enabled us to understand what it might mean to speak of a social unconscious (which is important in the understanding of gender), and the enormous details he gives to miniscule acts of everyday life. This is, of course, what feminists have called for since the 1970s. Furthermore, she argues, his concepts (habitus, doxa, symbolic capital and power) are deeply useful for certain kinds of feminist projects (e.g. Göransson, 2006), and the way he unconditionally sees gender as a social category with two objectively produced habitus (with their own *hexis*) undercuts the division between the traditional essentialist/constructivist divide within feminist theory.

3.1. Feminist Critique against Bourdieu

These are powerful arguments to the use of Bourdieu’s theory. There has, however, been substantial critique against Bourdieu from several feminist thinkers criticising him for being everything from a rigid radical essentialist to a misogynist sexist (cf. discussion in Fowler, 2000). Most of the feminist critique is about the static, deterministic and structuralist implication of his theories (cf. Butler, 1997; Moi, 1999;
Lovell, 2000). The way Bourdieu sketches the gender system (and indeed social space) it can easily be read as a ceiled system dominated by masculine values, with individuals as objective bearers of positions. Little girls learn to be girls very early on in child-hood, and thus acquire the stigmata of femininity early on, which in turn means that they have next to no possibility of choosing cross-sexual identity. The fact that there are indeed girls that choose to take a position that does not have a total fit with femininity and acquire a masculine habitus (Amazons, tomboys etc) is not at all discussed by Bourdieu (Järvinen, 1999; Lovell, 2000).

The ceiled nature of the system is particularly obvious in Bourdieu’s discussion of subordinate groups’ own participation in their subordination. His ideas of early gendered socialisation coupled with his thinking about Amor Fati\(^2\) (love thy destiny) makes social change almost impossible. But does the doxa necessarily always win? And do the dominated love their destiny in every social situation? Moi (1999) answers these questions with a «no» and argues that Simone de Beauvoir might have a too naïve a view of women’s possibility of changing their own destiny, but Pierre Bourdieu has too gloomy a view, allowing next to no way out of the social shackles of patriarchy.

The reason for this, sometimes contradictory, feminist critique might lie in the somewhat lack of clarity of his theories and main concepts (like doxa, habitus, gender) (cf. Järvinen, 1999; Moi, 1999; Fowler, 2000; Rosengren, 2002). Another reason for the feminist critique against the over-determinism of his theories is that he has based most of his thinking of the gender system and gendered social space on his studies from the 1950s and 1960s Kabyle society, which according to his description is a near doxic society. From that follows the caricature-like characteristics of the gender system, based on the dualistic enlightenment gender-dichotomy (man equals everything with high status, women equals everything with low status) (cf. Lovell, 2000). The black-and-whiteness of his view of gender has not changed despite more recent empirical work (about French society), e.g. women do still seem to be merely social objects hardly able to be capital earning individuals, free from their families. Indeed, gender does seem to be secondary (along with race, ethnicity and sexuality) in his analysis, despite his reassurance that gender is all-important (Bourdieu, 1999). For example, in the many graphs in La Distinction gender does never enter into his graphic equations. And nor so in most of his last work on journalism. In his Lyon lecture he only mentions gender once, and that is in relation to the doxic schemes of the journalistic fields: the black-and-white hard/soft, masculine/feminine dichotomy (Bourdieu, 2005:37)\(^2\).

So why, with this gloom-and-doom view of masculine domination, would feminists (myself included) use Bourdieu’s theories? His concepts are extremely useful
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to feminist intellectuals – as in the case with cultural theories I argued above. He manages to put concrete (researchable) words in discussions and thinking that has continued over the past four decades. Using his theories and concepts and applying them into feminist research projects does not, however, mean losing sight of one’s critical distance. As Lovell (2000) argues, to think with Bourdieu is an invitation to think beyond and against him. Moi (1999) argues similarly, that as a feminist, she is appropriating Bourdieu, which means that she remains both critical and appreciative to his thoughts. And unlike Järvinen (1999) she does not consider Bourdieu a feminist thinker, but his theories have an immense value to feminism. I will thus think with Bourdieu, and appropriate his concepts.

3.2. Thinking with Bourdieu on Gender

The strength of Bourdieu’s definition of gender is his unconditional adherence to gender as a social construction (he is deeply suspicious of any biological explanation to gender differences and sees them as masking true power-relations). In La domination masculine he talks of a relational gender system, which produces the social artefacts masculine man and feminine woman. These two gender only exist in relation to each other and both are the product of theoretical and practical construction work, with socially differentiated engendered bodies as a product. This takes place through a – mostly unconscious – Bildung process. Bourdieu furthermore talks of two classes of habitus: masculine and feminine, to which different hexis are bound. This I take to mean that gender actually constitutes two separate habitus, and not merely gendered capital as he mentions in La Distinction.

The gender system is characterised by a strong masculine domination, the strength of which lies in its invisibility, of mastering to keep dominance and to make it seem objective, part of the natural order. He also states that these gendered structures are surprisingly autonomous in relation to economic structures; throughout history the same system of classification can be found beyond economic and social differences. Again, his thinking of gender has changed; in La domination masculine Bourdieu states that gender takes a significant part in all distinctions, an admittance that cannot be found in La distinction. He furthermore puts the hierarchical and relational nature of gender in a historical perspective, pointing to its very long historical consistency, thus what I have called the “enlightenment dichotomy” (cf. Badinter, 1992/1994) dates back far longer than the Enlightenment era.

Sustenance of the system takes place through Bildung, which is mainly the responsibility of reproduction agents (traditionally the family, church, state – including the school system). The tragedy of the system Bourdieu paints is, however, that
the system is necessarily also supported by the dominated groups themselves; the system produces women who share the very same habitus that serves to oppress them. Women are symbolically condemned to submission, and condemned to their fate of understanding how low their sex is, tied to a self-fulfilling prophecy, the logic of damnation by *Amor Fati*. This is not to say that all women share this destiny. Bourdieu states strongly that one must always take social distinctions into account and never lose sight of class-based variability of gender, i.e. there are women that clearly benefit from the system, and others that are tied to the shackles of *Amor Fati*.

### 3.3. Appropriating Bourdieu

Whilst recognising similarities and noting difficulties, there are a number of clear beneficial points I can draw from Bourdieu's thinking on gender and add to my own. Firstly, there are striking similarities between Bourdieu's thinking and that of Simone de Beauvoir (1949/2002) (as Moi, 1999, discusses) in that both argue that one is not born a woman (or man): one becomes a woman (or man). For both of them social construction does not equal relativism. Indeed, being socially constructed, a woman (or man) means being produced into a woman (or man). There is an objective reality in which one is a woman; one is a man – albeit socially constructed, which means that sexual differences cannot be deconstructed away. Moi (1999) argues that this is where Bourdieu's stance as a constructivist structuralist is the most obvious, and as such he manages to bridge the gap between essentialist and constructivist feminist thinking. In this way, Bourdieu’s thinking bridges the frustrating gap between my own intellectual stance and my everyday thinking of, and existing through, gender. Let me explain.

Gender as a social construction, a system of power, is indeed a very appealing theoretical tool that fits neatly into the theoretical framework, which is the frame of thought in my academic world. But what does it mean in the world that is not academic? «Oh, what a cute socially constructed girl you’ve got!» «Eh?»

Using my children to understand my theoretical concept is a useful exercise. In their play and their way of dressing I clearly see the reflection of the cultural and institutional context in which they move daily. School-yard banter is directly transferred to taste and distaste in clothes; previously loved clothes are rejected because they are too boyish, or girlish respectively; my daughter’s pal Pablo is not okay to play with at school as “there he only plays boy’s-games”. When going to school, my son runs ahead beating everything in sight with a stick (read sword), and my daughter walks nicely next to me. I can hear my mother’s and my grandmother’s voices
through my own when telling my daughter to walk like a young lady and saying that my son needs to run off his energy. Again, this is more complex than a boy-girl issue. My son who loves to dress in tights and skirt (kilt) is never ever teased for this. He is excused. He is Scottish.

Social constructivism works well in my own back yard as well in academia. Too well. As so many others I want to see a unique individual person behind the social construction. I want a get-out-clause. My own ambivalence towards the constructivist-essentialist debate was clearly shown in a discussion I had with an honours-student about these issues. Gender, she believed wholeheartedly, is definitely socially constructed, just as class, ethnicity et cetera. But she sees herself as a uniquely born person, born with certain characteristics, e.g. her sexuality. The idea that her homosexuality would be socially constructed she could in no way adhere to.

Unfortunately there are no get-out-clauses that exempt myself and my nearest from the social world in which we live, and thus would excuse my own part in, for example, my children’s ways towards becoming a man and a woman. Instead I use my own experiences into academia, and thus carry with me an understanding of the complexity of the social world I will analyse. And I turn to this for a useful theoretical explanation.

The second issue Bourdieu clarifies and strengthens is the root of social order, where he joins socialist feminists in emphasising patriarchy and masculine dominance, as well as class structure and economic processes as important factors in the construction of social space. His cultural analysis of the same, with discussions of identity creation processes, is of course also akin to cultural studies feminists thinking. Mainly, I would say, he opens up for a truly intersectional gender analysis. Just as Bourdieu himself widened and deepened class one can widen and deepen gender. By using his theoretical concepts one is able to analyse the social world with a great variety of social categories, all which interact with each other, weaken or strengthen each other. And this is what Lykke (2005) argues an intersectional analysis should do. de los Reyes’ and Mulinari’s (2005) critique against Nina Lykke for only adding categories without any political conviction, could of course be turned towards Bourdieu and his theories, as could Nick Prior’s (2000) critique of Bourdieu for being overly chameleon-like, which applies also to this gender discussion. To me, however, the strength in Bourdieu’s work lies in the richness of analysis made possible by his theoretical framework, in which gender fits neatly.

The third beneficial point follows on from that. To me, the concepts Bourdieu offers, concepts that are particularly interesting from a gender perspective, add valuable dimensions to my gender definition, and give me, my study and my analysis, empirically and theoretically usable concepts. The fact that habitus is about gen-
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der as well as about social classes and the hierarchical distinctions in social space that follows from that, is useful when describing the way I see the structuring of social space. *Hexis*, habitus and symbolic power imprinted on our bodies, ties excellently in with feminist thinking of the politics of the body, and the most private as political acts (cf. Connell, 1987; McKinnon, 1989; Moi, 1999). His thoughts on the consistency and strength of the gender system are very interesting, and involve several useful concepts. His way of thinking is akin to that of Yvonne Hirdman’s (1990), albeit they use different concepts to discuss the workings of the system, and his concepts are more empirically usable (Göransson, 2006). *Doxa* has an obvious gender dimension; Bourdieu’s discussion of *doxa* is in fact the most interesting in *La domination masculine*, where he argues that male dominance relies on their symbolic power to define the *doxa*, which entails the belief system that everything tied to masculinity has high status, and everything tied to femininity has low status (cf. Hirdman’s, 1988; 1990, *principle of hierarchy and principle of segregation*). The strength of the *doxa*, into which women as well as men are socialised, lies in the dominant’s (men’s) ability to keep it invisible (cf. Jónasdóttir’s, 1991a; 1991b *principle of preservation*). Bourdieu brings, however, a historical dimension, and a cultural context, into the process behind the gender system, something that Hirdman fails to do (cf. Hageman and Åmark’s, 1999, discussion around *principle of precedence*). He exemplifies his discussion of the *doxa* of the journalistic field with the opposition of hard and soft news, showing that this is clearly gendered and that it permeates the entire field from hierarchies down to specialities. And (then Bourdieu brilliantly summarises just about every feminist theory in a paragraph by saying that) this *doxa* (distributed by sex) might seem vague and fuzzy but, by being vague and fuzzy manages to become so deeply rooted in thought and even in body that when the whole society has it in its head, the *doxa* ends up defining reality (Bourdieu, 2005:37). Again, one can not define away man/woman, just as one can not define away hard/soft news.

Furthermore, Bourdieu brings other interesting concepts into the equation of the consistency of male dominance. *Symbolic violence*, structured by habitus, is used by dominating groups to keep (women) in place, and result in sexual oppression, and the legitimisation of the domination. Again, the usefulness of his concepts for an intersectional analysis is apparent. Symbolic violence can thus be seen as the force used by the group(s) who has acquired the right habitus and capital in order to control the *doxa*. And as though *doxa* is not enough to hide the dominance of the dominant group (males, white people, protestants, upper-classes) Bourdieu talks of the *matrix*, those unconscious perception- and value structures into which the historic structures of the male order is incorporated. This makes it almost impos-
possible for us (men and women) to objectively perceive the gendered reality, as we (men and women) are part of the object we try to perceive. The matrix is indeed a very graphic description of what I am up against to analyse. Here I am thinking of the films with the same name, which have indeed many gendered connotations. In Bourdieuan terms the film is about a doxic reality and attempts to see through the created doxa, where indeed symbolic violence are used to keep everyone physically into place, and where the symbolic becomes real.

Gendered Power on the Field of Journalism

A recent, highly interesting and usable study from a Bourdieuan perspective has been done by the historian Anita Göransson and her team of senior researchers from a variety of disciplines (2006). In their structural analysis of the keepers of the highest positions of public power in Sweden they show that power is distributed according to gender in every single field. They study eight separate Swedish fields amongst them the media field. This, they argue, might not have decision-making power in society, but most certainly both agenda setting power. Most importantly, it has discursive power, i.e. power to decide doxa. This means that the dominating group of the field (the media elite) has then a double-power to define the doxa.

The media-researcher Monika Djerf-Pierre is part of Göransson’s team. Djerf-Pierre (2006) argues in her analysis of the media field that it (as every other field) is inherently gendered, permeated by perceptions of what is male and female, which has direct consequences for the constitution of the media elite, the dominant group on the field. Unsurprisingly she shows that only one fourth of top positions within the media is held by women, most of them are newsroom editors (31 percent) or editors in chief (31 percent). Only one tenth of the managing directors are women (Djerf-Pierre, 2006:424). Again, the gendered logic is at large, the most status filled positions of the status filled positions are held by men. As fulfilling a Bourdieuan prophecy, the members of the male elite have mostly a business degree whereas members of the female elite mostly have journalist degree (sometimes in combination with a social science degree) (Djerf-Pierre, 2006:427f). The gendered distinction is clear: the dominating group of the dominating class has a lot of economic capital, whereas the dominated group of the dominating class has a lot of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984), apparently also amongst the media elite. And of course, audimat, the economic side of journalism, is winning over autonomy, the editorial side of journalism, as Bourdieu discusses in his essays on television (Bourdieu, 1998a; 1998b).
III. THEORETICAL CONCEPTS USED

So far in this chapter I have discussed the theoretical framework in which this project is placed, and I have shown where this project, this book, is situated in that same framework. This is an important exercise as it clearly has implications for the way I have analysed the journalistic fields of my study. By necessity it is a long and large discussion. I will therefore, to enable a better understanding of the analysis that follows in chapter three and four, briefly summarise my theoretical thought-model through defining the main concepts I have used in the study – and which of course have informed my reading of the results: my object of study: *journalist culture*, and the more specific concepts that are part of the model used in the analysis of my research material: *social field, doxa, strategies and tactics, and gender*. These concepts derive from the theoretical perspectives I have presented in this chapter: Sociology of Journalism, Feminism and Cultural studies. This analytical thought model is visualised in Figure 6.
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**Figure 6:** Analytical Model for the Study of Journalism Culture.
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**Theoretical Perspectives**

| Sociology of Journalism | Feminism | Cultural Studies |

**Object of Study**

- Journalism Culture

**Concepts Used**

- Journalist
- Social Field
- Habitus
- Hexis
- Capital
- Doxa
- Strategies/Tactics
- Gender
1. JOURNALISM CULTURE

One of my perspectives, when looking academically at journalism, can be named culturalist (cf. Schudson, 1991; 2003; McNair, 1994; 2003b), and which is informed by the work of Raymond Williams (cf. 1976; 1981). The definition of journalism culture I attempted to use when doing the British study in 1992 (Melin, 1991b) was too wide and difficult to really use empirically. I took the concept back to the drawing board, and re-visited the debate over culture. The definition of journalism culture I use in this book is naturally born out of my definition of culture. Thus, if culture is a system of power, then so is journalism culture. If culture is human praxis and practices, then so is journalism culture. From that follows that journalism culture is what a particular body of journalists, at a point in history, feels, thinks, acts and is. Journalism culture is creation and re-creation of meaning and reality, constantly negotiated and determined by power. Journalism culture is, thus, a shared world-view – reality – for a group of journalists, which of course comprises a set of ideals, values and rules of how to handle things (like news) and how to enact that perspective. As culture, journalism culture is not homogenous. There is a constant fight between the dominant culture and different oppositional cultures, a fight for the symbolic power of creating the meaning of journalism (Melin-Higgins & Djerf Pierre, 1998; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 54; Melin-Higgins, 2004).

A culturalist perspective on journalism will, I believe, give me a fruitful theoretical base from which I can understand the journalism culture I seek to understand. However, cultural theory will not give me adequate empirical tools, with which to study journalism culture (see also Löfgren Nilsson, 1999: 45), nor will it supply a sufficient understanding of the gendered power play within the culture. For this I will turn to the useful concepts of Pierre Bourdieu.

2. SOCIAL FIELDS

Habitus can be understood as a system of social dispositions, which is internalised through our social background and our way of life, and impregnated into our bodies (hexis). This social position in society is placed in what Bourdieu calls Social Space (espace sociale), which is multi-dimensional and organised through different kinds of capital, e.g. cultural and economic. Within social space, there are a number of relative social fields (champ social) (e.g. literary field, scientific field, field of medicine, field of journalism), albeit autonomous they are influenced by each other. A field is a structured, limited space
of embodied meaning, guided by laws that need to be mastered by the players on the field. The reason behind the existence of a field (of cultural production) is to produce products, that are specific to the field (e.g. art, theatre, surgery, research, news) and that is deemed important by the field. To spread (sell) the products it is important to establish a need for the product in social space (Art – not kitsch art, surgery – not quackery, scientific knowledge – not everyday knowledge, trustworthy journalism – not bad journalism). Fields are thus universes of belief.

The players on the field are positioned hierarchically, and their positions depend on their capital, and through that their habitus, which also decides their strategies in their struggle to master the game, and to achieve a better position. A field is not only relational in respect to other fields in social space, but players on the field are relational, or move in relation to each other, on the field, and in doing so construct the hierarchy. The field is thus a social construction, the outcome of a struggle for symbolic power, a competitive arena, a network of conflicts, where the struggle is a fight for the right to define.

One reason for struggle is the reason to define the borders of the field. Bourdieu (1986) talks of symbolic bankers that guard the entrance to the field, and who have the monopoly to consecrate certain players (artists, directors, doctors, journalists). Entering the field is thus like entering a select club.

The perhaps most important struggle is the fight for symbolic power to define reality. In the field there are groups of players who hold dominating positions, and groups that are dominated, and their continuous permanent relations of inequality result in a struggle. Bourdieu likens this struggle with warfare, a fight for life and death (Bourdieu, 1993; 1998a). The dominating group is the established elite, and the dominated groups are often newcomers to the field – always challengers. Their aim is to change the field in accordance with their own wishes and beliefs, and to augment their positions. The establishment, on the other hand, wants to conserve the field as it is, to keep it unchanged, as that guarantees their power and status. The heart of the conflict is the legitimate vision of the world, and the power to impose the dominant definition of reality – the social reality in particular.
3. **DOXA**

*Doxa* is what we believe about the world and ourselves. It is a concept long used in philosophy and Pierre Bourdieu has borrowed it from Aristotelian philosophy, and made it central to his social theory. *Doxa*, from an Aristotelian perspective, is beliefs and presumptions that are present within a larger or smaller group of people. Bourdieu uses, however, the term in a wider meaning than Aristotle. Thus, *doxa* is thought patterns, language patterns, dress patterns, ways of acting, dressing, being, et cetera that are perceived as natural to a particular social field. No one questions the *doxa*, as no one would even think of questioning it. It is so natural you do not think about it – it is a kind of *common sense* (Bourdieu, 1988; 1998a; 2005; Rosengren, 2002).

*Doxa* is, however, not unitary. Indeed, there is a large number of – overlapping but still – different *doxas* tied to different social fields. So, one must differentiate between the *doxa* that is a term for the conditions for common knowledge within a field, and the conflicting *doxas* which we find in this field (Rosengren, 2002). The philosopher Mats Rosengren, who has tracked, mapped out and summarised Bourdieu’s thinking about *doxa*, states that:

A *doxa* does not only consist of discursive knowledge – it also embraces the whole thought and action sphere of humanity: everything from facts to ideologies, from style of clothing to a way of speaking. A *doxa* is difficult to catch sight of for those that live with and through it – doxa hides itself behind the mask of self-evidence and reality. A *doxa* is not only something external in relationship to the subject that carries it – it shapes, and to a certain extent decides what and how the subject thinks and perceive. Finally, every domain in society has its own, more or less specific *doxa* – from the most specialised disciplinary *doxas* to the most common *doxa* – *common sense* (Rosengren, 2002:75, my translation).

*Doxa* is naturally tied to the concept of *social field*; it is the *doxa* that is the main focus for the continuous power struggles between groups in the field. The common *doxa* is really the attitudes, values and action patterns of the dominant group in the field. *Doxa* is perceived reality. That is what the opposition-groups challenge. They have an *allodoxa*, a different, opposing way of seeing reality, which they, through various strategies, try to augment. The student uproar that culminated in 1968 is an example of this clash between the dominant *doxa* and *allodoxas* (Bourdieu, 1988).
4. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

According to Bourdieu, the dominated use “strategies” in their struggle against the dominant fractions over power to define doxa. What these “strategies”, or practices, are, is however somewhat vague. The social linguist Michel de Certeau, does in the book *The Everyday Practice of Everyday Life*, which is a study of “the fine art of talk in the everyday practices of language” (de Certeau, 1984.ix) make a useful distinction between the social practices of strategies and tactics. Like Bourdieu (whose work he critically refers to) he uses the metaphor of war to describe the struggle between the dominating and the dominated, but he also takes the metaphor further and uses the theories of military strategists to explain social power struggle.

The two ways of acting in war can be distinguished according to whether they rely on place or time. *Strategy*, he argues, is for the powerful, the dominating, those that have a place as a base for their power.

I call a strategy the calculation (or manipulation) of relationships that becomes possible as soon as a subject with will and power (a business, an army, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated. It postulates a place that can be delimited as its own and serve as the base from which relations with an exteriority composed of targets or threats (customers or competitors, enemies, the country surrounding the city, objectives and objects surrounding the research) can be managed (de Certeau 1984: 35f).

Strategy is, thus, for the strong and the powerful, which pin their hopes on the resistance that the establishment of place puts up against the erosion of time. Their place of power could be a physical property (property of the proper in de Certau’s words) or theoretical places (systems and discourses, i.e. doxas) (de Certeau, 1984; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 57; Melin-Higgins, 2004: 198).

*Tactics*, on the other hand, are the art of the weak, by *the other*. They have no place on which to rely so they need to rest on “a clever utilization of time, of the opportunities it presents and also of the play that it introduces into the foundations of power“ (de Certeau 1984: 39). Just as a strategy is organised by the holders of power, a tactic is determined by the absence of power and limited by the possibilities of the moment. Open warfare against the powerful would only lead to defeat, so the weak seek out the weaknesses of the powerful and use deception, trickery and guerrilla warfare as tactics. Always hitting the weak points, at the spur of the moment. The weak need to be constantly vigilant, as they are always watched, always in the vision of the enemy, always on enemy territory (de Certeau, 1984; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 57; Melin-Higgins, 2004: 198).
What Pierre Bourdieu terms “strategies” of the dominated in their struggle against the dominant, to augment their position, is thus from Michel de Certeau’s perspective not strategies at all, but tactics. The dominating fractions, on the other hand, that defend their status and doxa and places of power in the social field, do indeed use various strategies in their defence.

Despite the richness of Bourdieu’s theoretical world, the open war – or guerrilla warfare – that goes on between different groups of journalists over the power to define journalism is, I would argue, better explained using Michel de Certeau’s theories of social practice. His concepts strategies and tactics (which he borrowed from military history) describe the practices employed by powerful groups (strategies) to fight off the powerless, which use tactics to try to win ground (again to define what journalism is) (de Certeau, 1984; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 57; Melin-Higgins, 2004: 198)

5. GENDER

A final (or primary) theoretical point to make is that journalism culture, or the social field of journalism, with its doxa, strategies and tactics, is inherently gendered. Raymond Williams, Michel de Certeau and Pierre Bourdieu did not think in gender terms when constructing their theoretical models, although Bourdieu did try to rectify this when discussing the male dominance (Bourdieu, 1999). As I have previously discussed, despite their lack of gender awareness, their theoretical models are, excellent in the analyses of power structures, and I have therefore appropriated (cf. Moi, 1999) their theories in my definition of gender.

Gender is a system of hierarchical power. Gender are habitus.

Social space and all social fields – also the field of journalism – are gendered universes. That means that there is a gendered logic, which separates man from woman, male from female, masculinity from femininity, and always puts man, male and masculinity above woman, female and femininity. What is considered masculine or feminine varies over time and space, but the gender logic is rock hard: whatever is associated with masculinity is considered dominating. I understand the gender logic in a Bourdiean sense as gender equalling two habitus. And just like other habitus they are socially and culturally learned. Habitus, is not only an abstract phenomenon, like system of dispositions, compilations of capital, daily habits and thought-patterns, it is physically written on our bodies, carved into our spines. In other words, hexis (embodied habitus) is equally inherently gendered, i.e. we show in the way we walk, sit, talk, dress that we are a man or a woman. It is important
to note that although being a man and being a woman are social and cultural processes they are perceived reality. Therefore one cannot just «deconstruct away» being a man or being a woman (cf. De Bouvoire, 1949/2002; Moi, 1999; Bourdieu, 1999; Melin-Higgins, 2003).

Just as social space is a gendered universe, everything, even the smallest act or thought is inherently gendered and valued accordingly. Thus the other concepts I have defined in this section need a gendered explanation. That is an easy task. Take the dominant group in a social field. Its’ power lies in the construction of doxa. And it is shown both in its success in constructing social reality, i.e. what is or what should be, and also in what should not be, what is deviant. In any (patriarchal) society the dominant group consists of men. Thus men have the power to construct doxa. To construct what is and what should be. To keep up this system, female is defined as the opposite, the deviant, just as any oppositional group. In contemporary western society (but not only) humankind is objective, male is the norm, hidden behind objectivity, and female is the other, the object of male dominance. This system of hierarchy between male and female is kept up through a system of separation, where the nature of the system is kept hidden. «But of course, female journalists are better at writing about feelings.» «But of course, men can’t wore skirts.»

Bringing light to the system, showing the nature of the hierarchy, the nature of the system is thus always a political act, and seen as an act of aggression – whatever the context; whether in political debate, media coverage, scientific analysis, discussions at work, or in the privacy of the home, even in bed. To change their conditions, women, as a dominated group, use various tactics to try to change their conditions. Or try to take place and power. Or even just to put public light onto patriarchy or doxa. The dominant groups (consisting of men) respond to this declaration of war by using a number of strategies, based on their positions of dominance to fight back and defend their positions and power.

Just as with most things in society this gender system is not a black-and-white dichotomy. In the gendered hierarchy, man is not always «above» woman. As gender is habitus, a social construction, a cultural process, there are many other factors that enter into the equation. So, for example, married women with children have traditionally had a higher social status in our society than unmarried women (spinsters!) or women without children (barren women!). Homosexual men (poofs!) have a more difficult social situation and lower social status than heterosexual men. Black women (pumas!) have lower status than white women. Catholic men (Paddys) have in Britain lower status than Protestant men. Gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexuality, class, marital status, physical functionality et cetera all play a significant part in the social pattern that is our society. That means that if one has
acquired female habitus, then one can compensate this by acquiring capital that is more worth in social space: higher education, or marrying someone of higher class, or with a lot of money. 30

What all this means for the social field of journalism in Britain and Sweden during the 1990s, I will delve deep into in the following chapter.
3. INTERPRETATIONS

RESULTS FROM STUDIES OF TWO CULTURES

In the previous chapter I talked of a theoretical and methodological journey in time and space I undertook whilst doing the two studies in Sweden and the UK. In this chapter I will show the consequences of this journey on the results I got from the two studies. The first part of the chapter is a brief description of the main results of the respective studies. This points mainly to the patterns within each particular culture. In the second, and major, part of the chapter my approach is a thick description of the two cultures side by side. Given the differences in methodology, time and space, a comparative approach is enormously difficult (such approach is always difficult) so by looking at the cultures side by side I enable parallel readings and thus – sometimes – understandings of similarities and differences. Mainly, however, it will enable a base for the analysis of gendered culture (chapter four).
I. CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO JOURNALISM CULTURES

1. MAIN RESULTS OF JOURNALIST ‘89

In characterising the Swedish journalist ideals of the late 1980s, it is possible to outline a dominating pattern. But not all journalists fall into this pattern, of course. In this section, I will start by outlining the dominating pattern and I will then continue with alternative views on journalist ideals.

1.1. The Dominating Pattern: Educators and Bloodhounds

Why does one become a journalist? According to the 1989 study, a very large majority – enough to state homogeneity – wanted to be journalists to explain events simply, to stimulate new thoughts and ideas, and to give people experiences. They also wanted to scrutinise the elite and criticise injustices in society. They furthermore thought a journalist ought to be able to explain events simply to their audience. An important point made in the study was that motives to choose journalism are not the real reasons journalists actually once had (few people can remember exactly why one chooses one’s profession). Instead motives should be seen as an approach to the profession, and a reflection of the professional ideal they have. So, the results of the study very neatly fits into the theoretical model of journalist ideals as described earlier. Swedish journalists can thus be said to have an active, and rather high, ideal. The distinctness of this result made it easy to typologise. I thus created a typology, in which one dimension is about the relationship to the news gathering process; wanting to be active in the pursuit of facts, or being happy to more passively receive information. The other dimension is about the relationship to the message; wanting to be an obvious participant in the creation of the piece of journalistic text, or striving for a distant, neutral stance to the text. Thus, the typology gives four types of journalist ideals: Educator, who thinks journalists should actively pursue information, and gets involved personally, subjectively in the text with the motive of influencing and lecturing the audience at the same time as wanting to do something for society. The Bloodhound ideally wants to chase facts, reveal the truth, and then disperse this, let the facts be reflected in the news
item without personally touching it. Objectively seeking to reveal injustices and corruption in society is the bloodhound motive. The Craftsman/person can take any information that is given or found and ideally uses this to “hammer together” a story, and through a neutral professionalism manages to mirror reality and disperse facts to the audience. The Spokesperson ideal is about influencing the audience in a particular direction. Using information received from up-above the hierarchy, the journalist should use professional skills to subjectively mould the text so that it reflects a particular view.

The result of *Journalist ’89* was that Swedish journalists clearly had active Educator and Bloodhound ideals (Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 57-71; Melin-Higgins, 1996b: 156-161). It is also clear, given comparisons with earlier, similar Swedish studies, that Swedish journalists have substantially changed their ideal from a passive to an active, from neutral to participant since the early 1970s (Fjaestad & Holmlöf, 1974; Windahl, 1975; Thurén, 1988; Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 61, 127-130; 1996b: 161-162; 1996c: 102-105; Riegert, 1998). And that changes have continued during the 1990s towards a stronger Educator ideal (Djerf-Pierre, 2001b:24f). Another general pattern amongst Swedish journalists was the substantial gap between their perceptions of an ideal world of journalism and their perceptions of a crass reality. Journalists’ views of their managers, colleagues and audience – however positive they actually were – did not reach up to journalists’ high ideals (Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 73-81).

Using the theoretical language of my later studies, I would argue that what I in the Swedish study portrayed as strong homogeneity amongst Swedish journalists

![Figure 7: The two Dimensions of Journalists' Professional Ideal.](source)

**Source:** Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 45.
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(e.g. Melin-Higgins 1996a:127) is not homogeneity at all. The fact that the majority of Swedish journalists 1989 had strong Educator and Bloodhound ideals should be read as the Swedish field of journalism had a strong dominating culture with a strong *doxa* (Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004; compare also with Bourdieu, 1998a; Rosengren, 2002).

### 1.2. Differences and Opposition

The analysis of differences between groups of journalists is an application of Hirsch’s thought-model (integration of three models, cf. Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 151-152, and page 7 in this text). My primary hypothesis was the influence of the organisation on individual journalists’ attitudes. And indeed I found substantial evidence to support this. There were clear differences in approaches to journalism depending on where you worked. For example, in television and broadsheets, the Educator was the most common ideal. In tabloids most journalists held a Bloodhound ideal, and the Craftsman was the most common in regional and local newspapers (Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 104-125).

The main hypothesis did, however, fall with a big bang, when I did further statistical analysis. There were two factors that beat any other in strength: gender and education. These factors neatly divide my Typology of Journalist Ideals (see page 26 in this book). Level of education divides the dimension of approach to the newsgathering process: journalists with a university degree had an active approach; those without a higher degree had a passive approach. Gender divided the dimension of journalists’ approach to the process of creating news content: men tended to have a neutral approach, whereas women tended to have a very strong participant ideal. To push this result a bit, one could say that an active and critical approach is something you learn at university, and neutrality is a gender issue. There is, however, an anomaly in this typology. The Bloodhound ideal was by far the strongest amongst women – women with a degree in journalism. Again, further statistical analysis did show that the Bloodhound ideal had a stronger neutral element for men, and a much stronger element of the participant dimension for women (Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 132-137; 1996b: 164-167; 1996c: 111-114).

This is an image of my analysis of the main result of the 1989 study, and I read it then as homogeneity on the one hand and heterogeneity on the other, i.e. as differences between ideals in separate groups of Swedish journalists (Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c). There is, however, ambiguity in this reading and wording. Being consistent in translating the theoretical language of my earlier studies to that of my later studies, I would argue that what I described as homoge-
neity/heterogeneity or ideal differences between separate journalist groups, should be seen as oppositional cultures challenging the dominating culture and its *doxa* (Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004). With hindsight I can see what I did not see then. The Bloodhound ideal was in 1989 at its height of domination, having a couple of decades earlier challenged and taking over from the Craftsman ideal, as constituting the attitudinal part of the *doxa*. The Educator ideal was then starting to challenge the Bloodhound ideal, a challenge, which grew stronger during the 1990s (cf Journalistkåren i Sverige, 1970; Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; Djerf Pierre, 2001b; 2001c; Wiik, 2007a; 2007b).

### 2. MAIN RESULTS OF THE BRITISH STUDIES

Again, as with the Swedish study a strong dominating culture and oppositional groups can be found amongst the British journalists I studied. And, with support from secondary statistical studies, I would argue it can be said about British journalism in general.

---

**Legend:**

The factors gender and education are shown in relative terms and the figure should be read as e.g. more women than men hold a participant ideal.
2.1. The Dominating Pattern: Traditional Journalism Culture and Strong Doxa

British journalism culture is, hardly surprising, a reflection of the surrounding society, and as such it is conservative (with small c), patriarchal and hierarchical. The field consists of strictly hierarchical news-organisations, a class-based, male, social network (old-boys-network), and a sexist work culture. There is a strong culture of underlying conflict. Whilst supposedly team-working, individual journalists fight for attention (by-lines) and status: thus hunting for news is all-important. Hunting hard news, that is, as opposed to less important soft, female, unimportant news. Thus, the journalistic hero is a tough, ruthless, working-class reporter, hunting out dirty bits of news on politicians, thereby revealing corruption, ending up with a large by-line on the front page, making the news organisation sell lots of copies – and celebrating the victory in the pub (Melin-Higgins, 1997a: 106; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 56-57; Melin-Higgins, 2004: 203-207; see also Köcher, 1985; 1986; Henningham and Delano, 1998).

This culture is also underlying the doxa of the field of journalism, and it is very strong amongst the British journalists I interviewed. The doxa entails a strong belief in being objective, distanced news-casters, inspiring, but hard competition between media and colleagues, and, as a consequence, routinisation and lack of time as fetishisms. Furthermore, anti-intellectualism, focus on the elite (persons and states alike), and moral codes of good-and-evil, them-and-us, are strong features in the doxa, as is glorification of the drunken working-class hero. The central feature of the doxa is, however, finding the Truth, and that most means are allowed in the hunt for it (Melin-Higgins, 2003:57; see also Köcher, 1985; 1986; Henningham and Delano, 1998).

2.2. Differences and Resistance

Saying British journalists is a homogenous group, with a doxic culture, is only true to some extent. As in the general UK culture, there are strong oppositional groups amongst the UK journalists I interviewed. As these are perceived as threatening by the dominant group of journalism (those that sit in places of power, strong enough to define the doxa and dominate the field), it uses a number of strategies to ward them off and to fight for their place of power. These strategies include guarding who will become a journalist, or being gate-keepers (social bankers in Bourdieu’s terms), and guarding the all-important (definitely for one’s career) old-boys-network. Other strategies have more to do with the news-organisation: the strict hierarchy and routinisation allows for dispersion of status-jobs to the dominant group.
The news-culture is very sexist, racist and homo-phobic. This strategy continues
during, or after, working-hours in the pub, which blocks women, particularly wom-
en with families, to participate in this prelude to the morning meetings (when jobs
are given out) (Melin-Higgins, 1997a: 115-116; Melin-Higgins, 2003: 58; Melin-

These strategies block out groups of journalists from the higher echelons of
the media hierarchy. Those groups – as they do not have a place of power – use a
number of tactics to fight back. One tactic used by women, who want to get on in
the man’s world of journalism, is to accept the doxa and try as best as they can to
be one of the boys (girl-power). Another tactic is to openly oppose the doxa, and
to fight for changes in journalism. I have called this tactic one of the girls (mission
impossible). I found this tactic, again, to be used mainly by women, but there were
some men that also used this. A third tactic is, again, used by women, but they do
not at all challenge the doxa. Instead they play with and on their femininity and ac-
cept the place given to them as female journalists. They are sexy marionettes but in
the process achieve place and power. A fourth tactic, used by both men and women,
is to flight (space control), not of power but a situation where the various bits of
one’s life – work, family, special interest – could be combined. Going freelancer
is one such option (Melin-Higgins, 1997a: 111-113; Melin-Higgins, 2000; Melin-

3. TWO OR THREE JOURNALISM CULTURES?

Talking in this text of two cultures, two social spaces, two states (Sweden and
Great Britain) gives me a slight problem. The United Kingdom (another, not so
imperialistic name for Great Britain) consists of several countries, of which I have
made studies in two. England and Scotland are united through the crown (1603),
the parliament (1707) armed forces, foreign policy, oil – and public service broad-
cast. The two countries are otherwise divided by legal systems, religion, school,
higher education systems. And also by partly separate parliaments (since 1999)
and media systems (cf McCrone, 1992; McInnes, 1992; Meech & Kilborn, 1992;
they have distinct historical, political and cultural differences, which according to
Köcher (1986; 1986) should warrant separate journalism cultures. I should, thus,
expect to find three journalism cultures, rather than two.

This is true to some degree. I found Scotland to be more traditional, in that it
was still what English journalists talked of having been (with longing or with grati-
Scotland’s journalism culture seemed – openly – more machismo and more homophobic than the English. And female journalists did voice more frustration in Scotland than in England. On the other hand, political correctness was more widespread amongst English journalists. Furthermore the pub and alcohol, as a way of life, seemed to have a stronger hold in Scotland, as Edward says:

The pub? Well that’s not a journalistic thing. It’s a cultural thing. That’s part of the differences between the English and the Scottish. (Edward, 2002)

Every single journalist I interviewed in Scotland asked to meet me in a pub (mainly male journalists) or in a café or restaurant. Only one journalist in England did the same – and he was Scottish. Every single female journalist in Scotland talked of the pub as an issue for her career (in positive or negative terms). In England this way of life was said to be a way of Fleet-street, i.e. in the past. There has, however, been a change during the 1990s also in Scotland, and I will develop this in the last two chapters of this book. Another difference I noticed whilst doing the interviews was that Scottish journalists had more time at hand, i.e. they had the time to meet me for a lunch, whereas English journalists were much more stressed.

When I asked the journalists whether they experienced a difference in culture and in journalism, I received varied answers. The English journalists with no direct experience of Scottish journalism, argued there was no difference at all. The English with direct experience thought otherwise, as Brian, Nicholas and Charles voice:

I was a Scottish correspondent for three years. Yes, there’s a difference because of the different structure, but also because they think they are different. We have different perceptions in Europe, but in the UK journalists are all alike. Still, in England it’s easier for women. Scotland is much more male-dominated. Men drink bitter and women stay at home. (Brian, 1992)

Well Scotland is a very special place. I was the BBC Scotland correspondent during the 70s. /.../ No, there’s no difference between Scottish journalism and English. In fact most of my bosses here are Scots. Remember, one of the interesting features of the Scots’ antagonism towards the English is that the Scots run this place. Blair is a Scot, Brown is a Scot. Most of the time my boss here is a Scot, and ... we’re knee-deep in them. ... So I don’t think there’s a huge difference in that. It’s strange. English people don’t think about Scotch people at all. We tend to have a mixture of affection and admiration for them. And the Scottish accent carries with it an air of stern rectitude. It’s believable. Generally
a sort of good humoured affection. But when I’ve got back on a sort of regular intermittent basis, it’s got worse. They’ve got this extraordinary mixture of deep antagonism ... You find up there of this sort of deep chippy antagonism. A personal sort of warmth, but a collective antagonism. I mean, what’s their problem? (Nicholas, 2002)

I don’t feel part of the macho pub-culture that seems to be what Scottish journalism is all about. I’ve though never felt English, always Mancunian, and never British. Now I always say I’m Scottish, which is an ideological and emotional and political statement. I don’t know much about English journalists, but think there’s a difference because there are cultural differences between South-England and Scotland. What English journalists write about Scotland never seems to be the truth – even though we can never really capture the truth. The English see themselves as superior. (Charles, 1992)

Charles, living and working in Scotland, points to an ideological and emotional and political statement, which corresponds to what I found when talking to Scottish journalists. Being a Scottish journalist was a very obvious statement, one of pride. There was pride in being Scottish, in being a Scottish journalist (even though they might have been born English or Irish) and pride of Scottish journalism, which they saw as different from English journalism, as Dave, Amanda and Edward argues:

There’s a national identity of its own in Scotland. ‘N quite right! They have their own national newspapers. ... We [name of tabloid] sell just under 300 000 copies per day in Scotland. The journalists aren’t different though. Scottish journalists are good. They’re aspirational. ... A truly amazing race. (Dave, 1992)

What’s different [between England and Scotland] is about contact with the audience. In London the readership is distant, whereas in Scotland the readers are closer and the contacts more. There’s far greater degree of accuracy in Scottish press than down South. The task in Scotland is to explore Scottish issues for the readers and to keep them informed. /.../ Glasgow is second after London. It’s a BIG city and BIG stories happen. The broadsheets are national, not parochial. (Amanda, 1992).

One example is the Celtic-Rangers situation. When the story “Rangers has signed a catholic” came, the Scots down in London were amazed. The English didn’t understand. “So what” was their attitude. There’s a cultural thing. Reli-
region is political here. Another example was Ravenscraig, which was much more than a normal mill-closure. It was very important up here. (Edward, 1992)

It’s easier to move from England to Scotland, but hard the other way around. English men are editors and there are actually parallels between being a Scot and a woman. A Scottish woman is doubly discredited. (Polly, 1992)

There are very few differences apart from that Scottish journalists are much more parochial. The English have a wider horizon. [After half a bottle of wine at lunch he leant over and said quietly to me:] The English are such primadonnas. They are so uptight and stressed. Scots are not so stressed and much warmer. Status-wise there’s a difference. There’s an inverted snobbery in Scotland. I would never take a job in London even if I was offered one … and I have been. Why leave Scotland where the quality of life is so much higher? (Steve, 1992)

There was, however, also an ambiguity regarding Scotland and Scottish journalism. Edward points to problematic issues like the lack of resources, distance to UK-sources (mainly London-based) at the same time he, as Jenny talks with pride of Scottish journalism. They argue it is better because it is tough going, and more left-wing.

There are fewer hard journalists in Scotland and more in England. It’s because they [the English] can form better links with for example ministers. There’s also a resource problem. The bigger the newspaper the better facilities and the more specialists. No speciality makes it harder to have vision and knowledge. The press down-south is more right-wing and so are the journalists. There are very few right-wing journalists up here and they are at least left of centre. Also Scottish journalists have a greater knowledge and perception of England than the English of Scotland. Scots try to keep up to date. In recent years Scotland has become a fertile news area. There is also a big romanticism about Scotland about bens and glens and tartan. But that’s no harm and it’s not counter-productive as others think. (Edward, 2002)

Scotland is strange: on the whole the newspapers are good. They’re all to the left. Whereas in London, the right-wing tabloids are domineering. In Scotland journalists are more responsible and are better journalists … that means they go to the top in Fleet-street. Scotland is, though, a tough place to be in. You can never escape your past, cause you always meet someone that says “Ay, ich ken
yer fether”3. Also Scotsmen are more macho. But I prefer them … my husband is a Scot… (Jenny, 1992)

And Edward points to a special BBC problem, that of keeping the British state together, which includes seeing and understanding the different nations:

And I enjoy Scotland, and it’s a good place to live, and it was very interesting during the 1990s, and I believe in public service broadcast, and I believe in the UK as a whole. What I’ve done is important in the sense that you are reporting how a nation – Scots regard themselves as a nation – is developing, how the devolution of central power within the UK is happening, and the strain that that creates within the same state. It is important that the BBC has to be aware that Britain does not equal England, and that Scotland and Northern Ireland should not live in isolation. They are also part of a wider entity. It’s a very difficult relationship to sustain in a state. And I’ve enjoyed writing about it. /…/ I find it important because in the sense that minorities like Scotland, and don’t forget that there are countries the size of Scotland like Belgium and Norway that are completely independent. And Scotland could exist as an independent country if it wanted to, but then again it would have to make sacrifices and the people would have to decide that that’s what it wants. And at the moment there’s no sign that they want that. But the English all think that the Scots want independence. There’s a lot of misunderstanding in what we, vaguely, call the United Kingdom. And I think to be a reporter in that environment, to get the balance right and reporting it correctly and reminding people in all the constituent nations of the United Kingdom that we are a whole, but we all have different aspirations and want to live different lives. And that’s very difficult with a centralised organisation like the BBC. (Edward, 2002)

Holding these cultural differences in mind, given the perspective of my study I would argue that the similarities between the two nations England and Scotland, in relation to Sweden, are more important than the differences. I will therefore speak of one British journalism culture, and will in the next two sections compare and contrast two cultures. Given another perspective, it would of course have been equally possible to speak of (at least) two British journalism cultures.
II. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TWO JOURNALISM CULTURES

Most journalist studies look within journalism of a specific country (e.g. Schesinger, 1978; Gans, 1979; GMUG, 1976; 1980; 1985; Klausen, 1986; Weibull, 1991; Löfgren Nilsson, 1999; JMG Granskaren, 2001, to mention but a few). Some studies have, however, attempted a comparison between journalism, what I would call journalism cultures, in different countries (e.g. Köcher, 1985; 1986; Donsbach & Patterson, 1992; Johnson & Weaver, 1994; Egsmose, 1993; Patterson, 1998; Weaver, 1998; Chambers, Steiner & Flemming, 2004; Robinson, 2005). The hypothesis behind these studies is that there are clear-cut differences between the journalism of different countries. With their own distinct history, legal system, structure (including of course media structure) policy and culture the different countries give birth to distinct journalism cultures. Following this line of thought, which indeed underlies my analytical model in my Swedish study (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 52, see also page 7), the hypothesis of this part of the chapter is that I will find two distinct journalism cultures in the two states I have studied; one Swedish journalism culture and one British. Indeed, this also ties well in with Pierre Bourdieu’s concept-world. Within any given social space there are a number of social fields (Bourdieu, 1984; 1986; 1998a). Furthermore, he does distinguish journalism as a separate social field with its own doxa, without however describing what it entails (Bourdieu, 1984; 1988; 1998a).

From the result of the Swedish and British studies I conducted, and with substantial support from other studies, I can read major differences in journalism cultures between Britain and Sweden: differences in the make-up of the fields, differences in the doxa, different strategies used to defend the field and the doxa, and differences in tactics used to get a place in the field.

1. FIELDS: EDUCATION, EDUCATION, EDUCATION!

The constitutions of the two social fields are somewhat different. There is a clear difference in the make-up in education systems. Only 15 percent of British journalists have a degree in journalism (Delano & Henningham, 1996; 1998), whereas 42 percent of Swedish journalists had the same (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins,
Apart from university level degrees, there are other differences in that Sweden hosts a number of journalist courses at post-A-level colleges (*folkhögskolor*) with high reputation for practical training. These have even increased in importance during the 1990s and in 2000 one in five of Swedish journalists had attended these courses (Djerf Pierre, 2001a). In Britain, about one third of journalists have attended practical courses run by the trade union (NCTJ) and one third have received in-house training schemes (e.g. by BBC, Thomson, Westminster Press) in journalism (Delano & Henningham, 1996; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Chambers, et al, 2004: 67-70).

These schools, courses and schemes act as entrance-tests to journalism, and the people responsible for the courses by necessity become social bankers, guarding the entrance to the field (c.f. Bourdieu, 1986). Another way into the field is by connection. Knowing someone that knows someone is by far a more common way of entering journalism in the UK journalism (Delano & Henningham, 1996; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Chambers et al, 2004: 67f) than in Sweden, where a degree in journalism is almost a pre-requisite (Weiull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a). The famous (or infamous) British *Old-Boys-Network* looms large over entrance to the British field of journalism, and makes it difficult for women to enter the field through the traditional routes (Christmas, 1997; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004: 67-70). Put in other words, in Britain it is more important *whom you know*, whereas in Sweden it is your *A-level grades (gymnasiebetyg)* that matter (which in turn is highly dependent on your class-background (cf. Palme, 1992; Broady, et al, 2002). Steve explained the UK situation in 1992 as he saw it:

> I went the traditional, dirty, hard road, like most older journalists, starting at a local newspaper. Today most young BBC-people have a university degree. There are two thoughts about getting into journalism: one, the only real way to be a journalist is to go the hard way, otherwise you lose grip of reality. Two, it’s good to go to university to get a broad knowledge, then you can pick up the journalist skills when working. Both are right, I suppose. (Steve, 1992)

Kevin, on the other hand, is not as pleased about the new trends:

> I didn’t miss anything just because I don’t have a university degree. A lot of very good journalists don’t have degrees. And those that have come up the harder way are much better – those with a degree are elitist. I’m not envious! (Kevin, 1992)
From that perspective it is, perhaps, not surprising that the share of journalists from a middle-class background is higher in Sweden than in Britain (two thirds compared to half of the body of journalists) (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; Delano & Henningham, 1996; Henningham & Delano, 1998). The reason might lie in the fact that journalist courses in Sweden seem to be a way in to the profession for the cultural upper-middle class (Weibull, 1991; Palme, 1992; Broady et al, 2002). Journalist courses are particularly popular amongst upper-middle-class girls with straight A-level A:s, radical views, and a strong wish to develop and express their personalities, and thus choose journalism as a cultural strategy (or tactic) to get a career (Palme, 1992; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; 1997a; Broady, et al, 2002).

Gender is another major difference between the two social fields; in the end of the 1980s one third of the Swedish journalist-force were women, compared to less than one fifth in Britain (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; Bertagna, 1991; Delano & Henningham, 1996; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Chambers et al, 2004: 67-70). Half a decade later, the rate had risen substantially in both fields; about one fourth of British journalists (Henningham & Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003), and nearly half of Swedish journalists were women. The difference in rate of women could be explained by the higher number of journalist courses in Sweden, and the increasing number of ditto in the UK, as the majority of the students at these courses are women (Frölich and Holz-Bacha, 1993; Melin, 1993; 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1997; Wadbring, 1996; Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004: 67ff; Djerf-Pierre, 2006b; 2007a).

Another explanation for the gender differences could be the difference in structure of the field. In Britain the strict hierarchy of journalism and adherence to routines seem to be much more out-spoken than it is in Sweden, where flat organisational structures, availability of editors and managers, journalism as team-work is more the word of the day (Schlesinger, 1978; Köcher, 1985; 1986; Bertagna, 1991; Löfgren Nilsson, 1993; 1999; Weibull, 1991; Lindberg, 1990; Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004). In the UK, the media system, and the routinisation of news, fuel competition between journalists (Schlesinger, 1978). Journalists fight for beats and stories, fight for attention from their editors, all for the glory of status-filled by-lines, front-page covers, a popular column, or heading an important current affairs program (Tunstall, 1971; Burns, 1977; Schlesinger, 1978, Djerf Pierre, 2001a; 2001c; Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004). And this has negative consequences for women’s career opportunities in the UK (Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004; Lowrey, 2004). This is not to say that Swedish journalists do not fight for attention, status and by-lines, but this seems much more pronounced in British journalism.
Support for family-life is another major difference. Sweden hosts the world’s most famous parental leave system, which – in theory – mothers and fathers equally share, and after which they have the security of a well built out day-care system which costs very little. And, they have the right to stay at home and look after sick children – and get paid for it. This means that working life for parents are made as easy as can get with government support – at least in theory. As a consequence, Swedish journalists are married and have children to the same degree as Swedes in general (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996c; Johansson, 2007). The situation in Britain is quite the opposite. It was only in 1999 that Britain signed the European Social Charter, which allowed for father’s leave. Statutory maternity leave was, in the 1990s, only 12 weeks, and it is up to the mother-to-be to negotiate with her employers for pay, and continued leave. There is no guaranteed day-care, and after Margaret Thatcher’s reform, it is a private affair, meaning private kindergarten, nannies or au-pairs at high costs. And there is limited organised after-school day-care facilities. Obviously, this system, coupled with the traditional, hierarchical, routinised structure, has far-reaching consequences for journalism. It is very difficult to have children for British journalists. Female journalists (Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004). This makes the fields of journalism in Sweden and Britain substantially different as Swedish male and female journalists tend not to differ substantially when it comes to having children (Johansson, 2007). Indeed, having a system where the female part of the workforce is structured by childrearing: first employment, then childrearing, then possibly childrearing again if you are let into the ageist job-market, is said to be internationally and historically unique the contemporary UK (East Germany excepted) (Delano, 2003). The Women in Journalism network has, furthermore shown that about one quarter of women journalists in the UK have made decisions choices between a journalism career and a family (compared to a bit more than on in ten of men journalists). To me that figure seems low. All the UK women journalists I interviewed talked of the choices they had had to make between continuing journalism and having children. Here are some examples. Amanda chose her career rather than children:

I couldn’t have kids and be a journalist, though. The hours are too demanding and changing. You have to make a decision. A biological trap, really. Women, if they want to have kids, want to stay as much as possible with them, and not get a nanny and go back to work. (Amanda, 1992)
Flora and Rose chose to attempt the difficult balancing act of having both a career and a family, and they both point to frustration and sacrifices they have done – both of them left jobs they liked for part-time jobs and desk-jobs.

It’s difficult to be a mother and a journalist. The pressure is big. Radio-journalism is quite women friendly, though, as compared to other parts of the profession. It’s time that’s important. Emotionally you’re split and want to be with your child, but also not go home at five because you might let your colleagues down. (Flora, 1992)

I have two children. It’s OK having on-the-road-jobs without kids, but now a desk-job is essential. /…/ I was a on-the-road producer that went with the [foreign] correspondents. But four and a half years ago I became the foreign editor. I wanted a desk-job because I was pregnant. (Rose, 1992)

There’s been time in my career when I think: “God, I’ve done this long enough”. I left [the TV-news] after the election in 1997 because I wanted to spend more time with my kids. And that’s another issue. Journalism and family life can be tricky, particularly hard for women. (Rose, 2002)

It is clear that Rose has considered both her own choices and personal situation, and the situation for female journalists in general, and she does summarise their situation well:

My own gut-feeling is the big issue that no one has been able to deal with is how you equate the pressures and demands of 24 hour day, seven day week news-culture with the rest of your life. In many ways it’s just as bad for men as it is for women, and there’s an awful lot of men who find it as unbearable as women do. But the reality is, that it is still the women who come back to work after the first child. And they’ll keep going, and after the second child it gets a bit harder. Now, the BBC is very good at part-time work and extremely good with job-share, being flexible and so on, but the nature of the people that come in to the business is that they are competitive people who want to get on. And actually, if you’re working part time it’s difficult for you to have the effect that a full time worker has. So, there’s an inherent frustration for a lot of women in their 30-ies that have got to a certain level. They scale back; they don’t want to be in this place 24 hours, seven days a week. But by scaling back they implicitly signal that work is not the end of their lives. And it is difficult for men as well, because
It is, however, not only difficult to have a family, it is also very difficult to have a lasting relationship. Again, for female journalists. Male journalists are married and have children to the same degree as other Brits. The majority of female journalists, on the other hand, are single (53% compared to 21% of British women in general) (Henningham and Delano, 1998; Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004; see also Chambers, Steiner & Flemming, 2004). Maureen gives a voice to these statistics:

I’m single. It would be very difficult for me to have a permanent relationship with the job I have. /…/ I eat out a lot, mainly with female – they’re single or divorced – colleagues. I don’t go to the pub with my colleagues, though. Men go to the pub or the [BBC] club, but that’s not as common as it used to be, and it’s much more common in newspapers. (Maureen, 1992)

Most male journalists I talked to did not seem to have problems with having both a career and children, which also reflects the statistics cited above. Some of the male reporters did not even consider the difficulties with child-care. It was a non-existing problem, as Jack’s and Steve’s word show:

Jack: I have two [children]one is two years old and the other is four months.

M: Is it difficult to do your job with such small children?

Jack: I’ve been around the world a lot the last two years. Sure, I miss them. Most important though is that they are used to it. It’s generally not a problem. (Jack, 1992)

M: These apparently long working hours, does that interfere with family life, with seeing your children and grandchildren?

Steve: No, because that’s the way it’s always been. I don’t work in a bank from nine to five. I’m a journalist. I normally come here at 6.45 AM and leave around 6 PM. A 12 hour working day is common. (Steve, 2002)
Later on in the interview, Steve did, however, realise that there might be a problem for women having children.

*M: Could a woman do your job?*

Yeah, no problem! There are many women here now! ... But it would be difficult with children. There are a few women who manage. There’s one woman editor in Edinburgh. (Steve, 2002)

The male journalists I interviewed that had children, seemed to take their wives for granted:

I’ve got two children, they’re three and six. I’m married and my wife’s a foreign news correspondent, but she’s at home now with the kids. It’s difficult, but not impossible to be a journalist and a mother. The difficulty is time. (Brian, 1992)

My wife used to work, at the foreign desk here at the BBC, but quit when the kids came along. She now works part time in PR. It’s very difficult for women to combine journalism and family. Some do. They have nannies or so, but don’t spend so much time with them. But then, when one does [here he seemed to start talking about himself] one tends to do it more intensely. More quality time. But it’s a choice one has to do. We couldn’t have worked the two of us full time in journalism. (Brian, 2002)

I travel a lot, but my wife doesn’t mind me being away so much and it doesn’t oppose on our marriage because my wife is used to it ... over the years. (Martin, 1992)

*M: Does the family hinder you?*

*Dave: No, not at all. I’ve got a wife who’s reasonably happy with it. [He looked and sounded stress full.] It was worse when I worked for the Sun. That really shook my marriage. All the hours.../.../ I don’t think that women with young children can do what I do. I don’t actually know any. I mean, I work 7 days a week, 12 hours a day. /.../My wife gave up work after our son was born. She looks after the children. She’s the homemaker. Women always are. It’s a matter of instinct.* (Dave, 2002)
There were some male journalists that very clearly took on a bread-winner position in relation to their children. Charles and Edward decided to move to Scotland to give their children a safer upbringing, despite being aware of the lower status within their respective field. Nicholas gave up an exciting correspondent job for that of a more well-paid presenter’s job:

It’s a wonderful job! But I gave up the foreign correspondent job for my two children. I need more money. I have to pay for their school fees! (Nicholas, 1992)

These issues are of course not specific to journalism. The UK is a far more patriarchal, traditional and conservative (with small c) society in comparison to Sweden, as Olivia points to in her comparison between England and the US.

In the publishing world women always start as secretaries over here. Men never do. For them it’s much more fluid. It’s a deeply sexist country compared to America. /…/ Journalism in this country is a tiring life, and impossible if you want to have children and be a journalist. (Olivia, 1992)

I would, however, argue that the structure of media organisations and of journalism makes it extra hard to be a journalist and have a family, as indeed Olivia remarks. One explanation to this can be found when looking at the doxas of the two journalism cultures.

2. DOXA: SWEDISH EDUCATORS AND BRITISH BLOODHOUNDS

According to Pierre Bourdieu (1988), central to the social field is the doxa, the patterns of language, dress, ways of acting, being, that is perceived as natural, neutral, common sense (see also Bourdieu, 1998a and Rosengren, 2002). As shown in chapter two, previous research show that there are differences on the national level between the doxa of journalism in various countries – despite the fact that neutrality is central to the belief of all (Western) journalists (cf. Denis McQuail, 2005, see also Patterson, 1998; Deuze, 2005). There were, I argue, both attitudinal and behavioural differences between the Swedish and British doxa, and I want to emphasise these differences in this section.
Similar to McQuail, Bourdieu (1998a) points to the value-wise strong homogeneity in journalism, which he calls nearly *doxic*. This could describe the British journalists. Neutrality is the guiding light in the lighthouse of British journalism. And the belief is strong, in fact stronger than in any other (Western) country (Donsbach & Klett, 1993; Köcher, 1985; 1986; Patterson, 1998; Weaver, 1998; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c; 2003; 2004).

In terms of my typology (Figure 9, and Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 68; Melin-Higgins, 1996c: 102), British have a very strong Bloodhound ideal; a neutral and anti-elitist critical approach linked together, as is exemplified well in Diana’s and Bob’s comments on journalism:

**M**: Is there any other job that’s like journalism?

**Diana**: Can’t think of any, where you have an audience, a readership, where you are informing. It’s rather like bringing out research-documents, you know, do a lot of research and then write a report of it. Perhaps working for an organisation or government. You have to be impartial, which does not oppose being critical ... you can do both. You report what people think, not reflect it, or support it from their point of view. Your duty is to inform as much as you can as impartially as you can. (Diana, 1992)

**M**: What is good journalism?

**Bob**: I like to think that it’s fearlessness, to be able to withstand pressure, to follow your own instincts, to do the story as you see it, call it as you see it, be able
to say, “look, you might not agree with my interpretation, but this is how I see it.” And if the pressure comes on from those in authority, it’s to withstand that pressure. One example, I now have a slight problem that I am the political correspondent and I crossed swords with the first minister in the past. I once accused in print Jack McConnell.../ of deliberately sending himself a faked letter-bomb in order to discredit the SNP. Now, that’s pretty heavy. And he’s not forgotten that, but I was still right to write it, because it’s true. The cut thing is, you call out how you see it, and if that means taking a bit of flack, so be it. I like that. /.../
It’s not being an underdog. It’s holding those in power to account. (Bob, 2002)

Contrary to the UK, the Swedish doxa was not that of the Bloodhound. The doxa was characterised by a strong participant approach, and in European terms, a relatively weak neutral approach (Donsbach & Klett, 1993; Patterson, 1998). And Swedish journalism was far from doxic; plotting Swedish journalism into my typology (Figure 9, Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 68; Melin-Higgins, 1996c: 102) it shows equally strong Educator and Bloodhound ideals. It is interesting to see this in the light of time. In 1975 Swen Windahl showed that Swedish journalists had travelled from a more passive Craftsman ideal towards the Bloodhound ideal. Although still very strong in the late 1980s, it had somewhat given way to the Educator ideal. Indeed the journalist study made in 2000 shows that the participant ideal grew even stronger during the 1990s (Djerf Pierre, 2001b; Jönsson, 2005).

Involvement in the Text? Neutrality or Participation

Another difference I have detected is journalists’ approach to the message; the way they stand in the neutral – participant divide (in reference to my typology: Melin-Higgins, 1996a: 68; Melin-Higgins, 1996c: 102, see also Riegert, 1998). Again, to highlight the differences, British journalists as neutral Bloodhounds, and Swedish journalists as participant Educators, show significant value-wise differences in the doxas. The doxa of Swedish journalists’ emphasised the educational role of journalists; there was a strong aim at influencing their audience with an educational purpose. And, whilst strongly believing that journalists should be free agents scrutinising the elite in society, there were similarly strong beliefs in using ethical methods in the pursuit of, if not the truth, then what lies hidden under the glossy surface created by the powerful. Apart from the educational and critical aspects of the doxa, there also seemed to be personal aspects. Whilst pursuing news stories, Swedish journalists wanted to creatively express themselves (not necessarily objectively) – they saw journalism as a way for personal development (Ahlström & Österlund,
As I noted earlier, central to British journalism doxa is objectivity and the hunt for the Truth. It could indeed be seen as a criterion for journalism. Objectivity means never ever mixing one’s own feelings, views or thoughts into the news production process, but also to follow the company line, particularly in the BBC. “Here is the BBC, and this is the news...!”

Yes, we can be objective. In terms of treatment of news stories, even if we don’t agree... we can all have our subjective views, but we can stand aside from it as professional journalists. That’s the difference between the BBC and tabloids. What’s on the screen is neutral, but you don’t necessary go in from a neutral angle. To give you an example. There was a fire in a community club in Belfast. Local people said the army had set fire to it. The army refused to comment. I was convinced by the local people. Ten minutes before broadcast the army issued a statement which denounced any participation. The statement was taken in. /.../ Objectivity is to stand back ... being neutral is “X says A, Y says B. BBC has to be impartial. (Brian, 1992)

Good journalism is being impartial and do a good solid job. Yes, of course it is possible to be impartial. That is what journalism is all about, at least here at the BBC. /.../ Yes there is something like a British journalism culture. It’s about curiosity and rattling determination. (Brian, 2002)

There are definitely differences between different media. When I worked for the Daily Express, I was much more sensational and had a different approach to news. The explanation is that you cater for different needs. In the BBC we cater for the truth ... as opposed to the Sun. /.../ I’m the public eye. I’m merely the purveyor of facts. Someone has to ask the questions that people at home would want to know the answer to. I’m not a films-star! /.../ Of course I can be neutral. It’s though a difficult line to walk when dealing with political parties. It’s important to stand back and question the information. For example information from the police that’s probably, if not false, then hiding facts. It’s also a question to stand back and ask if we are doing things right. It’s a question of finding the truth, even if it kills the story. I have to be objective at all times... although different people, journalists, interpret a story differently. (Steve, 1992)
I’m one of the senior journalists on the program. I write and re-write stories as much as I can. There’s only one requirement, and that’s to be believed. To be as far to the truth as honest people would believe. When people switch on the news, it’s the truth, honesty, they should believe. /.../ To witness things on other people’s behalf, that’s what journalism is all about. (Nicholas, 1992)

Rose, having previously worked for other broadcasting companies, worked for the BBC in 2002, and she was very impressed by its devotion to rigorous journalism, which she described as:

It’s not taken what you are told at face value. ... The kind of BBC reputation for impartiality is soo oo engrained in everyone that works here that it is almost second nature. And the pressure on you to be impartial in the BBC is greater than that on journalists in other organisations. (Rose, 2002)

The BBC-journalists looked down their noses on tabloid-journalists, which they did not see as proper journalists, as in their opinion, tabloids’ news were far from the truth. On the other hand, the tabloid journalists I interviewed had quite the opposite opinion. Dave exemplifies this, both in 1992 and 1998.

We [at the tabloid] do a tremendously hard and crafty work. Here you can’t get away with being a bad journalist. We don’t write for your sort. We take a story and convert it into a readable story for those that live in council houses. They have the right to have the information. It’s our duty to make them want to read it. We make complex things simple ... And we sell the most! /.../ The reader is important! People have the right to know the truth! (Dave, 1992)

The great importance in this country is that people in the establishment don’t want you to know. We in the tabloids are really good at finding out those things they don’t want us to know. That’s why finding out things about public figures’ personal lives are so important... Michael Jackson is the prime example of why we shouldn’t have a privacy-clause. He’s hidden behind his wealth and fame – and he’s a perv, a pedophile. /.../ [Journalists] should be passionate about their jobs, which is to go out there and find out the facts. I expect them to be passionate, committed, accurate, driven, whatever it takes to do a news report, to do what they’re sent out to do. But they’re supposed to be dispassionate and only interested in right or wrong, the details, of the murder, the show-biz person, or whatever. But passionate in getting to the bottom of things, and about how they
Dave’s comments show another important part of the doxa, that of stressing the hunt for news which I found amongst the British journalists I interviewed. That means that it is the investigative part of the production process that is seen as the most important, where the Truth will be revealed. Preferably hidden, preferably by a politician. Central to the British journalist’s doxa is namely also the underdog perspective, and the role of the media as a fourth estate securing democracy, and the Mother of Parliaments, which is not at all stressed in the same way by Swedish journalists (Burns, 1977; Schlesinger, 1978; Köcher 1985; 1986; Weibull, 1991; Donsbach and Klett, 1993; Henningham and Delano, 1998; Melin-Higgins, 1996c; 2003; 2004). The distant stance that follows from the perceived objective neutrality (coupled with an underdog perspective) is directed towards the elite. In 2002 Bob said “It’s not being an underdog. It’s holding those in power to account”. In 1992 he twisted the investigation of the establishment-issue:

It’s important to have distance to yourself. If you can’t have distance, you can’t be subversive. It’s necessary not to be part of the establishment that you should police. You have to be an outsider as a journalist. One has to know the system and be sceptical. Then you fight back ... against one’s sources. (Bob, 1992)

Rose, having worked in foreign news, and in Europe, answered my question on whether there is a British journalism culture with a certain: “yes”:

Rose: My gut-instinct says yes.

M: How would you describe this British journalism culture?

Rose: If you’re being unkind, one of the disadvantages of being British ... we’re inclined to see stories only when there’s an element of negativity. We don’t deal very well with positive stories, and so we always look for the negative, or a counter-point to the story, the criticism. And I think sometimes, you know, we are guilty of reporting the reaction, the anti-reaction before we’ve explained what the real story is. So, the viewer, reader or audience may not know what the story is, but what the so-and-so’s negative reaction is. And I think this is very different in Europe. The up-side of this is that British journalism is much more questioning towards any kind of authority. There’s a famous quote by, I can’t remember what famous interviewer it was, I think it was Jeremy Paxwell,
and he said: “When I have a politician doing an interview with me, I ask myself why is this bastard telling me lies”. Now this is a completely different attitude to anything you hear in Europe. (Rose, 2002)

I argue, that with the stress on hunt for news, on digging dirt on the (political) establishment, on distant neutrality, on taking for granted that the source you are interviewing is telling you lies, comes disregard for ethical regulations. As Bob did in the quotation above, many of my interviewees expressed pride in being unethical and ruthless towards sources.

My role? It’s being pushy. To be in the right place at the right time. To shoot things that people don’t want you to. (Ray, 1992)

I’m a reporter, not a journalist, and an investigator. You’re just not there to do what you’re told. You must look behind the information the police gives, since they are always telling lies. It’s no point of being sympathetic. Though I often pretend to be when I want to get a job done. It’s better to be cynical. /.../ I’m not in the job to be popular. I’m seeking the truth! I don’t think I can be objective, though sometimes I’m a 100 percent right – and then we have to print an apology because people don’t like the story. For example, the boy that died from heroine over-dose and the parents demanded an apology, or the law-professor at Strathclyde that demanded an apology for the kinky-sex story. Other times we’re 200 percent wrong – and we know it – but it’s a good story and it’s printed anyway. One can be neutral. Unless the police is involved. They’re always lying. But I won’t back down. The truth can though always be found if you’re investigating properly. (Alistair, 1992)

2.2. The Darker Side of Journalism

The third interesting difference between the UK and Swedish doxas are linked to the news-room climate, which in Britain seems rather grim. The majority of British journalists had experienced improper managerial interference in the newsroom, two thirds had personal experience being victims of gender prejudice, and one fifth were victims of racial prejudice. Furthermore, three quarters experienced high, or very high, stress-levels at work, and nearly 90 percent thought stress levels were increasing. On the other hand, two fifths of British journalists are satisfied with their job (Henningham & Delano, 1998). The situation is rather different among Swedish journalists. Both Ulf Lindberg (1990) and Monica Löfgren Nilsson (1993) show that Swedish journalists are generally very happy with their job. Three quar-
ters experience co-operation and togetherness in the newsroom, and only a third experience a certain degree of managerial control. Löfgren Nilsson (2007b) has also shown that there is hardly any difference in the way Swedish journalists experience their working climate between 1989 and 2005. Swedish journalists are happy at work, and in their lives in general, and that they are similar to other Swedish professional groups in this respect.

It is, however, not necessarily the case that grim working-conditions and stress are experienced in negative terms. Indeed, Philip Schlesinger argues that stress and the hunt for deadlines has become a fetish amongst British journalists, or as he put it when describing the BBC:

In the occupational mythology of the newsman time looms large among the wicked beasts to be defeated daily in the battle of production (Schlesinger, 1978:83).

Ulf Lindberg (1990) argues amongst the same lines, when it comes to Swedish journalists. There is a difference, I would argue, between Swedish and British journalists. The glorification of the dark sides of journalism is central to the doxa of British journalists (cf. Schlesinger, 1978; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; Henningham & Delano, 1998) and definitely prominent amongst the British journalists I interviewed. This doxa is tied to the patriarchal, not to say machismo, side of the UK culture. This means it is cool and tough to be stressed out of your skull, and have near-death experiences: only the really hard guys can manage. Steve was very proud of being first on the scene in Lockerbie after the plane-crash:

I’m the office fireman. I was the first man at Lockerbie, and had to divorce myself from what happened. The flesh, the bones, bits of bodies, plane fractions didn’t touch me. But I started crying when I saw a broken teddy-bear with blood all over. [He continued the story with detailed description of what he saw.] I was also in the Gulf war. Not to cover the war, mind, but to cover the Scottish soldiers there. I saw a lot, though… (Steve, 1992)

Alstair is by reputation one of the tough guys of Scottish tabloid journalism. And at first he does show up a tough and aggressive attitude towards me, for example, he showed me his knife and said “I always carry a knife in Glasgow, and I’ve got a gun in my car” (Alstair, 1992). Later on as the interview went on, cracks showed up in his attitude, and he became very critical of the tough-guy kind of journalism he did:
The [Tabloid name] is a hell-hole. The journalists are not treated properly. It takes over your life – rules you completely. You find yourself entangled in it. It’s though a better paid job. But I want to get out of as soon as I can. Everyone here is treated like shit, and you’re only as good as your last story. Being on [the Tabloid] is tough. Rough stuff. It’s the toughest in the business, because it’s a) a tabloid and b) in Glasgow. You have to do a lot of nasty stuff to people’s lives. I refused to do nasty stories, so I’m not sent out anymore. Everyone on [the Tabloid] is arrogant, self-centred and aggressive. That’s what you’re taught. I didn’t use to be so aggressive before I joined [the Tabloid]. (Alistair, 1992)

Another big difference between the British and the Swedish journalists concerns alcohol and frequenting the pub. Alcohol has for centuries been a problematic issue in the Swedish culture and politics, and it is not long that public establishments have been allowed to serve alcohol without also serving food, i.e. there is no traditional pub-culture. Even though Swedish journalists tend to consume more alcohol than the general population in Sweden (Johansson, 2001; Jönsson, 2005), there is not at all the same glorification of the drunken journalist. At least not nowadays⁶. British journalists, on the contrary, manage the goriness of their jobs by winding down at lunchtime and after work with a pint in the pub. Alcohol seems namely to be another near doxic fetish amongst British journalists. All the journalists I interviewed spoke about this. Here are some voices:

We [journalists] like pubs, like being in pubs. Before the Fleet Street split the information that was passed around in pubs was amazing. Doesn’t happen so much now though. It’s a serious set-back to journalism. Alcohol is no problem today. Even journalists are much more health conscious nowadays. But pubs go with the job – we’re not a 9-5-kind of people. ... Women take part as well. I don’t drink at home, though. I tend to hang around the office area more. Most of my friends are journalists. /.../ I enjoy journalists’ company, we have the same sense of humour, talk about the same things. (Jack, 1992)

Everything is centered around the pub in this country [Scotland], especially for journalists. It’s a big problem. /.../ Yes, I go, but less than when I started. Then I went every night. There were lots of fun nice men – journalists are good company. Now I go occasionally, for someone’s birthday, or so. (Ailsa, 1992)

The reason I have so many contacts is that I went out and met people for lunches and a drink and so. You don’t meet people sitting in an office. (Ailsa, 2002)
Gendered Journalism Cultures

Pubs are very big. It’s a meeting place, where you take people for a drink, and where you try to draw stories out of sources. A few drinks can open people up. Also, most guys at the paper go for a drink after work, so do I. ... And I also sometimes go out with detectives and gangsters. (Billy, 1992)

Most journalists have a dreadful likeness for drinks. It’s good fun. Behaving poorly is fun and that’s why I enjoy and take part in the pub-culture. I do a lot of the job in the pub ... socialise a lot with journalists and politicians. It’s not a 9-5 job, you know, that’s one of the reasons. The Jinglin’ Geordie is the waterhole for politicians – right-wing to labour – and for journalists. (Bob, 1992)

What is indicated in these citations are several issues to do with the pubs. First, it is, as I said, a place to wind down after a hard-days work with your friends, that are also your colleagues. The pub is, however, not only a winding-down space, but a continuation of the news-room. It is where a lot of business is done, sources chatted to and interviewed, professional and social net-work created. And also a place where next days’ jobs are decided. As such a place, the pub is no neutral space (Melin-Higgins, 2001). Also, being a tough guy, with his gun and bullet-proof vest that is defying near-death experiences should not be seen as a neutral part of the UK doxa. It is also part of the strategies to keep the field of journalism free from unwanted persons.

3. STRATEGIES: SEXISM, RACISM AND ALCOHOLISM

Thus, another way of seeing the glorification of a stressed, semi-drunken, ruthless, unethical, distant journalist is as strategies to keep newcomers into the field subjugated. Again, I would like to emphasise the differences between the social fields of journalism in Britain and in Sweden. As I discussed in chapter two, the ways into the field differ; and one can indeed see the social bankers, gate-keepers, guarding the entrance to journalism as, perhaps, the foremost strategy to keep the field clean of threatening, opposing groups.

In Britain, the so called Old-boys’-network is vital to be part of if one wants to get a career in the City, in art, in academia, and indeed in journalism. The network is based on going to the right public school, the right college in «Oxbridge», the right people with the right contacts and right money. It is a matter of class. In journalism, however, the network is not an upper-class matter – quite the contrary
Interpretations (Bertagna, 1991; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; Christmas, 1997; Chambers et al, 2004).

Quite a number of my interviewees talked of getting help by people they / their parents knew to enter the field of journalism.

In 1968 I thought, “Why don’t I go to Paris and see the riots”. I did. Walking and hitchhiking. After getting back I told an author, whose son was a friend of mine, that I wanted to be a journalist. Seeing the riots “live in action” wetted the appetite. It seemed like a marvellous job. So this author managed to get me a job in a local newspaper through someone he knew (Martin, 1992)

I wanted to do something different, and I wrote to about a hundred newspapers actually … and complete stroke of luck … I only got one reply, from a weekly newspaper. And I wouldn’t have got that job if I hadn’t played cricket against the town team, and the editor was a cricket fan. You know, it was that sort of stuff. (Nicholas, 2002)

There are, however, those journalists that are critical of the system:

There’s a lot of nepotism going on. Young guys are hired, relatives of journalists. (Iona, 1992)

I have a friend who works for [The Broadsheet] who knows [the editor of the Women’s Page]. /…/ There’s a level of unprofessionalism here. It’s based on contacts, on wims. In the US I would never have the job I have! /…/ In the US education is the distinction, not background or money. Here it is who you know! (Olivia, 1992)

That Martin and Nicholas take the advantages of the system for granted and that Iona and Olivia are critical towards it, I believe, is an indication that the former two are winners, and that the latter two lose out. The network not only is decisive of who enters the field, but also controls career-paths, thus, the best way of getting on in journalism is by knowing the right people – and sharing their doxa.

It seems that one of the major jobs for the social bankers have been to keep women out of the field, and if that fails, then keep them suppressed, and preferably make them leave the field. Apart from the openly male Old-boys-network, the newsroom culture in Britain is openly misogynist, racist and homophobic. Sexist jokes are par for the course. Women are belittled with derogatory attributes under the guise of endearments and compliments (hen, darling, cutie), or when directed
towards successful journalists, giving them anti-feminine attributes (hard-bitten, tough as old boots, tough bitch) (see also Chambers et al, 2004; Ross, 2004). During the interviews these kinds of attributes were common. Another strategy, which is far more pronounced in Britain (Chambers et al, 2004; Ross, 2001; 2004) than in Sweden (Lindberg, 1990; Löfgren Nilsson, 1994; 1994; 2007b), is the suppression of women’s opportunities through the very structure and of the production process. The every-day-routines were perceived as difficult for, and sometimes clearly hostile towards, women, which every one of the female interviewees talked of. The formal morning meetings were perceived as particularly hostile and conflict ridden. It is indeed a ritual to keep up the distinctions between the dominant and opposing groups. Again, comments on this were common during the interviews. All in all, it is not surprising that 60 percent of women responded to having personal experience or knowledge of being victims of prejudice in the newsroom (Henningham & Delano, 1998, see also Burns, 1977; Schlesinger, 1978; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; Ross, 2001; 2004; Delano, 2003; Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004; Chambers et al, 2004).

There is little support for these strategies in the 1989 study, or the subsequent Swedish journalist studies either7. But then, these issues were not asked about, and no space was given to expand on this in the questionnaire. But, looking at other Swedish studies, I would say that these strategies of keeping opposing groups subjugated differ between Sweden and Britain in so much as they are being more pronounced in the British field; one could say they are similar, but hidden under PC-ness, parental leave, equality-regulation in Sweden (cf. Djerf Pierre 2003; 2005; 2007a). I will therefore expand more on this in the next section.

3.1. Pub-Going as a Strategy

There is, however, a strategy employed by the dominant group in British Journalism that does not seem to exist at all in Sweden. Namely the pub. Going to the pub is not only an activity in the social space of Britain, nor alcoholism just part of the doxa of British journalism, as I discussed in the last section. I argue that it is also a strategy employed by the dominant group to keep away opposing groups, particularly women. The pub in Britain is traditionally a male territory. Continuing the sexist banter of the newsroom in the pub after dark is a clearly hostile behaviour directed at women. Again, this was a topic that a lot of the journalists I interviewed discussed (Melin-Higgins, 1996c; 2000; 2003; 2004). Some of them, like Olivia and Lilidh commented on the usefulness for ones career and how women suffer because they are not admitted to the professional space of the pub.
It’s seen as wimpy to go home early. Therefore guys hang their jackets on the back of the chair until 10 – even if they have families! There’s a group that goes to the pub every night. If you want to get ahead in your career you have to go, since the paper picks favourites. It’s not so much a male thing as for those on the move. (Olivia, 1992)

It’s very true [the existence of a pub-culture]! And it’s a problem for women. Men are willing to go for a drink. Women miss out on meeting other people in the business hence they miss out on stories and jobs. It’s a truly sexist thing and it’s particularly bad in journalism. (Lilidh, 1992)

Jenny and Ruth point to the private consequences of going to the pub, namely how one’s family life suffer. They have, however, made the choice that their family is more important, and thus their careers suffer.

The pub-culture is a big issue – especially in Glasgow. But it’s nice with a drink when you work long hours. But now I only want to get home to my partner ... we’re married. The guys, even though they’re married, go to the pub across the office, The Jinglin’ Geordie, and therefore they seem much more committed. And they also meet more contacts. Politicians and so. They go to the same place. Times have though changed. Now women also go out. I meet most of my contacts for a drink. The difference is really single or married. When I was single I was prepared to work more. When you’re married you just want to spend more time at home. I couldn’t do the job with a child, though. Not unless the office-policy would change. (Jenny, 1992)

My marriage hit the rocks because of the pub-culture. My husband and I had bought a house in need of repair, and whilst he came home at four, I came rumbling in at ten. But that was after I left the newsroom, then /working at the newsdesk/ I never went out. It was such a guy-thing. It changed afterwords, then I went out with six female producers. It’s not a male-female thing, more of a family-or not thing. A lot of single women go out. When I got pregnant, my friends pitied me for having to stay at home. Now, I only want to get home to my daughter. (Ruth, 1992)

There were some women that mentioned creating an alternative to the machismo pub-culture:
No, it’s very strong in the newsroom, but not here. Our clubbiness happens here. This is where we open a bottle of wine. Social life here is cafés, wine-bars and restaurants. Pubs are very anti-women … and very smoky. (Flora, 1992)

There’s not so much [a pub-culture] at [my newsdesk], we have a separate culture, but at ITV there’s a drinking culture. I don’t fit in, and I’m arrogant to say that I don’t fit in. Actually, women don’t take part, but also an increasing amount of family-oriented men don’t take part. There’s never going to be any change if not men say they have to go home because of children. (Rose, 1992)

I did meet two male journalists that took a very critical stand against the pub-culture for family reasons. However, just as the women, they did suffer professionally for not to partaking in the pub culture:

Yeah, I’m professionally disadvantaged by not going to the pub, but… I don’t like to kick up a fight. (Charles, 1998)

A number of journalists [from the broadsheet he works at] go down to the pub for an hour or so after work. I only go two to three times per year. The office politics is conducted there, but I’m not interested in it. And my career suffers because of it. I should have lobbied harder [at the pub] for that foreign post in Paris that I didn’t get. ... Since Fleet Street broke up the Fleet Street culture also broke up. Now you only meet people from other newspapers at press conferences. Never socialise with them. (Magnus, 1992)

4. TACTICS: SEXY MARIONETTES GETTING PLACE AND POWER

So, how do female journalists react to such experiences of symbolic violence? Lacking place and power (de Certeau, 1984) they tend to use different tactics to cope, as I have previously sketched out (see also Melin-Higgins, 1996c; 2003; 2004). Swedish and UK journalists do in fact tend to use similar tactics, but there is one tactic that differentiates them, that of the Sexy Marionette. What do you do when your colleagues and bosses consistently flirt, pinch your bottom, call you wee lass, cutie, little girl, hen, darling, compliment your cloths whilst reading your copy, give you jobs to interview bereaved relatives of murder victims, because «you are such a sweetie-pie and can surely get them to give you a photograph of the victim» et ce-
tera? In the UK some female journalists responded to these sexual innuendoes, flirting, belittling name-calling by taken on the given role of female journalist. They adapt their attitudes, behaviour and **hexis** to fit into the given role.

The women I interviewed in the UK that used this tactic were all what I would describe as «feminine», meaning they were either fashionably dressed in a rather a sexy and girly way, or were dressed in more traditional feminine ways (half-long skirts, silk blouses, pumps, pearl necklaces). Obviously these are also class-markers. They were outspokenly anti-feminists, as Flora is adamant about:

> We have a kind of mission. /*/ My role is to tell women ... it’s not a feminist program ... but it should reflect that women succeed in society. It’s not enough of them though. I look for women speakers and sources. (Flora, 1992)

> Because I’m a woman, I’m always involved in ideas about womanly things, like premature babies and so, and sex and how to lose weight ... for features on the Women’s Pages. (Ailsa, 1992)

And they placed themselves in opposition to their “career-minded colleagues” who were “bitchy, masculine political reporters” (Ailsa, 1992). They worked in given areas, corresponding with their role, i.e. fashion, Womens’ Pages or Program, or areas belonging to the private sphere such as school, and social welfare. Amanda talks of this route into journalism:

> At first I got to do the dog-show and wedding stories. Everyone does it as a junior reporter – man or woman [she added quickly] That’s how you get to know the knots and bolts of journalism. I then became a newsreporter and got better stories as my career progressed. I’ve always wanted to be a news-reporter and the last job I wanted was a women’s reporter. But I was pitched in by an editor, since they needed somebody for the job. Women’s section has though changed ... the most of all kinds of news the past fifteen years[she sounded apologetic]. Now it’s exciting. /*/ Women’s journalism is to inform and be polemical. To give controversial news. Equality wouldn’t have a chance if not some serious women journalists had discussed it. /*/ There’s not really a gender angle in journalism. Journalists are individuals. I would hope to be able to write an important story as well as a man. The angle/interpretation might though be different. Women include details and explore feelings and emotions more than men. They have different approaches, though nothing is better than the other.
Women and men are not treated differently on /the broadsheet/. The joshing and joking is between individuals ... really. (Amanda, 1992)

A big difference in comparison with the tactic I have named one of the girls, where the journalists worked on similar beats, is that the Marionettes did not bother to try to raise the importance of the fields in the eyes of their colleagues. They were still proud of their area, as Amanda shows in the quotation above. They were, however, also quite aware of their low status, but plodded on and did not raise conflicts. Thus they manage to create space and power over their own professional lives.

In [name of current affairs program] there were mostly men ... only two women. Women work more as a team, and men are less co-operative. Now [working for Woman’s Section] it’s like being surrounded by your best friends. A good camaraderie. We’re very open and it’s a female environment. Beyond that, it’s not very different [between men and women]. (Flora, 1992)

They aimed their work and energy at the audience, not their colleagues. Ailsa points to this, but also to the complexity of her situation, which she solves by fitting into what is expected of her.

Fashion is to educate people, to make them use their creativity ... try to give people information that, particularly women, are interested in ... knitting, cooking recipes, fashion, sex, and such ... even if others make fun of it a bit, it is important. /.../ Yeah, you’ve got to think of the audience, to help them create a good look without spending a fortune. Part of my job is to answer calls from the audience, and the more you can help them the more loyal they are to /the paper/. (Ailsa, 1992)

Older women journalists seem lonely and bitter. Probably they’ve put the newspaper first for so long. They pretend to be hard and aggressive, and then they’re finding themselves alone. Well, as a woman you’re certainly in a minority. Men are quite patronising, but I don’t find it a problem. I get my stories in ... but in meetings you’re thought of as ... you’re not taken serious. (Ailsa, 1992)

Those aggressive feminists [never marry] get lonely and bitter, and they still won’t get their copies in. I enjoy my job and my lifestyle, and don’t care if some see me as a wee lassie. I still always get my copies accepted. (Ailsa, 2002)
What I found over the ten years that lapsed between the interviews was that the choice of tactic seemed to be successful for these women whose choice it was. They had all advanced their careers – none of which ended up in mainstream journalism – and were very happy with them and with their private lives. The frustration and inner conflicts I met when speaking to other female journalists was absent in this group.

I still get satisfaction out of it [journalism], it still gives me a buzz when I get a story in, and I want to get as much as possible in the [tabloid newspaper]. That’s the objective of my life... can’t compare it with anything. Each day is totally different. You have to know so many things, but not in-depth. It’s a great profession...it has given me a life-style I wouldn’t have had. (Ailsa, 1992)

The Women’s Own did focus-groups and that, and they found people want fashion, slimming and that. I mean, it still means an awful lot in journalism, despite people looking down their noses at it. And I actually don’t care, after having worked as a news-journalist when I started in a weekly paper, and you know, it’s not my scene. I was never going to be Scoop McGee. I think the thing about journalism, you know, it’s for everyone, there are all aspects of journalism. (Ailsa, 2002)

Einat Lachover (2005) shows a similar pattern in the Israeli journalism culture, where female journalists turn around sexism and take control over the situation by adopting a feminine tactic. Lachover does point to the individual advantages such tactics give, but also points to its role in cementing status quo, in my words accepting the doxa and supporting structural pattern in the field. These female – and feminine – journalists achieve place and power, freedom to get on with their lives and careers, at the prize of accepting the field as it is. And this is also precisely why they manage so well; they are not perceived as a threat (nor so they are) and can thus be left to be female journalists.

In Sweden the situation is quite different – or so I assume. In the studies I have conducted in Sweden, no evidence of such tactic was found. Nor have I found any evidence to support its existence through secondary material. Furthermore, going through all my professional and private contacts I have with the Swedish world of journalism and journalists, I cannot recall any trace of evidence to support the existence of the Marionette tactic. I must therefore conclude that Swedish female journalists differ from their UK colleagues in so far as the Marionette tactic is non-viable in Sweden, and thus is not chosen.
There is, however, a big BUT in this conclusion. First of all there are methodological issues. Perhaps the wrong questions were asked. Another issue that I get to time and time again in the case of Sweden is its political correctness. Bottom-pinching, sexual innuendos and jokes, belittling name-callings are not socially or culturally accepted in Sweden. Nor, I would argue, is using one’s femininity and sexuality to achieve professional advantages. But does that mean these issues do not exist, or that they are not talked about?

When writing the article for *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* (*Nordic Journal of Women’s Studies*) the section on the *Marionette tactic* raised a series of arguments between the editors and myself. They argued that the name *marionette*, particularly in combination with «dominated» and «feminine», was offensive and they even doubted its existence. They argued that female readers and journalists alike would take offence. I had to change the name and argue my case in the text (Melin-Higgins, 2003:60).
III. SIMILAR PATTERNS IN THE TWO JOURNALISM CULTURES

When comparing and contrasting Swedish and British journalism cultures, I found the results neither novel, nor surprising. Looking at differences between countries is, after all, what most comparative journalist studies seem to be after. The results, both from my own and other studies, verify my hypothesis of differences between the cultures based on differences in structure and culture at every level. But in a way it is also quite boring – particularly when I cannot spice statistics with interesting interview quotations, as in the case of Sweden. Turning the angle of my view, and reading through the clear-cut differences, I find instead very interesting similarities between the journalism cultures – despite the fact that Sweden and the UK are supposedly culturally on opposite ends of the spectrum of European journalism (Donsbach & Klett, 1993, Donsbach & Patterson, 1998).

There are similarities between the fields of journalism in the UK and Sweden in the way the social fields have developed, there are issues in the doxas that are similar, and when bringing habitus and hexis into the equation, there are very strong similarities in the way the dominating group (read male journalists) use and protect their power, and the way the dominated groups choose to fight for their place in the field. This I will show in this section of the chapter.

1. FIELDS: THE GENDER LOGIC OF JOURNALISM

The increase of space for women in the field of journalism is the first similarity. Although I spoke in the previous section of large differences between Sweden and Britain regarding the rate of women in the field, it is important to look at statistics from another light. During the 1990s women increased with about ten percent – to 45 percent in Sweden and to 25 percent in the UK (Djerf Pierre, 2001a; 2003; 2007a; 2007b; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003). This increase applies to Western countries in general (Gallagher, 1995; Weaver, 1998). Also worth noting is that the increase in numbers are larger than the percentages, due to the fact that the fields themselves have expanded.

To understand how the fields of Swedish and British journalism work we must, however, look beyond this statistics, look beyond the body-count (cf. de Bruin,
Despite getting bigger space in the field of journalism, women are hindered. They are forced to take what Pierre Bourdieu terms a dominated position. In Monika Djerf Pierre’s (2003; 2007a) terms, the gender logic of the field is at work to put women in their place. Or as she stated in 2006:

Media organisations are, like all other organisations, marked by gender. They are permeated by specific perceptions of male and female. And these perceptions influence both organisation and content. ... Men’s and women’s conditions have changed with time, as have the view of male and female (Djerf-Pierre, 2006:416-417).

This works on several levels. Despite the continuously growing numbers of women journalists and women in journalist courses and in the field, the situation for these women is very much the same now as then. There are vertical and horizontal hierarchies in which female journalists end up at the least favourable positions, with little hope of advancing.

1.1. Vertical Separation: The Infamous Glass Ceiling

The vertical separation is manifested in at least two ways. One, there are very few women on senior and decision-making positions. In fact, studies in Sweden show that the share of women in higher positions has remained more or less the same between 1969 and 1989 (Journalistkåren i Sverige, 1970; Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996c). During the 1990s, the percentage of women in higher positions grew, but was still far behind the share of reporters (Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2006; 2007a). And to yet strengthen the pattern, the rate of mid-ranking female media managers has increased, whereas the number of women in elite positions is very low (Djerf Pierre, 2005; 2006; 2007a). The pattern in Britain is the same (Henningham & Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003). Put in other words, this is statistics for the phrase glass ceiling, meaning there is an invisible line across which women’s careers cannot reach further (Grünig, 1980). Edward put words to the statistics of the glass ceiling:

The difference is ... I don’t remember ever having a female boss ... until recently. The [newsprogram] in London has a female editor. But I’ve always worked alongside women. (Edward, 2002)
Dave, who was the editor of a tabloid newspaper in 1998, talked widely about how fantastic women were to work with, but when I asked him why he had not seen to that there were more women on his staff (about 25 percent) and one senior positions (the feature editor), he answered:

For the same reason I don’t have one black reporter. I’ve never found one. I can’t find any good women or black news reporters. Quality is the only thing that matters! None of the women I have here are employed because they’re women. It’s about finding a pool of good people to choose from. But women don’t… it’s probably sexist to say, but are women as prepared as men to leave their lives to one side for 12 hours a day to do what I say?

This argument feels too familiar, and it is used, I would argue, frequently in debates on «why there are not more female X». Mary Stott gave another answer when talking to me about her long career, and how she continuously was stopped when it came to promotion.

When I was 19 I was given the Women’s page to write. I cried and thought it was the end of my career. /…/ At the end of the war I was a news sub-ed at Manchester Evening News. I left because there was absolutely no possibility of promotion for me. I taught young men to do the job, and then they jumped ahead of me when it came to promotion. (Mary Stott, 1992)

Her promotion eventually came – in 1957, as an editor for The Woman’s Page at the Guardian. This happened sixty years ago. But things have not changed that much, as Diana points to.

It’s a slow process and women have it harder. There are hardly any women editors and only a few senior correspondents, but nothing above that. There are other differences too. The [broadsheet] sometimes carries offensive pieces, male oriented stories, for example Essex-girl jokes… There are equal opportunities, but women have to work much harder. Men are more confident and boastful than women. The [name of broadsheet] men are nice, but [name of tabloid] men are not. … I’m not meaning to be arrogant. (Diana, 1992)

Being stopped because you are a woman. Having to be more competent and work harder then men to get a promotion. These are two possible explanations to the glass ceiling in journalism. Frances gives another explanation; she said no to promotion.
They had my confidence completely eroded. I was in a terrible state really, the two years after I walked out. And then I said no to a deputy editors job I was offered at [the broadsheet] because of the macho treatment I got there. (Frances, 1998)

The second manifestation of vertical gender differences is of economic nature. Just as female reporters, female editors are paid significantly less than their male colleagues. And that seems to be the case in many journalism cultures, not just that of Sweden and Britain (Creedon, 1989; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Lafky, 1989; Beasly, 1989; Smith, 1980; Abrahamsson, 1990, van Zoonen, 1994, Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997, Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998).

1.2. Horizontal Separation: Male and Female Journalism

Horizontal hierarchies are manifested as a separation of male and female journalists into different working fields. Men and women are separated by media; there tends to be more women that work in media with lower status (local newspapers, magazines, freelancers, organisational media), and more men that work in media with higher status (big national and regional news papers, broadcast media) (cf. Weibull, 1991; van Zoonen, 1994; 1998; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; b; c; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Henningham & Delano, 1998; Robinson, et al 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2006; 2007a; Robinson, 2005; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a).

Numerous journalism studies from all over the world the past century have, furthermore, shown that even within the media there is a separation between the sexes into separate fields; that between soft and hard news. Hard news covers the public sphere, that which is considered important for society, e.g. foreign, political, business, and crime news. Soft news is a confirmation of the private sphere, where nurturing and caring values are manifested. This is traditionally a female sphere, and is indeed also a female sphere in contemporary journalism. If you want, this is the enlightenment dichotomy translated into journalism where male, importance, status, hard news, public sphere, are seen as inseparable characteristics, and where female, unimportant, soft news, private sphere, nurturing, are seen as equally inseparable. This is presented by Monika Djerf Pierre (Djerf-Pierre, 2003:45; Djerf-Pierre, 2006:97 and 423; 2007a:97) in her dichotomised gender logic (see figure 4, page 38). As to confirm its existence, the latter have some times nicknames amongst journalists, like velvet ghetto, pink colour ghetto (Beasly, 1989; Creedon, 1989),
female ghetto (Schlesinger, 1978), and women’s fields (Smith, 1980). The former is simply called journalism\(^{11}\).

In Sweden there has, during the 1990s, been a general levelling out of the strong gendered differences regarding beats, or subjects. Politics, foreign news and culture have in 2005 as many men as women reporters. Still however, the general pattern remain the same: family is strongly dominated by women journalists and sports-, crime/court journalists and political columnists are even in 2005 almost exclusively men (Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). The same can be said, in statistical terms, about the UK (Delano, 2003). Interestingly, these statistics also tell that men and women in Sweden and in the UK interpret this gender dichotomy differently. Or as Anthony Delano puts it:

The data suggested that perceptions of newsroom sexism could be seen as a function of respondents’ sex (Delano, 2005:276).

In Sweden, a majority of journalists agree that there is a gendering of journalism, but only half of them see this as a function of gendered power, i.e. that men are favoured. The other half sees this as a natural state of affairs. Men and women are suited for different things. Perhaps not surprisingly, the former is the view of a majority of women, and the latter the view of the majority of men. To add to this, a third of men journalists think that women are favoured in the recruitment of important positions (Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). The pattern is the same in the UK. Twice as many UK women as men (journalists) believed that it is more difficult for capable women to get ahead, and have personally experience victims of prejudice (Delano, 2003).

Again, the women and men I interviewed in the UK give voices to these statistical differences. Jenny and Polly, as many other women, saw these differences as structural.

When I started on [Broadsheet] I became the social affair’s correspondent, which meant I should be doing the hard stuff. But also the soft stuff – only because I’m a woman! /.../ Women in news are very few. They all end up doing feature. (Jenny, 1992)

We all [women] have different ideas than men. We don’t want to play certain games and we’re bored by power-struggles. But to survive in a newspaper, women have to be so much better than men! (Polly, 1992)
Several of the men took the gendered separation between soft and hard news for granted. It was either nothing they had really reflected on, or they saw it as the natural state of affairs. As Henry exemplifies.

Gender differences? Women go to the pub on their own and men stick to themselves to tell dirty jokes. In newspapers there are no gender problems. There’s a total equality in terms of wages et cetera. Men and women are though different. And we do different stories. (Henry, 1992)

That there was gender equality and that women were better at doing caring feature stories and doing the tear-angle of tougher stories seemed perfectly clear to many of the men I interviewed. Dave, Charles and Martin exemplified another issue that seemed to be evident to many of the male journalists, namely that women tended to become more manly when working with hard news.

[Gender] Differences? ...Difficult question! Fuck! ... I have worked for a woman. There’s no differences between a great woman and men ... journalists. The biological clock makes a difference ... imperatives. Women have a more raw deal in life. I prefer women in some situations ... people talk easier to women, for example in a rape-story. As a feature editor I can see that as a feature writer, I’m a very good writer and interviewer, women have that instinctively, you know, to write about feelings and examining them. 90 percent of women are in feature. There’s less women in news-production, but they have built-in advantages. Men are more aggressive, hence news. Women become more manly in news. (Dave, 1992)

Women are shunted off into softer, women’s interest-type stories. Women that are in news-journalism have to deny their femininity. Be a man – come’n drink with us. Unfortunately some women have made themselves part of the pub-culture because they think that’s the way it should be. Men are not after the truth. It’s the story they’re after. (Charles, 1992)

Women are often harder as journalists. But I don’t come across a lot of women that want to be journalists. If there’s a very sensitive interview, for example a rape victim, a female journalist can be a lot tougher, especially tabloid journalists. They have more of a killer instinct than men. They are tough as old boots. They would go further than men to get a story. In broadsheet papers [where
Martin works] there’s no difference. Men and women are pretty similar. (Martin, 1992)

Like Martin, Kevin denied any gender inequalities in his own medium.

There’s no [gender] difference in the BBC… [After these words he quickly went to get more coffee, and continued the sentence when he returned.] … but women journalists in the BBC are discriminated: there are few women and they don’t have influence. And there are some good aggressive women that weaver away better than men. But I don’t think it’s worse than in other fields. There are no inadequacies, and there’s no bias against women journalists. You never hear the BBC say “we’ll send a man”. Though a lot of women think that they are sent out only to do soft news stories. That’s not so. It’s just that women are slow at coming forward whereas men go up to the newsdesk and say what they want, you know hard news stories. I don’t do that now, but did earlier as a reporter. Women are therefore given soft news stories and they seem to be more willing to take that treatment. Anyhow, women are better at crafting a feature story and generate their own kind of stories. A lot of women are more interested in caring stories, for example the environment, rather than sharper stories. (Kevin, 1992)

I interviewed Frances, a former colleague of Kevin’s, who gave a totally different picture of their common newsroom.

So what do you do when you want to cover political news and there’s already a mid-aged man doing it? The only way is to be better and more of a man than the man himself. /…/ One of the reasons I left BBC news was because Kevin took all the good stories and left nothing for us wee lassies. (Frances, 1992)

She was very critical of Kevin, both as a colleague and as a person. She did, however, agree with him on one issue, namely that a lot of women are slow at coming forward to “grab a job”.

Women are carriers of information, not decision-makers, because of bad confidence. They are not given good stories to follow up and don’t dare to ask and therefore become sloppy since they don’t need to be precise since everyone automatically check what they’ve done. It’s a vicious circle. (Frances, 1992)
When asked, the majority of Swedish journalists also saw this pattern, or rather they agreed that men are better at selling their ideas to the editor. Again, more women than men (75% compared to 49%) saw this pattern. Amongst the UK women I talked to, this was mostly not the case. They showed frustration about their situation, but did not problematise it like Frances. They often saw their own situation as appalling, but the situation for women on other (more status-filled) medium as better. In other words, the grass is greener on the other side:

When I started I only did soft news: flower festivals, babies, old folk et cetera. It’s easier in newspapers to gain credibility as a journalist. Here at the BBC you are seen as a woman journalist. (Maureen, 1992)

Very few newspapers had women in my days. There were practically no female subeds. /…/ There’s a difference depending on media, it’s very interesting that radio and TV … they are new media and don’t have the inherited sexism as newspapers do because they are older. It’s a deep rooted idea that women’s place is not in a newspaper. (Mary Stott, 1992)

Thus, one conclusion I can draw is that the main difference between the male and the female journalists’ interpretations of the gendered separation is that the male journalists did not see the gendered power-aspect of the separation. The female journalists did. As they did in Sweden (Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). They were all quite aware (albeit acting differently upon it) of the difference in status between soft and hard news, and thus the statuswise consequences for themselves for being shunted off into soft news-areas. Ruth had reflected on this. She started off as a news-journalist, but changed into current-affairs programs, when realising she could not abide the news-room culture. In 1992 she worked as a producer for a current-affairs radio-program. And she was aware of the price in status she had paid:

When you’re trained as a hard-news reporter anything else seems down-market. I did consumer and social programs for three years after working at the news-desk … the softer side of current-affairs, so that was OK. But now I’m doing entertainment. Entertainment, but still it demands journalistic skills… Oh dear! And now when I’ve said that, you’ve wasted half an hour talking to the wrong kind of person! (Ruth, 1992)

She added that her own analysis of her choice of soft news:
I’m more interested in human interest now, but earlier on it was hard-news. I wasn’t successful in it though, and that might be the reason it doesn’t interest me anymore. The failure might depend on the male culture. The difference lies in working environment more than in news-values. (Ruth, 1992)

In Monika Djerf Pirre’s (2003; 2007a) discussion of the dichotomised gender logic of journalism she points to both the stable and changing nature of this in Sweden during the 1900s. What actually constituted male and female fields have varied over the decades. But the higher status of the male field, and lower status of the female, has remained the same. I did not have the century long analysis of Djerf Pierre, but found one example of the shifting gendered nature of soft-hard news depending on status: the Orkney inquiry. It had taken place about a year before I interviewed the UK journalists the first time around. It was a story of several families of incomers on Orkney mainland being accused of child-abuse and satanic rituals – using the children in them. When it happened it was front-page news for a long time. About half of the Scottish journalists mentioned this story in different ways, and there was a marked difference between women’s versions and men’s versions (cf Kitzinger, 1998).

Two of the journalists I interviews actually reported the story. Martin was a news editor on a Scottish broadsheet, and as such chose to cover the story because it was so big, and because he was involved in it. As other male journalists that mentioned the story, he strongly took the side of the parents, particularly the fathers, against “the social-workers”.

The best story I’ve ever done was the Orkney story. It was also the biggest story last year. Lots of coverage. It was all about a family, that acted on behalf of a sick family, the one with the 13 kids. The parents had previously contacted me about this sick family. I did a story about that. Then they rang me again and said their own kids had been taken away along with some others, all in all nine children. It was all about a certain social-worker that persuaded her director that the kids told the truths. The story had a happy outcome, though. The parents got their children back, not like the Ayreshire story. But my wife doesn’t agree with me entirely on the Ayreshire story. Men and women were slightly different on that. There was this one woman in particular who was very different. [He made a face when mentioning this.] She was on Orkney as well. (Martin, 1992)

The woman he referred to was Jenny, who in turn spent a big part of the interview talking about the story. What they both agreed on was that men and women took
opposite sides in the story. Jenny does, however, point to how the story shifted from soft to hard news, not because of the subject, but because of its size.

Even though I was the social-affairs correspondent, a paid specialist in the area, I didn’t get the story. I covered it, but my copies weren’t printed. I didn’t buy the parents’ story and my version didn’t fit in with the media story. I was considered unreliable. The chief-reporter … a man … took the parents’ role and said that I was hysterical about the issue. In meetings, when I and the chief reporter met the editor, I was trying to analyse and point out weaknesses but I was said to be hysterical. Men believe men’s stories. I was the only woman on the Orkney case. Even though the story normally should have been a soft woman’s story the heavy guys took over because it was so big. There were big rows in the pub every evening between me and the others. I was isolated in other respects too. The families refused to speak to me because they saw me as their enemy. They tried to make me look bad in as many ways as they could. In one case, a mother witnessed that I had tipped all the families off before the social workers came in and took their kids. This was all over the media that night. I threatened to take legal actions and the lawyer said next day in court that “no family knew beforehand that the social workers would come”. That wasn’t printed. (Jenny, 1992)

Lilidh was very upset about the way the story had been handled, and used child abuse in general and the Orkney case as examples of how sexist and problematic journalism is. And of how male journalists use their power to take over stories if they want to.

I am so angry about the way child-abuse cases have been covered, especially that no one should believe the children. You have to know more about how child-abuse can happen before writing about it. Take the Orkney case. The legal system with Sheriff Kelby has let the children down. You know, there’s no smoke without fire. The whole thing is disgraceful. The role of the press … they’ve been dragging things up. It’s a very difficult thing to report on and you have to report responsibly. But uninformed male reporters seem to think that the social workers made things up. It’s not totally a gender thing though, but largely. The whole thing is about male power. (Lilidh, 1992)
2. DOXA: HARD NEWS AND DISTANT NEUTRALITY

Despite the differences regarding the doxas of the Swedish and British journalism fields that I pointed to in the previous section, there are also clearly identifiable similarities. Doxa is the world-view, perceived reality in a specific social field i.e. what is simply called journalism. And it is the main focus for symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1988; Rosengren, 2002; see also chapter two in this book). In other words, those who can define what journalism is possess true power and status. Defining doxa means defining norms, means defining the objective truth. Similarities regarding the doxas turn up when acknowledging the inherently gendered nature of doxa and symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1984; 1999; Järvinen, 1999; Moi, 1999). In other words, it is mainly white, middle class, protestant men who have power and status to define what journalism is. Thus, the struggle for symbolic power can really be interpreted as a struggle between the sexes (Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004). This is the meaning behind the phrase “journalism as a male bastion”, which most research on journalism from a feminist perspective seem to come up with. The argument is that journalism itself is a male construction, that men have created the tools used in everyday journalism, including the doxa and that mainly men work in journalism and reap its profit (e.g. Rakow, 1988; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 2003; 2004; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; de Bruin, 1998; 2004; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; Robinson, 2004; 2005; van Zoonen, 1998a; 1998b; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Chambers et al, 2004; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a).

Concretely, there are similarities in what is perceived as good journalism, i.e. the doxa, in Britain and Sweden. When looking at statistics of the answer to the question of what they thought about statements about the journalists’ professional role, four identical statements topped the lists for both British journalists I interviewed in 1992 and Swedish journalists responses 1989 (albeit the percentages differed) (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c:109). In Sweden these three statements actually remain the top three from 1989 to 2005 (Wiik, 2007a:79). Journalists in both countries thought it most important that journalists should be a scrutiniser of authorities, someone that can explain events simply, someone that can stimulate new thoughts and ideas, and someone who is a critic of injustices. The UK result is confirmed by Köcher’s (1985; 1986) and Henningham and Delano’s (1998; 2003) studies (for further support for my argument, see also Ross, 2001 and Chambers et al, 2004). Thus I dare to state that the doxa in the British field of journalism focuses around the idea of «the bloodhound sniffing out news stories and using any tricks to get to it, regardless of ethics», as I have previously discussed in this chapter.
What I did not emphasise previously, however, was the strong bloodhound ideal amongst Swedish journalists. Yes, the participant, educational ideal is stronger and the neutral ideal is weaker in Sweden as compared to that in the UK, and increasingly so during the 1990s. But evidence of the primacy of investigative (bloodhound) journalism is easy to find. When Swedish Television’s flagship news-program Rapport started in 1969, it was based on radical, investigative news-values. It brought into the living-room of every Swedish home, the so called Anglo-Saxon news-values that the liberal tabloid Expressen brought into Swedish journalism in the 1940s. The Watergate-scandal made journalists national heroes, and with that followed the 1970s and 1980s period of professionalisation in Sweden, during which the bloodhound-ideal was reinforced (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a). During the 1990s the major television and radio-channels had investigative programs, which fought with the tabloid newspapers for the sought-after professional prices. The, arguably, most prestigious journalist-prize is the Gold Spade, given by «Föreningen Grävande Journalister» (The Digging Journalists’ Association). And the most idolised journalists are Jan Guillou and Jan Josefsson, both famous and infamous for their «bloodhound journalistic methods» (Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a). All this is emphasised on Journalist courses, where investigative (Bloodhound) journalism was the only ideal taught and represented in syllabus literature on journalist courses during the 1990s (albeit changes have taken place since then) (Melin-Higgins, 1993; 1997a; Wadbring, 1995; Löfgren Nilsson, 1997).

That the Swedish Bloodhound-ideal is alive-and-kicking is furthermore shown in a study of tabloid journalists in Sweden (Olovsson, 2006). Daniel, who is a chief editor of a Swedish tabloid says the following about neutrality, truth and the consequences thereof:

Of course people have gone to jail for what we have written, and families have been split-up and people have become more unhappy. But if we start to take consideration all the time, we become a player, a part in the case. Also, we do not appear trustworthy, but we become protectors of some, but not of others. We should not be a party, we should only report what has happened. (Daniel, 2006, quoted in Olovsson, 2006:46, my translation.)

And to Tomas, a crime reporter at a Swedish tabloid, the Truth is as central to him as to any British journalist:
When I deliver it should be true. I should be able to stand in front of my chief editor and say that this is true. I won’t back a penny out of that. (Tomas, 2006, quoted in Olovsson, 2006:60, my translation.)

2.1. Allodoxa and Female Journalism

Another similarity between the cultures is the fact the doxas are challenged by oppositional groups within the cultures – despite Pierre Bourdieu’s (1998a) argument that journalism is doxic. There are in both cultures opposing doxas – what Bourdieu calls allodoxa, and they are of similar kind. Again, the gendered nature of the fields of journalism in Britain and Sweden is apparent. And again, the nature of the allodoxa is different from that which Pierre Bourdieu (1998a) talked of. He argued that the only potential allodoxa, the only conflict in journalism is that between audimat and autonomy. (For more of this discussion see chapter 2.)

In Sweden there is a gendered gap between the educator ideal, which is strongest amongst women, and the craftsmen ideal, which is dominated by male journalists (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b). The relative comparison between male and female journalists in Sweden places them in diagonally opposite boxes in terms of ideals presented in my typography of ideals (Figure 10 and Melin-Higgins, 1996a:103).

Statistics show that female journalists have stronger ideals, social commitment and personal involvement, and a stronger wish for personal expression through

![Figure 10: Main Determinants of Journalist’s Professional Ideal.]

Legend: The figure should be read in relative terms: more women than men have an educator ideal, more people with a university degree than those without one has a educator ideal, and the group with the strongest educator ideal is women with a university degree. And so on for each type, with the notable exception of The Bloodhound Ideal.
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journalism, compared to male journalists, which on the contrary in comparison tend to have stronger belief in neutrality, and journalism as a fact finding mission. Similar pattern is visible amongst the British journalists I interviewed (Melin-Higgins, 1996c; 2003; 2004), and supported statistically (van Zoonen & Donsbach, 1988; Delano & Henningham, 1996; Henningham & Delano, 1998). Indeed, some of the interviewed female journalists distanced themselves from «the ordinary macho journalism performed by semi-alcoholic, ruthless, bloodhounds». Jenny reflects on this:

I don’t want to be like those /macho/ guys. It’s easy to say that it’s all because I’m a woman, but that’s too easy, and I don’t know if it is so. There are women that are very different. XX is my opposite. She is tough and very good at macho hard news. XX told me that I get too involved in stories and that it would influence my news-values. But it’s up to us to be responsible. We need to have background information and we need to be involved to do a good job. That’s because the audience gets involved in the stories and take them in. (Jenny, 1992)

I did not interview XX, the female journalist Jenny refers to, but I have interviewed other female journalists that have adhered to the doxa. Though like the Swedish female journalists with a strong bloodhound ideal, those journalists tend to problematise the doxa, particularly neutrality and ethical considerations to a much larger extent than male journalists (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; 2003; 2004). Marie, a Swedish journalist working for a tabloid newspaper, talked of her own responsibility for the content of articles in Olovsson’s study (2006), despite the legal responsibility lies on the editor.

And it is I that have my name, and sometimes my image under the article in the newspaper, so regardless of who as the actual legal responsibility, it is I that am responsible for the content. Both to of the readers, those that I write about – and my managers. I also have personal responsibility to follow the guidelines and policy of the newspaper, for example not to interview young people under the age of 18 without the consent of the parents. (Marie, quoted in Olovsson, 2006:39, my translation.)

Thus, I can conclude that in both Sweden and the UK I have found a markedly different doxa amongst female journalists as compared to male journalists. This could be support for the – much discussed – thesis that there is a separate female journalism (cf. Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1990; 1993; 1997; Smith, 1989; Beasly, 1989;
Interpretations

Zilliakus-Tikkanen’s thesis of a female journalism is a essentialist explanation to Djerf-Pierre’s gender logic. Female journalists (women) bring naturally with them different ways of doing and thinking journalism. I certainly found evidence amongst the British journalists I interviewed that many of them had the same line of thoughts as Zilliakus-Tikkanen and believed in the existence of female journalism, either in strong and positive terms, or as a derogatory concept. Again, like Billy, some found the gender differences natural, along the line of the gender dichotomy as I have discussed, and thus useful.

The best reporters are women. I’m very much in favour of females in crime stories. They can do things men can’t do. The female angle is important and they have saved our lives many times. They have much more relaxed attitudes and tearful ways. A female can handle the tear-angle better than men and they are better at talking to widows [to get hold of a photograph of the diseased]. But it takes balls to do it. And the women have to be hard-bitten. (Billy, 1992)

Dave, who in 1998 was a tabloid editor had the power to do something about this usefulness of women. During the year he had been editor he had started to employ more women, because they were different from men:

Dave: Women look at life in a different way, have different interest to men, have broader mind. And they are particularly aware of women! Sounds daft but... it’s not politically correct, I couldn’t give a shit about that, but ... a columnist I inherited wrote, he tried to be funny, “there are not enough nurses with short skirts and low plunging necklines”. I asked my deputy about it...I didn’t like what he wrote...not like I don’t like jokes or so, had it been about the Spice Girls or Page 3 girls, or so, that would be fine. But there are things you can talk about when it comes to sex, and things you can’t and men just don’t realise where the line goes. Women are good at knowing that line. [And he started giving examples of crossing the line.]

M: So what are women not good at?

Dave: Killing! You know, the SAS. Murder. They don’t understand it and don’t get attraction of it. /.../ Women have a broader vision of life. That’s why they’re better than men and that’s why I surround myself with women.
Dave had far from altruistic or feminist ideas behind employing more women. He had realised that this newspaper needed to attract a wider audience; he had realised that women constitute a possible market. He explained why stories about the SAS worked so well in selling papers:

It’s very male oriented. It’s part of the cowboys and Indian-genre. It’s also about good guys and bad guys, cops vs. robbers, the SAS vs. the Iraqies. It’s heroes and villains. And we want heroes. It’s about... It’s pretty macho, but it’s basically about our guys going over there and beating [smacking his fist against his hand] the baddies on behalf of us back home. And we want to be proud of them. It’s the same as the cops catching a bad villain. It sells well. But it’s not all macho stories /in the paper/. On the other hand, I’m very interested in women’s emotions, how women feel. Every week we have a thing in the paper – the True Life Stories. We present two emotional sorts of questions that attract women. Let me give you a couple of good examples. “Why do women fall for bastards?” “Can an affair survive a one-night-stand?” “Can a mix-race relationship survive in the long run?” It’s all about getting young women talking about their real life stories.

The women that talked about female journalism in positive terms did not use any sales argument. They, like Ruth and Frances, had reflected on the issues, and taken a stand for a particular way of doing journalism. Both worked as radio presenters in 1992, but had at that time quite different attitudes. Ruth was then aware of what she saw as her female journalism style, and later acted on it, when becoming the main producer of a big news television program and choosing interview subjects and themes.

I don’t use a male status language. I’m more direct. It’s because I have a low boredom level and I get fed up with people not confronting and speaking clear which is much more common amongst women. Most [male] journalists are caught up in letting the elite run the world by using and confirming their language. ... Also, women are more happy to let new people talk on the program and letting emotions through. For example ... Letting unemployed talk about their situation themselves instead of letting the elite speak or interpreting events. It doesn’t matter if they stutter or are nervous or angry. I don’t take them off /air/. Very female. (Ruth, 1992)
Frances’ attitude in 1992 was that most women had a different kind of journalism than men, and was therefore discriminated. She tried hard not to go the female journalism kind of line, but still found herself discriminated in different ways and had a roller-coaster career between 1992 until the present date. In 1998 she spent a long time discussing the difference between female and male journalism and how the former was much better.

The good thing about female journalism is its ability to think laterally and to see that there are many different views on one thing, and there are many different societies within society. That’s probably the biggest one. If you’re like the guy that just walked past here, there’s no fucking way on this planet, and for the reference, the guy is tall, wearing a suit and looking English, there’s no way that guy’s got a chance, poor chap, of knowing how many different richnesses there are around him. Unless he’s an exceptional guy. But if you’ve got anything wrong with you, and that could be colour, disability, gender, age, or things like that, it enriches your life, because you see other worlds in worlds. If you could also somehow develop the balls to be able to bring back that into the public life and talk to guys like that, who probably runs the thing and persuade him that there are many more worlds out there, then that’s an asset for everybody, but you have to develop such extraordinary skills to be able to get that guy to listen to you. And earlier in my life it was simply enough to throw the evidence at him and walk off in a huff, knowing that he wouldn’t accept it. Now it strikes me that I actually have a chance of affecting him because I see his vulnerabilities too. I was making that guy more powerful in the past than he might have been actually. Whereas now I tend to think of everyone that there’ll be something in him that I can relate to and then I can help him out of this fucking fridge in his head perhaps. (Frances, 1998)

In the debate about female journalism, it is interesting to note the total absence of the term male journalism. The reason is of course the same as why we never hear the term male lecturer, male priest, male doctor, or female nurse. It is taken for granted. It is also interesting to note the essentialist understanding behind the term female journalist. It is as though genetically women are determined to think and do female journalism. Because of their female reproductive organs. If they would dare to enter into field of «normal» journalism, they become «manly», and are suspected of being homosexual, i.e. there is something wrong with their femaleness.

I do believe that Bourdieu’s notions of doxa – allodoxa, explain these differences between men and women in journalism. They also explain why these dif-
ferences are gendered, but not genetical in nature, why some women adhere to the doxa and some men to the allodoxa. What Zilliakus-Tikkanen (1990; 1993; 1997) calls «female journalism» should be interpreted as allodoxa, i.e. an oppositional, alternative way of thinking and doing journalism.

Bourdieu’s terms do, however, not sufficiently explain why in both Sweden and the UK there are large numbers of women that strongly adhere to the doxa and strongly embrace bloodhound journalism. Nor do they explain the conflicts this gives rise to. To fully understand these facts I must – again – turn to Michel de Certeau’s (1984) terminology to look at the world of journalism.

3. STRATEGIES: SOCIAL BANKERS AND SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE

Bourdieu recognizes the gendered nature of the hierarchy of social fields, i.e. in general terms men make up the dominating groups and women make up the dominated groups. This applies, as I have shown, also to journalism. Pierre Bourdieu recognizes the conflict that arises between these groups (but argues that there is no such conflict in journalism). Michel de Certeau (1984) does, however, go further and describes the conflict as fights or warfare. None of them see the gendered nature of this conflict/warfare. I argue that the fights between the groups over the symbolic power to define doxa are indeed gendered. In my material I have found similarities between Swedish and British journalists regarding the strategies used by dominating groups to defend their power, that of the increasing importance of social bankers at journalist courses, and that of symbolic violence in daily routines.

3.1. Social Bankers at Journalist Courses

Despite differences in educational systems in England, Scotland12 and Sweden, there are similarities in the way the social bankers of journalism use journalist courses to reconstruct and re-establish the doxa and thus defend the power position of the dominant group. If social bankers’ «job» is to guard the entrance to the field, what better than guarding the way leading up to the entrance? The results of a series of studies made of the Journalist courses at the University of Göteborg in the mid-nineties show that the educational environment was near doxic, i.e. there was one way of doing journalism that was taught, and next to no room for discussion, critique and indeed recognition of other ways of approaching the job. In the syllabus, and the texts of the reading lists, good journalism was shown as objective, fact-find-
Good journalists were depicted as professional, distant, neutral, active, knowledgeable, scrutinising, revealing, truth seeking, honest and powerful. In other words, what was taught, without exemption, was the journalist ideal I have called the bloodhound. Interviews with faculty members furthermore showed that they saw this ideal as the most important. Protecting the doxa this way seem to have worked, as the bloodhound ideal did indeed become stronger the longer students stayed on the course (Melin, 1993; 1995; Wadbring, 1995; Löfgren Nilsson, 1997; Melin-Higgins, 1997a).

As there is, to my knowledge, no similar research project in the UK, the evidence from there is more of anecdotal nature. None the less, having worked in Scottish journalist education for a near decade and having worked on British national level on planning and organising journalist courses, I have collected a fair knowledge and experience of how the discussions go. During the 1990s there has been a struggle between spokespersons for a university level journalist education and those working for an in-house or trade union based education. The latter wanted an education based on what journalists really need, meaning interview techniques, shorthand, appropriate legal knowledge and some other subjects that make up a good neutral investigative journalist, which was clearly an outspoken objective. Those working for a university level education stressed critical analysis interwoven with practical elements. The ideal output for this group was (again clearly outspoken) a critically and ethically investigative journalist.

Another major result of the Göteborg project was that, as with the field itself, journalist courses seemed to be masculine environments – despite the fact that the majority of students were female. This also applies to the situation in the UK. The majority of the faculty were, in Sweden, UK and other European countries, male – and the higher up in the hierarchy, the larger percentage of men (Melin, 1993; 1995; Wadbring, 1995; Löfgren Nilsson, 1997; Melin-Higgins, 1997a; Chambers et al, 2004). The Swedish study looked deeper into the presumed maleness, and showed that male faculty members chose books only by male authors, with masculine biased texts. For example, men in the texts were active and professional; women were only portrayed as mothers, secretaries, whores, or as examples of bad journalists. Interviews with faculty members showed a high PC-ness: equality between gender, classes and races were deemed important, but few members (only women) took the opportunity of integrating gender perspective into the curriculum (despite the fact that help was offered by the project team) (Melin, 1993; 1995; Wadbring, 1995; Löfgren Nilsson, 1997; Melin-Higgins, 1997a).

In the UK, I can tentatively say that the PC-ness is similar, albeit there is, I would argue, also more direct misogyny. I have heard heads of journalist courses
arguing that there are too many women on the courses, that female students should learn the ways of the job, and to get used to the rough-and-tumble of the newsroom (when being accused of sexism in the courses) (see also Chambers et al, 2004: ch 3). Frances and Ruth, two of the journalists I interviewed describes the very same process:

There were mostly women on the course in Cardiff, and on the BBC training course it was 50/50. They said they would prepare us for the newsroom. And they did. It was awful. Sexual jokes and innuendoes all the time /…/there was just one type of journalism taught: shorthand, law, and being a tough guy (Frances, 1992).

I was definitely different after Cardiff [having done a course in journalism there]. The ethos there was very tabloid, very hard and very male. I wasn’t bothered, though, but other girls quite often fell into tears. It was a good training for the news-room. The same very aggressive and very intolerant culture. It took me a long time to get out of that kind of job and out of that kind of thinking. (Ruth, 1992)

The argument for maleness of journalist courses are strengthened when considering the arguably masculinity of the doxa: the investigative, confrontational, critical, tough-guy characteristic of the blood-hound ideal could be seen as masculine traits. There are, indeed, connections being made between blood-hound journalism, status and men, time and time again by the journalists I interviewed in Scotland (e.g. Frances expresses this in the quotation above), in the course literature of the journalist course in Gothenburg, and by Swedish journalists exemplified by the way they choose candidates for prestigious prize, the Goldspade (cf. Melin, 1993; 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1997a; Djerf-Pierre, 2003; 2007a).

3.2. Daily Routines as Symbolic Violence

Keeping the field free from unwanted persons may be the primary concern – and thus primary strategy – for those in power but very clearly more and more manage to slip through the net laid out by social bankers. Thus the next set of strategies come into place, those involved with defending the power positions, the doxa, and I would argue, to force the non-desirables out of the field. In the fields of journalism of Sweden and the UK I have indeed found similarities in the way those non-desirables are dealt with.
Interpretations

Journalism, despite being seen as a highly creative and free job (not the least by journalists themselves), is in fact highly structured and routinised. This is indeed necessary, as journalists need to deal with an overflow of information in need of organising, and – not to forget – journalism is also big business. Central to the routines of everyday practices in any newsroom (or indeed the very structures of journalism) is the morning meeting, where information is shared amongst colleagues, ideas are discussed, jobs handed out to individual journalists, or teams, and then every one skips on their way to the day’s chores with a *let’s be careful out there* shouted after them. At least so is the theory. Another way of seeing the morning meeting is as places of power, where only certain information is shared, where some ideas are discussed, and others are dismissed and suppressed, as «bad ideas», where jobs are given out according to set patterns, where fights over the jobs give rise to overt or covert conflicts – or war. Patterns following the gender logic. In fact, morning meetings can be seen as the epitomised gender logic of journalism (cf. Burns, 1977; Schlesinger, 1978; Galtung and Ruge, 1981; Andersson Odén, 1996; Christmas, 1997; Egsmose, 1998; Löfgren Nilsson, 1999; Melin-Higgins, 1996c; 2003; 2004; Chambers et al, 2004).

The conflicts and frustrations that the morning meetings gave rise to, and the consequences of this for the daily activities, and indeed for the careers of individual journalists, were tangible in most of the interviews I conducted in the UK. And so was the gendered nature of this. As I have pointed to earlier in the text, Frances was livid with the way Kevin was pals with the news editor and “grabbed” all the good (read status filled) political jobs for himself on morning meetings. Lilidh worked as a general reporter wanting to do hard news-stories, but found herself increasingly doing soft news.

Yes, I’m sometimes given certain stories because I’m a woman. The industry is *very* sexist. But it’s wrong not using women for certain jobs, as long as it is not held against them. But then … men are much more eager to criticise women than their male colleagues. The idea that women are being harder in tabloids are always used against women like me [that work for a tabloid]. Any woman who’s assertive is seen as *hard nosed*. Like me! “A woman would have to work harder” said my editor at a morning meeting, and sent me off to do certain jobs [she made face whilst saying the last sentence]. (Lilidh, 1992)

Olivia would have been happy working with news, like Lilidh, or at least “important feature jobs”, but found herself being positioned on the women’s desk. She had very negative experiences of morning meetings in the newsroom:
Men and women see themselves differently. I’ve noticed a split in attitudes in the coverage of certain stories, for example the Orkney inquiry. In my experience, men and women have different news values. And that has hampered my career. Ten, fifteen years ago editors, men, would look blank at me when I suggested stories at morning meetings. That made me doubt myself. It’s undermining when people don’t understand what you say. For example the Greenoch women’s protests against nuclear power. I wanted to cover that, but it was seen as unimportant women’s stuff. Later it became a big story, but then only men covered it. (Olivia, 1992)

Frances left the newsroom to become a presenter on a current affairs program, because she could not get to do the jobs she wanted to:

I’m too critical to stay in the newsroom. … And I’m fed up with [Kevin] taking all the good stories. (Frances, 1992)

An essentialist notion of gender coupled with the distinction soft – hard news was evident in the examples given to me by the journalists I interviewed to exemplify the power play (or show-off of power) that took place during the morning meetings. Men were giving the hard news jobs, and women given the soft news jobs. This, I argue, should not be taken literally, but again as gender logic at work. The so called «hard news» is what is deemed important and power-giving according to the doxa, and thus what should naturally be given to those in power. Men. And those in power – white middle-class, protestant, hetero-sexual men naturally expect and demand to get what gives them power. Hard news thus becomes part of the masculine sphere. As Djerf Pierre (2003; 2007a) discusses, and Olivia shows above, the actual content of this masculine part of the dichotomy changes over time, and indeed between Sweden and the UK, but the distinction and strategy to implement this dichotomised logic remain the same.

As has been pointed out previously, amongst Swedish journalists gender equality is much higher, and more widely accepted. Still, female journalists found it more difficult than male journalists to get their ideas accepted, less so that they were listened to by the management, and in general felt they were more controlled than did male journalists (Löfgren Nilsson, 1993; 2007a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b). Or, with the words of a young female Swedish journalist from Löfgren Nilsson’s study:
Look here, now I’ve got one of those bloody sex-studies to write about again. I’m always given those jobs. Dan, my colleague, him no one gives these jobs. He gets the jobs at the police, or the court and that. I never get those jobs. But of course I wouldn’t actually want to write about it either, because I’m not interested... Of course it’s important to write about young women’s sexuality. It’s important stuff to them and I think you should do it. It’s actually very important. I’m just so fed up at always being given these jobs. I just don’t understand it (Löfgren-Nilsson, 1994:106, my translation).

Despite what I had expected from reading other studies on (gendered) organizational cultures within journalism (cf. Burns, 1977; Schlesinger, 1978; Galtung and Ruge, 1981; Egsmose, 1998; Löfgren Nilsson, 1999) it was not the morning-meetings, nor the use of structural routines that the female UK journalists I interviewed found the most suppressive or problematic. It was the everyday work in the newsroom. The general newsroom culture was, according to them, also conflict-ridden, where open symbolic violence was used as a strategy to suppress and belittle female colleagues. During the UK interviews I carried out, many of the journalists gave witness to the sexist, racist and homophobic nature of the newsroom culture. Sports-talk, sexual jokes and innuendoes were used to keep women out of the core-group of journalists, or to make them feel uncomfortable. A we – them culture in the newsroom, where we were the tough, professional guys that created a comradeship through their patter, banter and pints. Them were the others, the women that were told their place. The guys’ banter worked as clear keep out signs. This could be of more or less sexist nature.

I hate third-level discrimination. Someone can say “I don’t like women that dye their hair white”. Somebody else can give you this pointed look all through a meal. Is there actually any difference? One of them is completely out of order immediately, but those others ... someone can come and say hello to us and not give us any eye contact. It’s lots of ways you can close people down without saying “I don’t like women”. (Frances, 1998)

I started at BBC radio as a trainee and a researcher. My contract wasn’t renewed, though and I know some funny things went on behind my back. Definitely sexist – all my fellow trainees, they were guys, stayed. ... Also I was pregnant. (Polly, 1992)
There are few women (two) in positions of responsibility, though there are more writers. I wouldn’t like to work on the news-desk. I’m not temperamented for it. Favourites are picked there more than in other places. It’s the old style men-go-down-to-pub. They guys hang out together and the camaraderie doesn’t accept women. Apart for flirtation! (Olivia, 1992)

I didn’t like the politics of the newsroom. That’s why I left. It’s a male dominated area. It’s a middle-middle class, bright grammar school boys-culture, and if you’re not into sexist and racist jokes, and don’t like cricket, you’ve had it. Then you’re isolated. (Ruth, 1992)

Ruth continued giving me some examples, here are a couple of them:

When I worked in the new-room, the editors didn’t have any concept of racism, which I very much argued against. I was editing a piece on some Fidji soldiers that retired after 30 years in the British army. In the end the reporter asked one of them if his grandfather wasn’t the last cannibal. The whole point was to take the piss out of them. I edited it out, but was later blamed for taking the yummiest piece out, and had to put it back. Another example that makes me angry was an AIDS joke going around the newsroom. Gay equals Got Aids Yet? When a gay guy on the staff’s boyfriend was dying, I asked them to keep quiet, but they didn’t understand – or didn’t want to understand me. You can’t explain to someone that can’t see. I didn’t want to work with people that are that stupid. (Ruth, 1992)

Frances, Polly, Olivia and Ruth gave witness to the not so blatant and serious side of symbolic violence – relatively speaking. This includes being ignored, not being listened to, cracking sexist jokes, going for lunch/pub without asking, using tones of voices, and looks, talking about certain subjects (like sports) et cetera. The list can be continued on the professional level with the giving of «soft news» to women, or positioning them on certain beats on the grounds that they are better at it – because they are women.

Another, more blatant, way of practicing symbolic violence against female journalists was through name-callings. During the interviews all but three male journalists used derogatory names for and to their female colleagues. Girl, hen, darling, are examples of names, and girly, sexy, pretty, little, are examples of attributes, used to belittling female colleagues. Under the guise of friendliness and compli-
ments, these types of names and attributes are used to put women in their place, to make them, not professional journalists, but pretty little women – the other.

When female colleagues clearly refuse to accept this given role, but stride on, make a place in the important, power giving, masculine sphere of the dichotomised gender logic of journalism and are successful at it, reaching top positions as senior investigative journalists the name calling takes other forms. “She is a hard-bitten old hag.” “She is tough as old boots.” “Everyone knows she slept her way to the job.” “You know, she’s had an affair with the editor – that’s how she was given this job”. These are all examples of citations from male (and one woman – Iona) UK journalists I interviewed, describing successful female journalist colleagues. Let me give you one example from this depressing list. After I had interviewed Maureen in 1992 she introduced me to Steve, whom I was to interview next. He was terribly nice and polite to Maureen when she stayed, but the second she had left the room he turned to me and dropped the comment “She’s only going out with girls, she’s a dyke!” Later on during the interview he said:

[Men and women] … they are not really different. It’s though more difficult for women to be on TV because they have to dress differently every day, otherwise people complain. Also, they want to be primadonnas and stars much more than men. Like Maureen. She’s a hard-ridden old hag! … In a positive sense mind you. And she makes stories as well as I. But she’s perhaps softer than I. If you blindfolded all of us and gave us a set of information, the story wouldn’t be so different. … You know how she got her job. She knows the BBC management very well… [he blinked at me] (Steve, 1992)

Jenny told me several stories that deeply upset her about how she had been treated in the newsroom:

After I qualified I took a job at the [Tabloid]. That’s something women trainees rarely do since it has a reputation for testing you hard. A few days after I started some union macho types pressed me up to the wall and said. “We don’t take bloody trainees like you here”… And I was qualified! (Jenny, 1992)

What upset Jenny the most was not actually the physical violence as above, but the symbolic violence like back-talk and false discreditation that she experienced from her colleagues and managers:
When I’m working in uncomfortable areas [that clashes with doxa] I’ve found that other journalists tries to discredit me. Only the hardest can do that to colleagues. (Jenny, 1992)

Jenny was very hard hit by symbolic violence (see also Kitzinger, 1998) and because of it decided to leave journalism. Diana told a story that deeply upset her, and as Jenny decided to leave journalism (she later decided to return and worked for a political magazine in 2002)

It was a very macho culture. I was /as a senior reporter/ only asked to do the girly stuff. There were a lot of girls in the newsroom that really suffered. /…/ At some stage somebody went to the news editor and said that he needed to do something about women in the office cause they were all leaving. And interestingly I was warned. Before I went to [the national broadsheet] I went to a friend for tea. She used to be on the foreign desk and there were about five other women who had been on [the national broadsheet], and they were saying “Why are you going there?”. It was like five old girlfriends saying “Why are you going out with this new boyfriend – he’s shit”, but I just thought that [the national broadsheet] had a new regime with a new editor, and actually they were completely right. Anyway, I’m digressing – but I was warned. When another load of women were all leaving and one of the men said to the news editor, who was a bully really, an appalling bully, “Look, you need to do something about women on the newsroom”, and he said “Yes, we need more beaver in the place to brighten things up”. It’s on [the national broadsheet]! It was just horrendous! That’s macho male culture. And there were much more of these sexist jokes. And I thought “Oh God, have I come to this?” so I wanted to get out. There was an environment there that I found horrendous. There was this young hard working reporter – she was terribly nice and very good. She was on a three months contract, and needed a continuation, and she came up one day and said that the only way she could get the news-editors attention was to kneel down or stoop low so he could get a look at her cleavage. (Diana, 2002)

To this story I should add that when I had turned off the tape-recorder Diana told me several stories of outright sexual abuse that had happened to her and her female colleagues at this national broadsheet. I was however not allowed to re-tell the stories.

To all this one could say that this is all done face to face (well sometimes), and that it is just joshing and joking between individual journalists (I have heard that
argument often enough in discussions). However, in statistical terms, 60 percent of UK female journalists have had personal experience or knowledge of women being victims of prejudice in the newsroom (Henningham and Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003). This seems like a surprisingly low number. Every single UK female journalist I have spoken to have given me examples of what they have been called, of how often they have had their bottom pinched and bosoms stroked, how their texts have been ignored, dismissed, how their ideas for jobs have been pinched by male colleagues with the approval of the editors. But it is not only those women I interviewed that give such tales about symbolic violence in UK newsrooms. Similar results have been found in other studies during the 1990s (Egsmose, 1993; 1998; Ross, 2001; 2004; Chambers et al, 2004) The sheer number of examples indicates to me a structural pattern. This is the strategy of symbolic violence. In the UK.

And what about Sweden? The land where political correctness has been institutionalised, where almost every party-leader is a declared feminist, where every second journalist is a woman, the situation is below the surface very similar to the UK. Take away the self-professed gender equality of Swedish media, and the news-room is structurally similar. The gender logic is at large. Symbolic violence is similarly use. Monika Djerf Pierre and Monica Löfgren Nilsson (2004) show that – despite having a well thought out gender-equality plan – there has been a substantial backlash regarding gender equality in Swedish Television during the 1990s (see also Djerf Pierre, 2007a). Sometimes the strategy of symbolic violence is not at all hidden. Jan Guillou, the hero of Swedish investigative journalism, the then leader of the Swedish journalist trade-union lashed out in a very sharp attack against what he saw as a disastrous trend in broadcast investigative journalism. According to Guillou, experienced and well-respected (read male) journalists, were replaced by bimbo-reporters, i.e. young, pretty women. As consistently as was done in the obligatory textbooks on journalism courses, Guillou makes a clear connection between women and low quality, bad journalism. If the message is not received during the journalist training, or at every single morning meeting, if women think they can walk into the most prestigious and powerful programs, then the empire strikes back.

For years I have heard anecdotes about their newsroom experiences given to me by Swedish female journalists, which are similar to those tales British journalists told me. Particularly plentiful seemed the experiences of symbolic violence amongst women investigative journalists. Some of them chose to leave their prestigious job to get away from the everyday symbolic violence. Unfortunately it seems these anecdotes have been substantiated. The Association for Investigative Journalists’ (Föreningen grävande journalister) magazine Scoop published a volume on the
Gendered Journalism Cultures

theme The Macho Reserve (2007:1) where a gendered study of the SVT’s flagship Mission: Investigation (Uppdrag Granskning) is published (Leffler, 2007) and a number of journalists write about the gendered nature of investigative journalism in Sweden. The reason for this publication is said by the new editor of Scoop, Matilda Uusijärvi, to be a way to investigate the investigative genre of journalism and to put light to the women’s harsh situation in this business. Thus, again, scratching the surface ever so much and the gender logic is very similar between Sweden and the UK.

3.3. Men Experiencing Inequality

In Henningham and Delano’s (1998; see also Delano, 2003) study 31 percent of men answered that they had personal experience or knowledge of gender prejudice in the newsroom. That figure intrigued me. There were only a few of the men I interviewed, like Alistair, that seemed aware of women’s situation.

Both men and women have to be tough and take a lot of shit both from the paper and from sources; everyone is arrogant, self-centred and aggressive, because you have to be. The difference shows in the job. Not a single woman was sent to court or to murders. A woman would be sent to the widow or the kids. One woman started crying during a funeral she was sent to report at [he said with a sneer] and she was sacked after that. Women are best for the sympathy angle. /.../ XX, the big boss in London, calls them “psycho-bimbos” – he wants the women to be tough, but still feminine. It’s different at so called quality-papers. Women there are treated like little toys. /.../ Male journalists are much bigger bitches than any woman I’ve ever come across. (Alistair, 1992)

Most of the men I interviewed had a complex manner of, on the one hand seeing essential differences between women and men, but on the other hand seeing opportunities to be equal. Like Liam.

There’s no conscious policy as far as I know not to have women in this office. There would have been a different jargon had there been a woman working here. During the election a woman researcher was hired. We forget that women have a very civilising influence on us. You would naturally have asked different questions had you been a man. You wouldn’t have remarked that there are only men working here. In journalism there is equality. (Liam, 1992)
Or like Dave who recognised some structural differences, but did not really see it as a problem.

There are far more women than men in [The Tabloid] ... I think. It’s harder being a woman though. If they have kids it’s a big change. They have to leave work and it’s very tough to come back. Women generalists and news-reporters are mostly single. Other than that, men and women are not really different. (Dave, 1992)

It is indeed interesting to note that he thought that there were “far more women than men” in the tabloid, when there were in fact 20 percent women working there, including secretaries and receptionists. This overrating of the number of women, I believe, is because men feel threatened. Brian discusses these issues in a fascinating way, both in 1992 and 2002.

It’s swung the other way now. Men are worried that women get a positive discrimination. There are no differences, structurally – there are lots of women. There’s the Glass Ceiling though. Women can’t get to the very top. There are no women program editors, though there is no difference qualitatively. The only area that’s not equal is camera crews, which is a very physical job (Brian, 1992)

It’s easier for women to work with producing or some correspondent jobs, where you know your time-table. But then they can’t just go up and take a plane. So producing is what’s best for women. When it comes to the job itself, there’s no difference. There’s even some old cronies that complain that women are correspondents just because they are women, and that they didn’t get the jobs because of their talents. And they are not as good at the job as the old guard. But there are more women now. There are even those that say that it’s easier for women to get a job than men. And also if you’re from an ethnic minority. They work on it a lot here at the BBC. It’s a good place to work at. (Brian, 2002)

Again, on the one hand he recognises structural problems, but on the other thrashes equal opportunities, but does so in disguise of talking in third person. After I turned off the tape-recorder he continued to verbally beat up female colleagues. So did Edward and Nicholas, even though they were far more upfront about their feelings on tape.
Yes, things have improved, there are more women now. But I have to say I’ve always thought that’s been over-blown, this business of that men dominated. I think they did in television, but I can’t remember a time when I didn’t work alongside women. When I worked on my local newspaper in 1979, both the senior reporters were women, and on the sister-paper in Dumbarton, there were two other women and one man. On the printing side, there were no women, but that was a much more industrial side. On the journalistic side, you could call it the intelligent side somewhat provocatively, of the newspaper, women were always there. When I went to Radio Scotland, there were a significant proportion of women. The difference is, I don’t remember ever having a female boss… until recently. The [newsprogram] in London has a female editor. But I’ve always worked alongside women. They drank as heavily, in many respects they were just like the men. But they didn’t get the promotions to the very highest positions, and I think that hasn’t changed as much as it ought to have. The same with ethnic minorities. /…/ There’s only 1 percent ethnic minorities here, and if people see a lot of black faces on television… They’ve got to be careful. It’s another difficult balancing act for them [The BBC]. But I think is good that it’s changing but just like America, which suffered this, you’ve got to be careful you don’t sort of positive discrimination over-compensation. (Edward, 2002)

M: Do you think you could manage to do what you did when you did it had you been a woman?

Nicholas: I think it would have been a lot more difficult … at the time. There was a lot more reluctance then to send women to the kind of places like El Salvador and Uganda, and all that kind of thing, which I think has been overcome now. Having said that I now think it’s much much, much more difficult for a white middle-class male reporter to succeed in television, than a woman … or someone from an ethnic minority. The almost desperation to advance the careers of young women particularly, but also ethnic minority people is quite intense. The BBC, like a lot of large organisations, has a tendency to think of only one thing at a time. That is a high priority now. There are a lot of very good white middle class male reporters that are completely stuck because that is not the flavour. The people don’t want that. Or the people might want that, but the BBC wants to accelerate the careers of women and ethnic minority people very fast. And the holy grail is to come up with a hard-bitten women reporter, who can take her place doing the really major international stories. Like in America, there’s a lot of rather brassy 40-year old … well that’s a rather pejorative …
looked at me] they are not soft-centred kind of characters, driving around in
trench-coats on battle-fields. We’ve not been terribly successful of finding that
kind of people over here. (Nicholas, 2002)

M: Is that bad?

Nicholas: I don’t know if that’s bad or not, really. As far as I’m concerned I
couldn’t care less as long as the stories are reported well. But there are all sorts
of other issues that are slightly more important. The only reason I get to this
is that, if you’re a great woman reporter, sooner or later most of them – as in-
deed happens to males as well [be added quickly casting a glance at me] has to
reconcile the demands of their families with the demands of the job. And there
is now much more opportunities to present news-programs, because we have
24-hour news cast, and there’s not just the one bloke who does the evening
news. The news-channels use up dozens and dozens of presenters, so there are
plenty of more opportunities now to combine a journalistic job with some sort
of stability, or predictability in your work-pattern. And when, as is the case, you
get paid a lot more to read off an autocue, than go and get your balls shot off
somewhere, then the temptation to do that becomes overwhelming. It’s only the
very driven, who are either in love with themselves, or in love with travelling
and living out of suitcases, that go out on the road. And they tend to be men …
men tend to be more loop-sided emotionally. But there are more serious issues to
discuss. (Nicholas, 2002)

Again, I can see similarities between the fields of journalism in the UK and Sweden.
I believe that Dave, Brian, Edward and Nicholas give voice to a feeling of threat,
which, I further believe, puts a light to the statistics that intrigued Monica Löfgren
Nilsson (2007a). She shows that on the one hand, 57 percent of Swedish men jour-
nalists (compared to 81 percent of women) believe that the distribution of beats is
gendered (gender-typed). On the other hand 34 percent of Swedish men journalists
(compared to only 6 percent of women) believe that women are advantaged in the
recruitment to important positions in the newsroom. Men and women both in Swe-
den and the UK, thus, see gendered differences in the newsroom differently. Men
recognise differences in an essentialist way: the differences between women and
men are natural, and it is therefore not a problem that men and women do differ-
ent kinds of jobs as that is biologically given. The problem for those men is when
women start to threaten their position. And that is when they react with symbolic
violence. So how do women re-act?
4. TACTICS: FIGHT OR FLIGHT – COPing WITH JOURNALISM

As I have shown throughout this text, many female journalists in the UK and Sweden feel belittled, angry, frustrated, sad, and cynical. They like their job, but they hate the situation and culture they are in. Given the evidence of symbolic violence that I have also shown throughout this text, their feelings are not surprising. How they handle this varies, however, widely. They use different tactics to get a place in journalism. In the previous part of the chapter, there is one tactic, that of the Sexy marionettes, which I have only found amongst UK journalists I interviewed, and not in the Swedish studies. The other three tactics used by female journalists that I have found, are however noticeably similar in the Swedish and British journalism cultures. The Swedish situation is elegantly exemplified by the Swedish journalists Ann-Marie Lönnroth and Maria-Pia Boëtius (1991) discussion of their experiences of the gendered nature of Swedish journalists. They argue that the newsroom is a place of gender-based power, conflict and culture clashes and that female journalists, in their experiences had to use guerrilla warfare to assert their ways of writing and being a journalist. Boëtius said about the newsroom:

Us women are allowed in /the media/. We can have little islands, where we are allowed to write about things that interest women, or women are allowed to come in and do a traditional career, if they can prove they are a “manly man”. We could have female chief editors – absolutely – but only if they show, and preferably prove that they do not have any inclinations towards women’s issues or such matters (Lönnroth & Boëtius 1991:29f, my translation).

In Table 1 I have made a summarising table of the tactics used by the Female British journalists I interviewed. It is important to point out that none of them have used the terminology I am using. I have interpreted their stories and their behaviour during my observations. What is also important to bear in mind is that some of them have changed over the ten-year period, and as a consequence, some of them have changed tactic.
### Table 1: Tactics Used by British Female Journalists 1992-2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexy Marionette</td>
<td>Ailsa</td>
<td>Flight Sexy Marionette</td>
<td>Successful freelancer and owner of production company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Flight Sexy Marionette</td>
<td>Successful freelancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>Flight Sexy Marionette</td>
<td>Manager of BBC department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the Boys</td>
<td>Clarissa</td>
<td>One of the boys</td>
<td>Deputy editor for tabloid newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Flight One of the girls</td>
<td>Left to have children. Senior reporter at political magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>One of the boys</td>
<td>Senior broad-sheet reporter and famous radio presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Flight One of the girls</td>
<td>Freelance radio presenter, owns production company, plus lecturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgina</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Left to have children, started writing novel, wants to go back to journalism part time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Flight One of the girls</td>
<td>Was sacked, then senior reporter, then retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Flight One of the girls</td>
<td>Left to have children. Manager of BBC department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the Girls</td>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>One of the girls</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Left to have children. Wants to come back to journalism part time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lilidh</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Seriously ill from stress-related illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Stott</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>Legendary editor of woman’s page at the Guardian, retired, deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Full-time writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Lecturer in higher education. Deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>One of the girls</td>
<td>Senior television producer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Typologising the women into users of a particular tactic is one result of the analysis I have done. None of them have used my terminology themselves.
4.1. One of the Boys – Girl-Power

One – very successful – way for women to getting on in a man’s world, of getting a place of status, of climbing the steep hierarchical ladder in a field, is to beat the social bankers at their own game. They need to get to know the rules of the game, and thoroughly know how to play well. This Lovell (2000) shows in a historically based critique against Pierre Bourdieu’s pessimistic way of viewing opposing groups’ (e.g. women) possibilities of entering and conquering a social field. Think of the 18th century female sergeant major, Lovell writes. Think of Margaret Thatcher – the iron lady – clad in silk knotted blouse, or Barbro Alving in beret and trench-coat, or Kate Adie in bullet proof vest – the latter two reporting from the war of the time. All of them dressed in contemporary power uniforms.

In the studies I conducted in Sweden and the UK, and with support from secondary UK statistics, it is clear that this tactic, of choosing to be one of the boys, is popular and successful for Swedish and UK female journalists (see also Christmas, 1997; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; van Zoonen, 1998b; Delano, 2003; Djerf-Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Christmas et al, 2004). It is a tactic used to achieve status, power, and a career in journalism. To do so, it acquires the female journalist to adopt attitudes, behaviour and hexis according to the rules of doxa. They need to acquire capital that is considered masculine, which has high symbolic value and status in journalism, and that mainly men are in possession of. In this they are similar to those choosing a marionette tactic, but they go the opposite direction. They do not accept the given role of female journalist. And thus they do not accept the given beats or the given positions, nor given female hexis and manners. Quite the contrary, they fight, they enter into conflicts, they challenge editors’ choices, they act somewhat aggressive at morning meetings, or at sexual innuendoes, name calling et cetera. They want the «important» jobs, they want to cover politics, crime, foreign policy, war reporting. They disturb the peace. They question the gender logic of the field.

They do, however, not question the doxa. Quite the contrary, they internalise the doxa. They believe in that the end justifies the means, that revealing the truth – particularly in politics – is all-important, that investigative journalism is superior – the only real journalism, that distancing oneself is an important professional stance. In the Swedish study a remarkable find was that women with a journalism degree had the strongest ideal of all, that of the Bloodhound, i.e. that which had been the dominating doxa for the past couple of decades. And this ideal is considered masculine (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; Djerf Pierre, 2007a).

In an interview study of Swedish female journalists Eva Ekstrand supports this finding. One of her interviewees, Pia, has clearly adopted the (bloodhound) doxa. She emphasised that the “job of the journalist is to reveal corruption and misno-
mers in society” (Pia, in Ekstrand, 1998:54, my translation), and said about her readers:

It is my obligation to report as truthfully as I can about the parts of society, which they have so much harder to get an insight into, than what I do (Pia in Ekstrand, 1998:72, my translation).

Amongst the UK journalists that had adopted this tactic, it was clear they did not question the doxa, as Rose’s answer exemplifies (see also Melin-Higgins 1996c; 2003; 2004).

M: Is it possible to be objective?

Rose: It’s an ongoing quest, isn’t it? I mean, objectivity is very difficult, because we all come with things from a particular value system. But at the same I think it is always possible to stand outside it and ask yourself: “what is the truth of this story? Why is so-and-so saying X, and so-and-so saying Y, and what are we as journalists that are investigating the story on the ground, or doing the research, what do we think of different line that we are hearing?” So, I think that 100 percent objectivity is possibly not always possible. But I think all journalists know, actually, when they’re not being objective. All people can say is that is not an objective way of looking at it. (Rose, 2002)

In Olovsson’s study of Swedish tabloid journalists’ ethical ideal, Susanne defend her newspaper’s news-values, e.g. hunting public persons, like politicians, and dig into their personal lives.

Tabloid newspapers should investigate the power. Be unafraid, go further. Stand on the little person’s side. (Susanne, 2006, quoted in Olovsson, 2006:43, my translation.)

The results tell me that the women choosing this tactic need to hold firm to their beliefs – they need to know the rules of the game really well. They show this in other ways too. They internalise the doxa. The UK study shows that they became one of the boys in so much as they were part of the newsroom banter. They frequented the pub as much as «the other lads» (Melin-Higgins 1996c; 2001; 2003; 2004), as Frances shows:
I’m deep into the pub-culture, which is quite rare for women journalists. Women go home, men go to the pub. The pub-culture, which is prevalent among Scottish journalists, is for men, and it expands to the workplace. They talk at work the way they would in the pub. Hence women are seen as being boring, gullible and not witty since they’re not in the talk. … and that’s true though. (Frances, 1992)

They adapt their life-style to journalism; journalism becomes their lifestyle. This means a deliberate choice not to have children, and not to have permanent relationships. Elisabeth, Maureen and Frances talked of these choices and being happy about them, like Maureen.

I’m single. It would be very difficult for me to have a permanent relationship with the job I have. /…/ I eat out a lot, mainly with female – they’re single or divorced – colleagues. I don’t go to the pub with my colleagues, though. Men go to the pub or the [BBC] club, but that’s not as common as it used to be, and it’s much more common in newspapers. (Maureen, 1992)

Frances had, however, reconsidered her position and in 1998 talked of her personal failures.

All my problems are personal. Since then I’ve got separated, and am just about to get divorced. It is important to me, and a disappointment that we didn’t have children, and it’s probably getting too late. And I feel very sad that I have not managed to get a balance in my life at all. Despite me going on about workaholics, I’m the worst offender, and I’m becoming one sad bastard. But I see it, which is a start! I’m not sure what to do about it, though. (Frances, 1998)

Seeing these women’s tales through Bourdieu spectacled eyes, I read being «part of the newsroom banter», «in the talk» and «into the pubculture», and actually mastering the doxa, also as signs of having acquired the type of (masculine) capital that have – and give – high status in the field of journalism. Choosing to give up ideas of a family does not only mean favouring newsroom work, but also fertilising a social capital that is useful in journalism. Add to this that Frances and Elisabeth are the two women journalists I interviewed, which had a degree in journalism, then the UK and the Swedish fields of journalism again show strong similarities, in this case also in the importance of accumulating the right kind of capital (cf. Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2006; 2007a).
Choosing a Bloodhound tactic goes, however, further than acquiring the right kind of capital and thinking along with the *doxa*. Two years prior to the interview Frances had been sacked from the position of deputy editor of a broadsheet newspaper. She spent a lot of the (several hours long) interview talking of the reflections she had made. A lot of them were of personal character, like how masculine her appearance was.

I may have developed a lot of male characteristics, being uncaring. I’m constantly forgetting about friends’ birthdays and so on. And events other women tend to remember. I’m like a guy that way, and don’t seem to notice them. (Frances, 1998)

Rose had given considerable thought to her appearance as well, and it made her choose career path, away from on-screen correspondent to behind-the-scene editor.

Rose had given considerable thought to her appearance as well, and it made her choose career path, away from on-screen correspondent to behind-the-scene editor.

I liked being a radio reporter, but not on-screen TV. The hair-style and looks matters too much. There’s definitely a bimbo-effect in television. Reporting is the most obvious, but those are not the ones with power, and power is what’s interesting about the job. (Rose, 1992)

Most people do not normally comment one’s own or other people’s way of dressing. These women who had chosen the *one of the boys*-tactic were, however, objects of several comments from their colleagues (I gave some examples of this in the previous sections). Iona made comments on female journalists way of dressing in general, and Elisabeth’s specifically:

If Elisabeth had been herself, and not so butch, she wouldn’t have been respected. They look for male qualities. With a woman, looks definitely count. There are no unattractive women at the news-desk. YY and ZZ [that work for the Women’s Page at The Tabloid] are both very pretty. Elisabeth dresses like a man and is therefore more respected. There are two ways of getting on as a woman [journalist] one, become one of the boys or two, have a figure and face ... the vital statistics. (Iona, 1992)

Internalising *doxa* to the extent that one acts, moves, dresses accordingly, is what Bourdieu (1984; 1999) calls *hexit*. Using his terminology, these women thus changed their *hexit* to fit in to the culture of the field. The women I interviewed that
had chosen this tactic to be one of the boys had rather masculine gestures, and ways of dressing – one could even say they had taken masculine personas. None of them wore skirts. Few of them wore make-up. Most of them moved in masculine ways (see also Christmas, 1997).

This is indeed a successful tactic; all the UK women I interviewed in 1992, whom had chosen this tactic, had succeeded well career-wise ten years later. It is the group of female journalists that had risen the highest on the hierarchical ladder in the Field and was in 2002 famous journalists. They were also spontaneously mentioned by – mainly male – colleagues, as examples of brilliant female journalists. They were seen as «real journalists».

It is, on the other hand, a tactic that is almost impossible to combine with having a family. The female journalists that did have children left their career behind for a while. Two of those are, as I am writing this, in the process of coming back to good part-time positions. The other three have managed very well after returning to work to get a position that suited their life-situation. But in the process they have shifted their way of thinking about journalism.

There is another down-side. As I see it, they were all perceived as threats. Monika Djerf-Pierre (2003:46; 2007a:98) calls this tactic (historically used by Swedish female journalists) the strategy of competition. Given, of course, it cannot be a strategy in mine and de Certeau’s (1994) terms, the name points brilliantly to the position these women put themselves in: they challenge, they compete, they go to war head-first on men’s own playing-field. Many of the UK men – and a couple of the women – I interviewed hailed these women in one breath, but in the next pulled out the sword and cut them at their ankles: “but they think they can drink like the rest of us” … “but she has screwed her way to her job” … “but she looks more like a man than I do” … “but she’s a hard-bitten old bag”.

4.2. One of the Girls – Mission Impossible

Pierre Bourdieu (1998a) claims that journalism is a doxic field, with no discernable oppositional groups. In the studies I have conducted I found – quite the contrary – a clear oppositional group in the fields of Swedish and British journalism. Indeed, this has also been found in other studies and countries: the Netherlands (van Zoonen, 1998) Sweden (Djerf-Pierre, 2003; 2007a) and Finland (Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997). This oppositional group (or groups) consists mainly of women. Perhaps Bourdieu’s reluctance to see women possible of using their female capital, or female habitus, to their own advantage, refusing to submit to their submittance, has hindered him from seeing this oppositional group in his study of the field of
journalism (cf. Bourdieu, 1998a; 1999). With de Certeau’s eyes, however, it is plain that this is a powerless group, using every means at their disposal to enter into (guerrilla) warfare with the powerful. The tactic with which they have chosen to do so, I call one of the girls (see also van Zoonen, 1996/1998; 1998b).

What I found in both the Swedish and the British studies was that the women who chose this tactic wanted a career in journalism, but it was a secondary goal. Journalism itself, and their use of it were more important to them. These women were high-achievers, had university degrees to a higher extent than others, and came often from a middle class background. To them, journalism was far more than a job. It was an instrument through which they could express and develop their personalities. They had a mission with life, a mission in journalism (cf. Palme, 1992; Melin-Higgins 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; 2003; 2004; Broady, et al, 2002). Because their mission is more important than their career, they did not align themselves with the boys but instead with those like-minded. They became one of the girls.

Educators and Missionairies

In the Swedish study (Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996bb) I named this group educators. Köcher (1985; 1986) used the name missionaries, and Djef Pierre (2003; 2007a) called this tactic specialisation. Behind both these names were wishes to delve deep into a particular area of interest, to educate, to spread important news, to explain issues and events, to stimulate thoughts and ideas. There were in other words a clear mission regarding educating an audience about something special (Melin-Higgins 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; 2003; 2004; Ekstrand, 1998). But there were also differences. Let me give some examples from the British study to exemplify these differences. Olivia and Mary Stott both exemplify the more educational side of the tactic.

It’s important that it’s the Woman’s Page I work for. That’s the more feminist side of me and not so much a burning desire to be a journalist. […] [My role] … not that much, sadly! I assist in something that’s important to women. The editorial stuff is the most important of what I do. The job is about disseminating information to people. A bit like academia actually, but not as sophisticated. The principle is the same: inspiration, information. Seems a bit like PR sometimes, particularly Women’s page. We do a lot of puffing! (Olivia, 1992)

Mary Stott, the legendary creator of the Guardian Women’s Page talked to me of how she worked hard for women’s issues.
Between 1957 and 1972 I worked for the Guardian. It was the only Women’s Page at that time I would like to have taken over. It appealed to an intelligent audience. The others were all about knitting and recipes. I was exploring ideas and wrote about them but also got other people to write columns. The readers were very involved. I wrote a book [Women Talking] that started women’s groups. It was the most exciting feeling that I have ever had. Especially that they took issues from my book and the Women’s Page and did something about it. Women’s Page is still very useful. The Guardian’s first Women’s Page editor, Madeleine Linford, wrote a good Women’s Page, but it was mostly fashion and cookery et cetera. Now they don’t concentrate on that. It’s more sex now. I would never have printed that! It’s disgraceful to write about things [like sex] … yes distasteful. Women’s Page hasn’t changed for the better. The editor now doesn’t seem to think of readers’ responses. They’re not influencing their lives in any way. Well I did! I gave them a platform to discuss that [women’s issues]. (Mary Stott, 1992)

She continued by stressing her educational professional role as a journalist:

I want people to be stimulated by what I do, and then do something like setting up a group. My role is to enlarge their horizon. /.../ Journalists are like teachers, pouring ideas into pupils’ minds. (Mary Stott, 1992)

In Eva Ekstrand’s study of Swedish female journalists several of them has an educator ideal. Katarina speaks of a “primary school-teacher ideal”. She wants to “write so that readers learn something every day” (Katarina in Ekstrand, 1998:71, my translation) and let her articles take up space, as it is important to:

“explain things, and if there is a difficult word explains that to the reader, and sometimes even write footnotes for readers to learn things” (Katarina in Ekstrand, 1998:59, my translation).

Unlike Mary and Olivia, Diana and Frances had no section in which to work. When I interviewed them they had both fairly recently changed media-organisation, partly because of the increasing impossibilities of writing what was important to them, and what kept them going as a journalist. Diana was very happy with her situation, because she could speak out.
I find increasingly that [broadsheet] newspapers find the kind of injustice, social stories dull and boring, and they’ll run them occasionally. But I found it was getting harder and harder to get those kind of stories in. /…/ What’s nice about [the magazine] is that we still do them. At [the magazine] I’m completely anonymous so I lose the byline and all that kind of thing, but it doesn’t matter, cause I’m writing it and getting it in. [laughter] It’s quite nice in a way, cause people don’t know who’s written it especially since you’re writing it in a much more direct way and if we think the home-secretary is an idiot, you can say it. /…/ I’ve bee able to stay true to what I do by going here. I’m really lucky! (Diana, 2002)

When I interviewed Frances in 1998 she was very frustrated to have lost a position she had had that had enabled her to speak out.

M: Why did you become a journalist?

Frances: It’s the best way for women to intervene in social and political life. Particularly in Scotland. But I should have been a doctor or a politician. Here we’ve got an inverse relationship between the number of sassy women journalists and women in public life. People say “You’ve got Kirsty Wark, Kirsty Young, Ruth Wishert, Murial Grey”. The whole list is very impressive. But we shouldn’t put all the gender-eggs in one basket. Muriel should probably have been a businesswoman, and I certainly should. Or a poet… But I can’t rhyme. We should be making news, not frigging reporting on it. It’s too difficult to get into these other things. To answer your question, that’s why we’re all inmates here – because Scottish men can’t speak. Scottish men don’t speak, so women have got an opportunity to get in there, on particularly radio and television. /…/ I think that what it is, the attraction [of journalism] for women is a way of being in public life without hitting quite as many glass-ceilings and just pure naked prejudice. /…/ My aim of what I’m doing in journalism is … trying to change situations that are bad, not treating people so badly they get defensive about it and you can never go near that story again. (Frances, 1998)

Again, these statements about their purpose with journalism differ slightly from those of Jenny and Iona.

I had a fight with my parents so I left for Stirling to get away from them, hence not a doctor. Did history and sociology. /…/ I did a social works placement as part of my degree, but I hated it. I realised that I couldn’t make any changes.
Only for one person, not politically. After uni I did some free-lancing, mostly for women's magazines and mostly about sexual abuse. I had some older friends that abused their kids. That's why I got interested in the area. Also, I was involved in Women's Aid. [...] Another job [like journalist]... well it's social worker or something academic. It's because you investigate issues and try to cure and solve them. (Jenny, 1992)

I had a difficult teenage [said with a lot of tension]. ... and therefore I wanted to work with teenagers. I did Sociology and started as a trainee in social work but found out that I couldn't change anything. Journalists have more power. So after my degree I found a post grad course in journalism, which I decided to do. (Iona, 1992)

In Ekstrand's (1998) Swedish study Maj has more of a missionary ideal. She did a degree in social works and came into journalism because she was politically active and very socially interested. She wanted to do something. Journalism to Maj is to:

Change the world, society. One must realise whose side one is on, never keep the machinery behind its' back and never let oneself be used. One should be a tool for the little person, to give her comfort. And one can indeed do some entertaining, as long as one knows where one stands (Maj in Ekstrand, 1998:48, my translation).

I believe the difference between educators and missionaries is one of degrees. Whereas Olivia and Mary had a mission (feminism) with journalism, they mainly wanted to teach their audience about what they found important. Diana and Maj had much more politically outspoken goals with their work. They wanted to preach. And Jenny and Iona chose journalism because they wanted to achieve something. Not just to teach or preach, but to change society. They were doers. Finally, Frances, who in 1992 had a very clear-cut and typical bloodhound ideal, had undergone private and professional change shortly prior to the 1998 interview. This had forced her to re-consider her goals with journalism, and she became very clearly political, even joined a political party. In 2002 – as to make the connection with Köcher's missionary role complete – she taught journalism and feminism to women in Africa.

These women did not only have a mission to change society. They also wanted to change journalism. And as a truly oppositional group (in Bourdieu's terms), they did not only reject the gender logic of the field (like those wanting to be one of the boys), they were an allodoxic group. They saw through the doxa for what it was,
and rejected it (cf. Bourdieu, 1998). Ruth expresses this in her comment on the sexist culture of the newsroom and the tactics women take referring to the previous one-of-the-boys tactic, but also one that is taking a different stance:

[News journalism] that’s a men’s game! There are women that play it and women that don’t. Those that don’t go into a different kind of journalism. (Ruth, 1992)

Jenny was quite aware of the difficulty in her situation, but made tactical choices (see also Kitzinger, 1998):

There [at The Tabloid] they always send women out when a child was killed because they think women can make people co-operate better, but that we’re also too sympathetic and don’t want to do it. And we say so to the parents. … You know “Bathing Bells” the page three girls? I was forced to write the comments to them. But I wrote the wrong thing, though: un-sexy things. And then I wasn’t asked any more. /…/ Then I understood I had to create a niche for myself, otherwise I’d end up doing crap jobs for the rest of my life. The hard stories are exclusively for men. I chose health as I think it’s important. (Jenny, 1992)

Child abuse, women’s issues, Scottish politics, the Scottish legal system, feminism, ethical and race issues, are some of the specialisations the women I interviewed having chosen the one-of-the-girls tactic, worked with. They had all done what Jenny above voiced, namely created a niche for themselves. And this ties in with Monika Djerf Pierre’s (2003; 2007a) wording of the tactic as *specialisation*. She argues that the subjects, which women with this tactic have chosen, are those that especially appeal to women in general. Thus, again, it connects to Köcher’s (1985; 1986) and my own (previous) way of describing this ideal, or tactic. One obviously needs a *something* to educate and mission *about*. Something one finds both important, and which is different enough in normal, masculine journalism to make the basis of a niche market.

Having a mission with journalism also meant rejecting distance to the subject, or the job. It meant rejecting the holy grail of the *doxa*: reaching the truth through neutrality and objectivity. Even BBC reporters rejected neutrality and objectivity, and problematised the renowned BBC impartiality. In the Swedish study the result is supported by the low percentage of Educators believing in neutrality (Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c). In Ekstrand’s (1998) Swedish study Agneta (who did a degree in Cultural Studies, and not journalism) felt “hindered by the ready-made formats that journalists are forced into” (Agneta in Ekstrand,
She experienced the Guillou-complex amongst her colleagues as narrowing. Journalism is part of a male world, that goes too far in the hunt for sensations and she did not want to see herself there, nor did she want to see herself as a «real journalist». She rather wanted to go her own way, meaning:

To give a voice to those, which are not normally heard. And that is women and children and groups that not normally get in. /…/ To give an example. To see to that not only male researchers write (Agneta in Ekstrand, 1998:72, my translation).

Here are some UK journalists talking of their stance.

Neutral? [She said with a laugh.] Americans would say yes, the British would laugh. You could be more neutral than many are though. If you can’t you shouldn’t try. It’s better to be open about your views. … Neutrality is though important for credibility. (Olivia, 1992)

It’s not possible to be neutral, but it’s possible to write in an objective way. You always have feelings that interfere. It’s a fool’s paradise to be objective. (Ruth, 1992)

[Journalism] It’s so exciting. It has the potential for improving things in society. /…/ Journalists are there to question authority, to report, question and discuss what goes on in society. You can do a professional job. You can be neutral … but, there’s an establishment view. There are some stories you do where you feel you’re biased, but the others [colleagues covering the same story] are also biased, but they have a different opinion. There’s an establishment view that seems neutral but isn’t. For example, child-abuse cases. There there’s a very male way of looking at things. (Lilidh, 1992)

Diana exemplifies the allodoxa in another way. Despite having moved from seemingly different media and positions, those of being a home-affairs correspondent on a national broadsheet to working for a satirical magazine, she argued that the “stuff” (stories), the type of journalism she did, had not changed, but that her writing for the satirical magazine was more honest.

The nicer thing about it is that it is slightly more honest journalism in that, providing you are factually accurate, you can almost write it as polemic, and you
don’t have to phone the other side to get their side of the story, so this is a very
obvious honesty. It’s almost like writing leader-columns, and you don’t have to
go to some government department to dutifully get a quote about what they’ve
done wrong, or whatever. So, it’s writing it as it is, really. (Diana, 2002)

Indeed, subjectivity was what they aimed at, making their voices heard. This to
them meant honesty, and thus good journalism. Ruth and Frances talk of this.

Journalism is mostly about information packaging rather than going out find-
ing stories. [Current affairs program] finds interesting subjects and interesting
people and dig deep. It’s like reportage in news-paper journalism. /.../ It’s the
first time I’ve worked with real journalism. (Ruth, 1998)

M: Is neutrality a bad thing?

Frances: It’s a real biggy, this issue, let me think… I don’t generally think any-
body can be objective, that are not being terribly honest about where they’re
coming from. If you’re even taking a picture it’s a matter of how you’re framing
it. What is it you want to say? Until you know why it is you take a picture, so
you need know why you are going to do a picture before you even can see it.
Because everything about journalism, we can’t reproduce things. Speech doesn’t
even reproduce ideas that are in your head. Since you are actually doing a chop-
ing job every time you speak, you must know why you’ve gone in, and what
you are looking for, otherwise your chopping is completely random – and ut-
terly irresponsible.

M: Are you neutral?

Frances: No, I’m not neutral. … I think in a funny kind of way I’m getting closer
to that than I used to. It sounds a bit happy-clappy, but I generally believe in the
goodness of people. People generally think they’re working in a positive direc-
tion, and you can choose to frame them up if you want to, deliberately miscon-
strue what they’re doing, because it makes a better story. But a lot of the time
people are trying. Well, it doesn’t improve things just racking them down with
stuff. (Frances, 1998)

In this context I would like to give an anecdotal Swedish example, which clearly
shows that there are indeed journalists in Sweden who think in exactly the same
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lines. At a lecture in 2002 about differences in approaches to journalism with a class of my first year media-studies students, a famous Swedish investigative journalist was invited to speak about her work. When asked about what journalism is about she said:

Journalism is passion. It’s all about passion. For your job and for politics. To be a good journalist you have to like talking about politics with your friends at Saturday nights dinners. It’s not enough to merely ‘want to work with journalism’ or ‘to find news’ to be a good journalist. You have to be passionate. I don’t believe in objectivity. And I know that’s what all text books say is good journalism. No, you can’t be objective, and you shouldn’t be even if you could. You should always bring a bit of yourself into your job. (Swedish investigative television journalist, 2002)

Ethical Fighters

Both the Swedish and British journalists that have chosen this tactic also reject the behavioural part of the doxa. They reject the tough and ruthless part. To them, there is no end that could possibly justify breaking ethical codes, and generally be ruthless. Indeed, this is not surprising, as attitudes and behaviours are naturally tightly linked. In the quotation above, Frances does not only point to being subjective herself, but she also sees those whom she writes about as subjects. Doing that has ethical consequences. Iona and Jenny give some more voices to this.

The police is very Masonic, and therefore many crime writers are Masonic to get to the sources. Their attitude towards things, for example rape-victims, isn’t responsible. The [Tabloid] named a rape-victim and the consequences was that the journalists were banned from rape trials. And the consequences for the girl…? So many things in journalism are done for the wrong reasons (Iona, 1992)

It’s worrying that journalists today are both very influential and irresponsible at the same time. I’ve publicly criticised other journalists for doing so. I’m not one of them! I’m different because I analyse things journalists do. (Jenny, 1992)

Jenny also gave a specific example to explain her stand:

A four-year old girl died of AIDS that she got from her mother that in turn got it from a blood-transfusion. When the girl started school all reporters on the
case hung around the school. I refused to do it. They ought to have thought of the family. But they never do. When the girl died photographers almost fell over their heels to get a good picture of the coffin leaving the house. Neighbours stood around the coffin to guard it from journalists. Then The Sun wrote that the parents had hired body-guards to protect them from angry neighbours. Just as they wrote that parents in the girl’s school were upset when she went to school, when in fact they were upset over the journalists’ behaviour. That family taught me more about how journalism should work and how it shouldn’t than anything else. (Jenny, 1992)

Why I see this group as truly oppositional and thus truly threatening is because they challenge not only the gender-logic and the doxa of the field, but its entire culture. They challenge the structure of the field itself. They go further than challenging the field by using their female capital fully and thus by specialising in subjects and genres that are connected with femininity, as Djerf Pierre (2003:47; 2007a:98) argues. No, they do not passively let themselves be controlled, or pushed into a female sphere like their colleagues who have chosen the tactic of sexy marionettes. Instead they do not accept the submission, and lower status the so-called feminine sphere of the dichotomised gender-logic of journalism (cf. Djerf Pierre, 2003:45; 2006; 2007a:97; Djerf Pierre and Löfgren Nilsson, 2004), even if they might have been placed in this subject area. Instead they have more often actually chosen to work within the so called feminine sphere, because they think it is important. Furthermore, they fight, at morning-meetings, in the news-room, in every way they can, for better positions and to increase the importance and space of their sphere.

In terms of culture things have gone a lot better. It’s no longer tolerable to have pornographic pictures on the wall. The really crude sexist stuff is gone. But things are stuck on the next stage. I have the freedom to say what I want in print. I’m allowed to be a feminist and have feminist campaigns, which was not the case ten years ago. But it’s got a woman’s stuff-box around it. And I have to fight every day to retain it. (Polly, 1992)

Frances had come to a point in life where she was fed up with the constant sniping and fighting, and she had come up with another tactic at morning meetings:

Guys don’t think they are excluding women. They just don’t. And they don’t see how they’re doing it, and they get fed up with women sniping all the time. At a meeting the deputy editor went through a job list, and it was a very testosterone
driven list, and one of the female reporters said exactly that, that it’s a very testosterone driven list. Well his body language was amazing. He rocketed back in his chair as if he got hurt. Defensive, folded his arms. And [name of female journalist] ended up looking belitterant, sitting forward in her chair, because she expected an argument, which she then got. But, the editor said ”It’s not enough for you to say it’s testosterone driven. Give me some ideas!” I knew this would happen, and I actually had seven ideas written down. /…/ Of course, everyone livened up, cause they were all hot and sexy stories, not like what would happen when Jeltsin was gone. I went through the list, and was very quick about them. The editor said “Excellent! All of those can go straight in!” A few years ago I would have let the newseditor sweat and made him lose his face. Now I saved his neck and got my stories in. (Frances, 1998)

One way of increasing space is to fight, or negotiate for new space; new programs, pages, sections, columns, beats, and even media, which indeed some of the UK journalists I interviewed talked of having done, and they talked of its importance. Lilidh and Frances were part of a co-operative women’s group that started a feminist magazine. They both loved it!

[The Feminist magazine] is spare time and not paid. My task there is more managerial. I love it! Working with other women! We get things done … there’s not so much politics and playing with egos going on. It’s more co-operative. (Lilidh, 1992)

At the BBC the routine takes over. What’s important is to produce news. Often young cheap journalists are used to save money, and they are unsure of themselves and trust the routines. Hence sloppy stories. At the [Feminist magazine] creativity is much more important. To get good ideas. There isn’t the same hierarchy there. No one is the chair-person. Personal skills are more important at the [Feminist magazine] whereas the male structure is more important at the BBC. This might be a female type of hierarchy … then hierarchy isn’t such a bad thing. At the [Feminist magazine] people are not afraid of asking if they don’t know something, which is a problem at the BBC. Here there’s no male status thing involved. (Frances, 1992)

Mary Stott (as I have previously spoken of) and Ruth left newsroom environments to create a woman’s page and a current affairs radio program, respectively. Ruth says:
Now I work with right-on women. There are mostly women in the department, even the head. There’s a totally different atmosphere … but not necessarily because they’re all women [she added hastily]. (Ruth, 1992)

One of the advantages of getting one’s own space was the control over areas of interests – important content – and indeed the structures of the space. This was the most obvious amongst those that had created their own medium.

**Having Children and Networking**

Another advantage of freeing space was freeing time. Most of those UK journalists having chosen the One-of-the-girls tactic had also chosen a life outside – or alongside – journalism. All of them had a spouse and children, and it was important to them, as Lilidh expresses:

I’m ambitious but not willing to destroy my family life. You can do a good job and not let it ruin your life. A lot of men have a more macho attitude, “do the job and forget the family”, so many of them are either alcoholics or going that way. I would like to socialise more with other journalists and go to the pub with them and so, but on the same time not let it take over my life. I like having friends in the business, but I tend to go out with friends and relatives. But as all mothers I have a problem with baby-sitters. I think I go out more than most women with small children, but I don’t go to the theatre or cinema. It’s very tough, you know, mortgage, short of cash and so. /…/ I’m one of the few women journalists I know that has young children [2, 6 and 11 years old] and I would very much like to have another child, but can’t afford it. You know, time off. It’s a matter men never have to consider. (Lilidh, 1992)

Having a family despite continuing to work in journalism was an important choice, one that has not been necessary to the same extent in Sweden, as I have previously argued. The similarity lies, however, in the way private life was admitted into journalism.

I can’t separate myself as a person and as a journalist. I’m one. /…/ I talk a lot of politics with my husband. He gives me such an input. He is the most important factor in my life. Both for me personally but also professionally as a journalist. (Jenny, 1992)
The biggest influence on my being a journalist is my husband being a black Londoner. That way I could see how racist the press is... It's not that he is my husband, but knowing some one close that's black. (Ruth, 1992)

Many of the women choosing the, in many ways toughest, strategy of being *one of the girls*, also chose to have a family-life alongside a career in journalism. They solved this in very different ways, but in common was the fact that they were all struggling with the balancing act. Diana solved her difficulties by quitting the editorial work for a large broad-sheet in favour of a 50 percent job as a special correspondent (on her favourite beat) on a bi-weekly magazine, and spent the other half of her time with her family.

I enjoy my family life a bit more, and I’m also starting to do a book I’ve wanted to do for a very long time, that may or may not see the light of day. /.../ I work from home on the Monday, come up here [to London] on a Tuesday morning, and I usually get to go back on a Thursday night. I spend much more time with [my son] than I would have done working full time on a national daily. I’m only really away three days in a fortnight. My husband is retired so he’s looking after them when I’m away. That’s great! /.../ I’m really happy. (Diana, 2002)

Choosing to have a family and continuing to work in journalism is a very difficult choice to make in Britain with difficult and tiring consequences. If not sooner, it became overwhelmingly clear when I interviewed Ruth in 1998. She had managed very well to negotiate a position from where she could both produce what she saw as important television programs, and be with her family. Everyone was not as lucky. Susanne, a colleague television producer of Ruth’s, was preparing a program and rushing around, obviously under stress. When she said she did not have time to answer my questions, her colleagues commented her in various ways. Her female colleagues made excuses for her: “You know, she’s really stressed. She’s trying to do it all in half a day. God knows how she can do it!” or “She’s got two kids, and working fifty percent, but tries to cram everything one does in a 100 percent job into half a day.” Her three male colleagues, on the other hand, made only derogatory comments about her, such as: “She used to be out and about much more before she had kids. She was much more fun then”. “Watch it, she’ll bite your head off. Motherhood makes strange things to a person”. These comments put Diana’s comments on working part-time as a news-correspondent on a national broadsheet into perspective:
Working three days a week was the undoing of my career there [National broadsheet] (Diana, 2002).

Challenging the *doxa*, i.e. challenging the elite group’s right to define *doxa*, and in many cases choosing to have children at the same time, places this group in a difficult position. Entering into war means you have to be prepared to fight daily battles, which is wearing, and a heavy price to pay. This is of course not specific to the field of journalism in the UK, but is something that would hit any woman in any profession in the UK. This general patriarchal structure does indeed affect the women I interviewed in the UK filed of journalism. Over the 10 year period, journalists who in 1992 used the challenging tactic of being one of the girls talked of their fatigue. Some continued to fight on relentlessly, despite hard setbacks. One way to handle war is to close ranks. It became clear to me – looking over the 10-year period I studied the UK culture – that creating a social network that served to give support was utterly necessary to survive the field if choosing a tactic that openly challenged the *doxa*. Indeed, Monika Djerf Pierre (2003:41; 2005; 2006; 2007a) argues that in Sweden, female top journalists have substantially larger social capital than male top journalists do, and they have a larger network, more mentors and supporting people around them. The situation was similar in the UK (Delano, 2003). Olivia argues that networking was important if you want a career.

I have some journalist friends, but not as many as Louise, or other journalists. Lots of journalists have a very strong network of journalist friends. It’s important if you want to have a good career. I don’t do it, because I’m not interested in the career-bit. I really want to write novels. I feel different because of my interest in literature. My friends are more of a book-circle. (Olivia, 1992)

Ruth argues that networking is not only good for one’s career, but for support, and thus the general well being.

When I started I was the only woman in the newsroom. Now one editor is a woman and there’s one woman out of four producers. All the researchers are women. The last five years things have become much more equal. The number of women is higher and so is the quality, and that is because women have become bosses. That changed the atmosphere for women at work and to work. The support has increased. Men have their *old-boys’ network* and women are left out. Now professional women start giving each other support and form a network. (Ruth, 1998)
Given the amount of symbolic violence the women I have interviewed have experienced, they do need support. There were, however, other UK journalists that did not manage the culture, despite looking for support from others. Out of the six journalists I interviewed that had chosen the tactic of being one of the girls in 1992 (the retired Mary Stott excluded) only one (Ruth) still worked in a newsroom in 2002. The others had by then chosen to use another tactic, namely that of leaving the newsroom, but still trying to keep their professionalism as journalists (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; 2003; 2004).

4.3. Flight – Space Control

When the strategies of the dominant group in the field become too much, there are a number of ways for individual journalists to handle the situation. One way of retreating from the war of the newsroom, but still stay in journalism is to go freelance. In Sweden the proportion of women freelancers were higher (46 percent) than women in journalism (34 percent) in 1989, whereas the proportions were the opposite in 2000: 41 percent of freelancers were women, and 45 percent of journalists in general were women (Djerf Pierre, 2001a; 2007a; Malmström, 2001). In the UK I interviewed one freelance journalist in 1992 (Iona). She had chosen to go freelance as she, as a court reporter, felt trapped in the news-room. Newspapers focus too much on crime reporting, she argued, and forget the legal angle, thus as a freelancer, she was able to write better journalism.

I don’t need to go and collect picts, as so many journalists have to do. I don’t like door-knocking. /.../ I have a chance to be critical since I’m not tied to any of the papers. (Iona, 1992)

But also adding:

I do what I do for the regular hours and because I’m more in control of what I’m doing. (Iona, 1992)

Being more in control of their situations seems to be an important incentive to go freelance. Like Iona, Frances had experienced really rough tumbles in her career, and both their newsroom experiences were spiced with symbolic violence, which had hindered them from doing what they wanted. Ailsa and Amanda had taken the opportunities of changing organisational structures to go freelance. For all four of them this has turned out really well. The reason is probably because they were well
known journalists to start with, they had built up both a niche for themselves, and a professional network to support their work. Going freelance thus became a way for them to enhance their career, and to be able to do the kind of journalism they wanted.

This was not the primary reason why four other journalists I interviewed chose to become freelancers in the period between the interviews. Diana, Georgina, Rose, Jenny and Polly left their newsroom employments to have children, because they could not cope with the pressures and hours of the job with small children. They also said they wanted to return back to work as soon as possible. Polly, who had had her children, and gone freelance prior to the 1992 interview said:

There are only two working mothers at the [Broadsheet] and only four in the big Scottish newspapers that I know of. It’s impossible to be a [female] journalist on staff and see your children. (Polly, 1992)

Previously in the chapter I have described the strain female journalists are under when deciding to have children or not, and the strain they are under when actually having children. This is not a strain most British male journalists experience. Nor do Swedish female journalists. Indeed, Anthony Delano (2003:283) points to UK government statistics in his argument that there is an internationally and historically unique situation in the today’s UK in that women take a several year break from work for child rearing. In Delano’s own journalist study he sees the result that far more women than men journalists intend to take a break from journalists, and intend to work freelance as a reflection of these statistics. Still, I argue that the fundamental structure is the same in Sweden and the UK. The dip in the number of Swedish female journalists in the age group between the ages of 30 and 40 has been explained with women quitting journalism for a time to rear a family, as is there has been an increase of female freelancers (Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; Malmström, 2001; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). Behind these statements lies a notion that women stay at home with children and men do not, and also that it is difficult for women to manage a career in journalism with small children. In Sweden as well as in the UK. Swedish government statistics support this (SCB, 2008)21.

Going freelance has, however, meant that Diana, Georgina, Rose, Jenny and Polly have more control over both their time and subjects, as Iona pointed out as an advantage to being freelance. Georgina and Jenny worked with web-journalism, and were able to do so from home. Rose started her own production company. Diana and Polly worked as writing freelancers selling to broadsheet newspapers. Common for the five of them was that they were not entirely happy with their situ-
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misery. They missed “the hub” of the newsroom, and they wanted to get back to the safety of working on staff. In the 1990s UK being a fee-lancer did not have glamorous connotations, nor did web-journalism, although the latter might be changing along with increased used and thus importance (as it has in Sweden). And both jobs were paid less than a newsroom position. In other words, choosing the tactic of fleeing the newsroom, although it is creating a space to continue with journalism despite having children, is both socially and financially insecure (see also Robinson, 1998; 2005).

When their children reached school age, all five of them wanted a staff job. Diana managed this in 2002, and considered herself really lucky, as I showed in the last section, and Georgina got a part-time job she liked in 2005. As Olivia states, getting a staff job is difficult:

I only work three days per week, the rest of the time I write on my novel, which is part of the MA in fine arts I’m doing. I’m called “deputy editor”, but I’m not hired by [The Broadsheet]. I’m on a freelance contract, which means no security. I probably won’t get a staff-job here on [The Broadsheet] because of the NUM. Staff jobs are highly paid and the union therefore decides how many jobs there should be. I’m paid half of a staff-salary. (Olivia, 1992)

Rose did, however, find a way back to staff position, but not as a journalist. She had left the status-filled position of news-editor. Being in senior positions did not exempt women from the strategies of the dominant culture. Quite the contrary. Both Rose and Flora, who was also a broadcast editor in 1992, talked of being harassed and not wanting to stay in the newsroom. Both chose to leave the newsroom, but stayed in the media organisation as administrative executives. They talked of how they enjoyed their space, but also how they missed “journalism proper”.

Polly never found a staff-position in journalism.

The core problem is commitment. I don’t want to spend 14 hours six days per week in the office. Half a year ago I started to be given less and less work. It tends to happen to women at a certain age, when they get more and more marginalised. They become freelancers, like me, or do PR-jobs. There’s an age-factor involved; it happens to women in their fourties. But it’s also fundamentally sexist and not a child-care problem. Men can age and go on in the career structure, but women reach a sell-by date. I’ve given up on journalism. But it has also to do with the election results [The Conservatives won] and I intend to do a PhD in women’s social history. I’ve failed in journalism! (Polly, 1992)
Indeed, in the ten years that passed between the interviews, two women who were in that age-gap (Maureen and Frances) became victims of re-structuralisation and had to leave their staff-positions. Polly’s bitterness was tangible. Because of this, the interview was rather awkward to do, but it gave me an insight into the survival instincts that became the reasons to leave journalism. Also, I heard her being commented by colleagues for being “a pain in the butt”, “a radical feminist”, “a man-hater”. The period of a year or so that followed after the interview I noticed that Polly’s columns became rarer and rarer. She did, however do what she wanted to do, namely to go into academia. Unfortunately she became ill and died before I had the chance of interviewing her a second time.

A colleague of mine at the time, Pamela, asked me if she could partake in my study, as she had so much to tell about journalism. As so many others, she had very negative experiences of the newsroom environment. Eventually she, as Polly, “escaped” to journalism education, where she found a space that was free of harassment and was easier to control her time, and thus spend more of it with her family (she had two children). Choosing journalism lecturing as a profession could indeed be a way for individual journalists to manage their space. Getting regular hours, at the same time the job is challenging, creative and important, but also, getting possibilities to use one’s “journalistic capital” – to paraphrase Pierre Bourdieu – seems like a very good alternative to stressed and frustrated women. One could, however, also argue that journalist education can be seen as a collective tactic, a topic I will delve into in the next, more reflexive, chapter.

Pamela did, however, not go straight from journalism into academia. She took the roundabout way through public relations, a field she found time-wise suiting her family-life. But her position did not give her enough mental space, and she found that she was not in enough control of her work-situation. Academia suited her better. In Sweden, it has been argued, public relations is indeed a route for female journalists to get space for both family and (cf. Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1996a)

There is one final, more tragic way of leaving the newsroom: through illness. Two Scottish female journalists, Polly and Lilidh, were ill for longer periods because of stress-related illnesses. Both tried to have a career in journalism, and have children. Lilidh was very devoted to both her three children and to journalism, and in 1992 talked of her determination to fight the culture at the tabloid she worked at, and for getting a career, and starting a feminist magazine, and having a social life – indeed wanting more of a social life, and having another child. She wanted to do everything. She now no longer works in journalism.
[The best about journalism is that] it’s exciting. And has a potential for improving things in society. Generally speaking I love it but the worst is becoming addicted to it, talking work at home, being a news-junkie. I can’t read books anymore. I’m used to look at things quickly. I would rather work for the Herald [than The Tabloid], because I’d like to do quality paper journalism. And I’ve worked hard for it. But I know that all this writing about feminism and kicking up fuss about sexism would prevent me from getting it. (Lilidh, 1992)

In 1999 she was taken seriously ill and was later diagnosed with chronic fatigue decease. She was too ill to do the second interview.

The tragedy of Lilidh’s and Polly’s professional lives must not take away the attention from my main argument regarding the tactic of flight – space control. Fleeing the newsroom is tragic in the sense that the women who have opted for this, often are forced by patriarchal structures and symbolic violence to do so. But one can also see the tactic of flight as survival instinct. It is a way of finding new usages of ones aggregated capital. Monika Djerf Pierre (2003; 2007a) names a third way for Swedish women journalists: the strategy of expansion. They seek out the empty spaces, the weaknesses of normal journalism, use those to their advantage and create new genres and styles in un-gendered territory. They expand journalism. In Michel de Certeau’s (1994) eyes this is a truly creative guerrilla tactic. And I believe this is the way to see those British and Swedish women who leave the newsroom and search for new opportunities. Not tragic at all. But very strong and creative.

5. MALE OPPOSITION

In this chapter there has been a lot of talk of women journalists, and it is easy to understand if someone takes this as meaning fundamental, essentialist differences between women and men. If so, I would like to correct this image. I do not hold an essentialist view of gender. I do not believe that differences in approach to journalism between men and women that work as journalists are naturally or biologically given (for further discussion of gender see chapter one). Rather, I have pointed to differences between the women I have interviewed and indeed some of them, those that have chosen a one of the boys-tactic, have to a large extent accumulated masculine capital and even adopted a masculine hexis. In a comparative analysis it is, however, too easy to forget the individual people, and only pencil out the larger patterns. To avoid this, I would like to point out an anomaly in the neat pattern I have previously presented. There are some male journalists that broke the codes of their field, and create their own – oppositional – pattern.
5.1. The Family First

There were two journalists with children that did not adopt the practice of letting the career come before their family. When their children were small, their wives stayed at home. After a while, this became a problem for them, and they did their best to change their working conditions.

The irregular hours when they were young were difficult for my wife. She was left in the evenings and nights, as I was a sub-editor and not a writer at the time. It was good cause I had the days to be with the kids. It’s easier now. My hours now have become more 9-5, even though I’ve worked sometimes on reviews shows. And I have the liberty to work from home one or two days a week if I want to. It’s more like a vocation. (Charles, 1998)

My wife is a school administrator. It’s great because she gets school holidays. Lucky for me she was willing to stay at home and look after the kids. Once you have kids, … I didn’t want to go off and visit all these places, if I got kids at home that I didn’t know. And the best compromise was to work with regional correspondence at home in the UK, where you know you could bring up a family without being stuck in Chechnia for three months. … So now you know how unambitious I am. (Edward, 2002)

Finding a way around the various pressures at work meant making choices and compromising, as Edward points out. To Charles it meant leaving the sports desk and working with feature. To Edward himself it meant not going abroad as a foreign news correspondent.

So, it’s been good really, and I’m relatively contented. There’s always a compromise, and the family is the compromise, in the sense that if you want to do foreign correspondence, then you can’t. And my personal view is that you can’t do that with a family. In that kind of cutthroat environment you’ve got to give a 100 percent to the BBC, be prepared to go to war-zones, all of which is fine. But you can’t do that if you’ve got someone that’s looking after the family, and they’ve got a job they’ve want to do and are equally dedicated to. So, it’s very hard to do both very successfully. (Edward, 2002)

Apart from choosing a beat that worked well with having a family and thus getting comfortable working hours, both of them chose to move away from career-wise
very good positions in England, and they chose to say no to London-offers they had had since they moved up to Scotland.

I would have a great deal more status if I worked for an English newspaper. They hardly know where Glasgow is. I’ve had possibilities to go down to London and work there, but it’s becoming more and more impractical due to my family. /.../
There’s a bigger rat race down there, and therefore bigger rats. There’re more career-oriented and more willing to blind themselves to the moral issues of what you’re doing with the story. They’re doing anything to get a story. (Charles, 1998)

There is an important difference between the two of them, namely that Edward is happy being “unambitious”, to use his own word, which means he has fought to get a working position that is comfortable for his family. Charles did, however, have other reasons apart from family. He worked against the entire culture, he rejected the doxa it self.

5.2. Rejecting the Doxa

Statistics could be read in many different ways. In the Swedish study from 1989, the Educator was strongest amongst women. Relatively speaking. In numeral terms, there were actually more men that held the educator ideal than there were women. About one third of male Swedish journalists agreed with the Educator ideal to some extent (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996b). Even if the patriarchal power structure can explain the structure of the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK it does not imply that all men accept this, nor that they adhere to the doxa.

In the UK study two men, Charles and Magnus, had chosen to reject the doxa. They were both very critical of the journalism that went on around them.

My function? It’s to break news and move the market. To cover what’s happening and make things happen. A good article is good if the share prices move up or down. ... Also, to provide analysis. To explain things. And also try to get others to write about my area, foreign correspondents. /.../ There’s a problem with time [in journalism]. The paper takes as much job as you want to write, that is, write as much as possible. So we write. [The broadsheet] staff is insecure over-achievers! ... It’s irritating about the job that you always have to simplify, that is you make judgements even before the article is written. It’s frustrating that you can’t get the subtleties in the article. (Magnus, 1992)
It’s in my nature [to differ from normal journalists]. I worry about things, to try to make them as good as I possibly can. And try not to make up excuses for things not being as good as they should be. /.../ I’m better than them. Manifestly it’s better to think as much as you can about whatever topic you write about. I try to give myself as much time as possible to arrive at the conclusion, which is the article that you write. And just the notion of starting from scratch, and ten minutes later, you write x amount of words on this topic, and it’s hard work, but it’s a real sense of achievement of having spoken to as many people as you can. Who should I speak to? And not actually believe them. Who should I be sceptical about? All these sort of qualitative judgements. It’s all part of a process that I find fulfilling. I would always try to understand. And the process of understanding should communicate itself in what I write. If I’ve understood this, hopefully I ought to be able to write it in a way that helps you to understand it as well. (Charles, 2002)

Both Magnus and Charles talked of the problems they had with lack of time, as they needed more of it to make better analysis, to write better, and thus provide better understanding. Keywords they used, like evaluate, analyse, understand, interpret, communicate and inform the audience, are very similar to those used by the women who chose one of the girls tactic. And indeed, Charles and Magnus had a similar qualms as those women about being neutral, and finding the truth-and-nothing-but. Charles explained this view in 1992 as a trying to be honest, rather than objective.

Sports [journalism] has nothing to do with the truth. The news is artificially created. With culture [journalism] you have to go out and find a story. There are different values of what makes a story. Sports journalism is an artificially set of circumstances, for example an injured foot. /.../ I’ve never seen my role differently despite the step from sports to culture. My role is to get facts, be honest, to inform and to entertain and help the whole process of understanding. In sports all that is difficult because no one in sports is interested in doing that. They’re not interested in reality and the truth being printed. (Charles, 1992)

It is interesting to note that although Charles admitted to letting his emotions and views into his stories, he still wanted to be «objective».

Yeah, I’m bringing my thoughts and feelings into thinking and trying to understand why I’m liking or not a piece of music. (Charles, 1998)
Well, every journalist ... you can’t become invisible or opaque, I don’t think. If you do, then anything you produce is completely worthless. You have not evaluated anything you’ve been given. You have to go through a process of evaluating, cause you have to decide who to speak to, who to believe. And that’s where my comment’s come from. I’m not just saying “this is right, this is wrong”, I’m involved in each step of the way. (Charles, 2002)

I’m trying to be objective, trying with every mean I’ve got to transmit my enthusiasm. (Charles, 1998)

You have to make objective, or distant judgements about things. “I like this guy, but...” (Charles, 2002)

I believe the reason for this seeming anomaly lies in the fact that the doxa has so thoroughly impregnated the notions of what is journalism, and is also so tightly tied in with trustworthiness, that it is very hard to avoid using the term «objective» when describing what one wants to achieve as a journalist. Charles did, however point out that he tried to be “objective in a subjective way”. This, again, is similar to the approach of those women who chose one-of-the-girl tactic. There was a difference, however, between Charles and Magnus, in that Magnus did not align himself with anyone. Charles did, though, feel more comfortable working with women. He had even worked at the Women’s Page for a couple of years. This had made him aware of female journalists’ problematic situation

I felt uneasy working there [Women’s Page]. Why is there a section called Women’s page? Are the rest men’s pages? Women become ghettoised. They shouldn’t be. If you should have special women’s pages there should be women working there, not me. But I couldn’t refuse the offer because it was a huge promotion for me. I did actually OK at it. /.../I prefer to do the more emotional stories, like the ones most women journalists are sent out to do. Much rather that than the knots and bolts story. Women have disadvantages, though. They aren’t taken terribly seriously, and women who want to do knots and bolts stories have a hard time. (Charles, 1998)

Like the women who rejected the doxa, Charles and Magnus rejected the pub-culture. They were both critical of journalists that spent their lunch and teatimes in the pub.
There’s a very romantic view of news-reporters: cynical, wild-eyed, drunk detectives that want to find the truth. But the truth is that they can’t see further than the bottom of their glass. (Charles, 1992)

_M, 2002: My impression is that you are not like other male journalists._

_Charles: I take that as the highest compliment I have ever had about my job as a journalist! I don’t actually mix very well with other journalists. (Charles, 2002)_

They had both made an active choice not to partake in the pub-culture, although they were both aware of the fact that the pub was a continuation of the newsroom, and that they thus missed out on office-politics, jobs and promotions.

_I don’t take part of the pub-culture. I go to the cinema, theatres, listen to music, et cetera. But I don’t spend three hours at lunch in a pub. I don’t like journalists, and I don’t feel apart of the Scottish journalist culture. I feel that I’m more influenced by impressions when I’m sober rather when I’m drunk. But that makes me miss out on office-gossip and politics. (Charles, 1992)_

_A number of journalists [from the broadsheet he works at] go down to the pub for an hour or so after work. I only go two to three times per year. The office politics is conducted there, but I’m not interested in it. And my career suffers because of it. I should have lobbied harder [at the pub] for that foreign post in Paris that I didn’t get. … Since Fleet Street broke up the Fleet Street culture also broke up. Now you only meet people from other newspapers at press conferences. Never socialise with them. I go to the theatre, the cinema, for dinner parties, or give them. I normally leave the office at 7:30 and then do something. I have lots of journalist friends. Well two sets of friends really. University friends, lots of lawyers and one politician, and then journalists. But I know them all from college. From Cambridge. (Magnus, 1992)_

### 5.3. Paying a High Price

Edward, Charles and Magnus all three paid a high price for challenging the British journalism culture and its _doxa_. Edward, who called himself “unambitious”, had got stuck in a position that he did like, but was none the less stuck in it. But he was aware that it was a choice he himself had made.
And of course there were times when I see friends get on, go abroad, get awards cause they are great correspondents. And I think yeah, he is a great correspondent but he complains to me he can’t hold down a steady relationship. If I’m honest I look at the box, and say to myself “I could have done that”. I have pangs of regrets, of course I do, but equally you know you can’t do both. The risk is too great because before you know it, your kids have grown up and you don’t know them and the relationship with your wife is probably not as good as it could have been, and many marriages break under that sort of strain, and I figured I didn’t want that kind of life. (Edward, 2002)

Magnus, was also aware of his career-wise situation, but he was still very happy doing what he did.

I really enjoy writing. I’m getting paid for something I enjoy doing. (Magnus, 1992)

In 1997 he did get a foreign correspondency job that he sought after. However, he only stayed on that job a couple of years, before using the flight-tactic. He currently works as a public relations director for a large American company.

Charles’s career has been like a roller coaster. A couple of weeks prior to our 1998 interview he was sacked from his position, for which he felt terribly bitter.

I’m not happy that my column has been struck without letting me know. I think it’s because I’ve been to long at the [Broadsheet] and they see me as a piece of furniture. [Been there 20 years.] I’ve not been terribly well treated. It’s not in my nature to complain, and it’s partly my fault, cause I don’t network like all the other guys, and perhaps I should have been more of a primadonna. But I do feel bitter about it. It’s an honour to be a columnist, and then taking it all away without telling me why. (Charles, 1998)

When I asked him if he wanted to continue working for the newspaper in another position he answered:

No, I would have liked to do more writing. I want to get out of journalism. It’s much more hard work and challenging to write a book than write journalism. And more creative. (Charles, 1998)
At the same time he was aware of the financial insecurities of working freelancer, or as a novel-writer.

I’d not like a career, but I’d like more freedom, more leeway to be able to do my own writing at the same time as having the financial security of being on staff. (Charles, 1998)

I re-interviewed Charles in 2002 as I had seen his name as a scriptwriter for comedy-shows, had heard him on radio comedy-shows and talk shows, and his by-line kept appearing under feature-articles in the newspaper he worked for in 1998. When I met him he was very clearly very happy. He said that thanks to the change of editorial group on the newspaper his life had changed substantially to the better.

Dream job? I’m actually very close to it now. It would be great to have a weekly satirical radio show. If I can continue to be a news-paper man, but somehow do less words for the paper, cause it’s physically hard, I’ve got permanent soreness in my arms for typing to much, and to more stuff for the radio... yeah. I’m very close to my dream job. Yeah, I’m very lucky. (Charles, 2002)

5.4. A Matter of Class?

Thinking about these three men, who differ substantially from the other men I interviewed and from most male British journalists I know, I am trying to see a common pattern. They are all from upper-middle class backgrounds, with a substantial network of contacts, not only in journalism. Despite going their own way in the field of journalism, they had the security of the old-boys-network. As to accentuate this, Edward wore his old public-school tie on both occasions I met him.

Magnus and Charles were the two male journalists with the highest education (PhD and MA). These to were also doers, and fighters in the same way as the women who had rejected the doxa were, and whom, I should add, all had higher degrees. To bring in Swedish statistics into this personal saga, it is indeed interesting to note that the journalists who had an educator ideal, also to a much larger extent than other journalists had a university degree in subjects other than journalism.

So, perhaps educational capital rather than gendered capital better explain approaches to journalism. I will carry these thoughts with me into the next chapter.
4. REFLECTIONS

ON GENDERED JOURNALISM CULTURES

When looking back, reflecting, on the result of the studies and my analysis thereof, the differences between the journalism cultures stand out strikingly. This is not surprising. Anyone that has hopped on a bus or bought yoghurt in the local supermarket in London and in Stockholm can tell there are striking cultural differences. And the differences are of course similarly striking when watching BBC news and Aktuellt on television, or reading the Guardian and Dagens Nyheter.

However, more interesting than the differences between the Swedish and British journalism cultures are the similarities. Indeed, what I found when digging under the surface of different cultural patterns was similarities in the structure of the fields, similarities in doxa, similarities in strategies to defend the power over the field, and similarities in tactic used to fight for space in journalism. The common denominator is a gender order that permeates the cultures and every corner of the fields of journalism. This is not exactly a surprising find. More interesting is the play and dynamics around the way this gender order is defended and challenged. And again, I have found common denominators in the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK. This is the main result of this dissertation, and what I will discuss in this section of the chapter.

The chapter is divided in the same fashion as chapter three, i.e. in turn I will discuss fields, doxa, strategies and tactics in order to draw the main lines of the characteristics of the journalism cultures of Sweden and the UK. I will concentrate
my analysis, and my discussion thereof, on some particularly interesting issues. The first issue is feminisation; on the one hand the way in which it has been coupled with commercialisation and on the other hand how it is linked to bourgoisement. The second issue is the gendered logic of the doxa, particularly the distinction (not) made between male and female journalism. Finally I will look at the dynamics between strategies and tactics used by dominating and dominated groups specifically, and how they use the matters of essentialism and of journalism education.

1. FIELDS: FEMINISATION + COMMERCIALISATION = ?

I have not put a lot of emphasis on changes, processes and trends in this dissertation. The major reason for this is that the British sample only allows me so much in the way of trends. There are, however, some trends that the results of my studies point to (and that is clearly visible in chapter three), which are highly interesting and imperative for my thesis. The foremost of these trends is that the number – and share – of female journalists has increased substantially during the 1990s in both the fields of journalism in Sweden and in the UK (e.g. Delano and Henningham, 1996; Henningham and Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003; Ross, 2004; Chambers et al, 2004; Jönsson, 2005; Djerf Pierre, 2007a; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). Indeed, Carter, Branston and Allan (1998) name the 1990s “the decade of women”. This process has been termed feminisation, and is often connected to – or explained by – (depending on how you see things) commercialisation and bourgoisement.

1.1. Feminisation and Commercialisation

One of the trends, commercialisation, is said to have taken place during the 1990s in Britain and Sweden alike, as well as in other countries. There have been a number of studies discussing the commercialisation of the media, a process partly due to structural changes, e.g. increased competition. Commercialisation means an increasing awareness of audience needs and wants, to which the media quickly respond. The audience is the market (Klausen, 1986; Sparks, 1991; Hallin, 1996; Bourdieu, 1998a; Holland, 1998; van Zoonen, 1998; Jönsson & Strömbäck, 2007). Indeed, in his essay Sur la television, Pierre Bourdieu (1998) puts forward a critique of the mechanisms within the space of journalism, which forces journalism to bow to the demands of market forces (audimat), and moreover forces other fields of cultural production to comply to these mechanisms as well. This is not a discussion of media’s power, but rather a discussion of the power of the market.
Jönsson and Strömbäck (2007) are somewhat more concrete in their analysis of the commercialisation of Swedish television news- and current affairs-programs. They argue that there has indeed been a change towards commercialisation during the 1990s, which shows itself in the format and narrative structure of the programs, e.g. increased focus on individuals, dramatisation, sensationalism and shorter bits of news. In an increasing competitive market (even for public service), this is done to reduce costs and maximise profit. That the journalism cultures of Britain and Sweden have become more commercialised during the 1990 I do not doubt, and I have seen consequences of this in my every-day media-intake, but also in the way this has affected the every-day of the journalists I interviewed. Most of the British journalists I interviewed in 1998 and 2002 commented on the consequences of commercialisation. A lot of their comments had to do with toughening working-conditions. Nicholas, for example, was very upset about the hardening and increasingly competitive culture he worked in.

There are much more wider important issues [than gender] to do with seriousness, the cult of celebrity, about the extent to which you sacrifice some standards or change your interpretation of seriousness in order to attract younger people or whether you think that’s a fruitful thing to do, about news-agendas, about what’s news and what isn’t, and about the extent to which you widen the agenda of news-program in order to attract those people who don’t think news is interesting or relevant to them … which is actually a very sensible argument in many ways, but what it actually boils down to is doing a lot of stuff about footballers and pop-stars and all that sort of stuff, which is of no real importance. The alternative argument says it’s just an argument for dumbing the whole thing down, of getting to zero in some game of the lowest common denominator. This points to the paradox that we have a more educated audience than we’ve ever had before. Whereas one in eight went to university 20 years ago, it’s now one in three, and they want to have one in two, and yet we have the most dumbed-down media of all. Look at tabloid newspapers, look at ITN. It’s an abdication of seriousness at a time when the population is in a better frame of coping and being attracted to it. (Nicholas, 2002)

To me the really interesting issue about commercialisation is not that it supposedly brings about popularisation and dumbing-down of the media-content, but the way in which it affects the journalism culture in which this is reflected, and the way this is inherently connected to women and to feminisation, the way in which the entire discussion becomes part of the gendered logic of journalism.
Women as a Market and Women’s Issues as Marketable

What then does feminisation of the field of journalism entail? The concept feminisation is used both in every-day language as a derogatory way to explain too many women and too much touchy-feeling-ness in an area – and in academic feminism to celebrate the increase of women and intimisation of an area. Because of this division, the concept is rather hard to come to grips with, but I argue there are three main issues at hand when discussing feminisation specifically of the field of journalism. Those are, first, the awareness of women as a market, second, that women’s issues and soft news are given more space in the media, and third, the implicit connection made between women’s issues, soft news and female journalists.

The first issue of feminisation, then, is that the increasing competitive media-structure has brought about an awareness of women as a market, i.e. a direct connection to commercialisation of the field. This is clearly visible in my British material, as a change over the ten-year period. Let me give one example. Dave, who had gone from being deputy to chief-editor during the period, had also gone from being rather misogynist to favouring “women’s stuff”. When asked what stories sell newspapers he answered:

It’s all people-things, not policy things. The stuff I cover is all about people. People being heroes. People baring their sole to you, people talking about their trials, people talking about injustices, about beating injustices. People telling you things that happen to you. About people. (Dave, 1998)

Then followed an explanation that men prefer “cowboy-and-Indian-stuff” and that his tabloid largely catered for men’s need. But things had changed, he argued:

I’m very interested in women’s emotions, how women feel. Every week we have a thing in the paper – the True Life Stories. We present two emotional sorts of questions that attract women. Let me give you a couple of good examples. “Why do women fall for bastards?” “Can an affair survive a one-night-stand?” “Can a mix-race relationship survive in the long run?” It’s all about getting young women talking about their real life stories. (Dave, 1998 – see also chapter 3, page 128)

The second issue of feminisation is what Dave is pointing to, namely that women’s issues and soft news are given more space in the media. van Zoonen (1996/1998) argues along these lines that the commercial logic of journalism (which entails human interest stories, audience needs and desires, emotional investment and sen-
sationalism) is (apart from sensationalism) in fact what always has been termed “feminine news”, and that news, far from being a masculine bastion, has become feminised. What is wanted in news today is “a woman’s touch”. The popular status of soft (feminine!) news amongst the audience has been understood by media’s market department, and soft news has thus been given more space in media institutions (see also Smith, 1980; Edström & Jacobson, 1994; Carter et al, 1998; Holland, 1998; Djerf-Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Djerf-Pierre & Löfgren-Nilsson, 2004; Ross, 2004; Edström, 2006).

This trend does not only affect soft news as media content, but the entire journalism culture. The third issue of feminisation is namely the implicit connection made between women’s issues, soft news and female journalists. More soft news equals more female journalists, and vice versa. There are thus two sides to this, two explanations if you like, both equally essentialist in their beliefs. The first, more market-driven – and closer to the every-day use of the word feminisation – entails that if the (female) audience wants more soft news, women’s issues, then the media need more women, more female journalist who can write these stories. In chapter two I showed that several of the British journalists held onto these ideas, and this trend arguably started by the tabloids. In 1996 the Sun employed a 29-year-old woman (Rebekah Wade) as deputy editor following an alarming decline in readers. Her job was to attract women readers, and take the Sun away from the sexist, ladish Kelvin MacKenzie years to a newspaper that also catered for women’s needs (Holland, 1998). Other newspapers followed suit, including Dave’s newspaper.

When I came here 10 months ago, no head of department was a woman. Since then I’ve changed it. My deputy is a woman. The head of feature is a woman, and her deputy. The magazine editor is a woman, despite the fact that she’s just had a baby. Still, three fifth is men, but I have a large female input into my newspaper. (Dave, 1998)

He also pointed out (see pp 127) that this was done in order to get the women’s angle into the newspaper.

I find this problematic. Not that there are more female journalists, nor that the media content seems more varied. No, I find problematic the presumption that there is a correlation between the popularised, unserious news and women. There seems to be a belief that women as news-consumers crave not-so-important news. It was obvious that several of the journalists I interviewed over the entire period held these views. Ailsa is one example. Here she ponders on the shift the media has taken and why her stories (women’s issues) sell so well.
There are so many horrible things happening so people want relief, and TV has dumbed down and papers have gone the same way, even the BBC. Papers are losing the battle anyway and fighting for the female readers, they are a big part of the market. So if you write for female subjects you reach a large part of the market. For the foreseeable future. (Ailsa, 2002)

The other part of this is blaming, not the female audience, but female journalists for the changing nature of journalism culture. Nicholas, in the citation above did not really direct the blame for the dumbing-down anywhere apart from possibly the marketing department. On tape that is. As soon as I had switched off the tape-recorder he started – in large words – blaming the increasing number of female colleagues for bringing with them a (feminine) culture that threatens the BBC-standards. He argued that they do not have the competence of doing “proper news”, and the reason for this, he stated, was that they spent too much time on their looks and on taking the children to/from the crèche.

The other explanation to the belief that more women equals soft news comes from an academic feminist perspective. In the 1980s and early 1990s many feminist studies were made with the presumption that the under-representation of women in journalism led to the overrepresentation of sexist content in the news and in the media in general. One example is a study at the Swedish Television (Abrahamsson, 1992) where a gender-based content analysis was conducted of all nine news-programs and observations were made of the production process in the newsrooms. The conclusion of the study was that men dominate both in numbers and in choice and shaping of subjects (journalism as a male bastion). Quite typically for these types of analyses, the research group argued that an increasing number of women in the newsroom will eventually change the attitudes towards, and thus the shaping of the news, e.g. “male news” will be made more available to a female audience and vice versa (Abrahamsson, 1992, see also 1983). On a similar note, Helen Baehr (1980), the editor of the book Women and Media, says in her foreword that the texts (and previous studies) of the book are a response to the growing concern of Women’s Liberation Movement for the representation of women in the mass media. Thus, the articles in the book bring together and discuss the necessary correspondence between women working in the media and the representations produced. Baehr does, however, problematise this correlation somewhat more than Abrahamsson’s research group:

The struggle against representation is basically the struggle against the structures of patriarchal economic and social relations, which produce sexist me-
dia images and representations. For feminists working in the media this means fighting to develop alternative forms of organisation, production, distribution and consumption which are opposed to present conditions and dominant representations (Baehr, 1980:v)

The conclusion is, however, the same, namely that few women in the media equals sexist media content. And both representational values and organisational climate will improve if there are more women in journalism, i.e. more female journalists equal better newsroom conditions and better content. It takes, however, a «critical mass», a high enough share, for women to make a difference in a male dominated occupation. Women being a third (33%) of the workforce is said to be the critical number above which women can start to make a difference (Baehr, 1980; Robinson et al, 1998; Smith et al, 1989; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; van Zoonen, 1991; 1994). Thus, when the numbers approach (as in the UK during the 1990s), or supercede (as in Sweden during the 1990s) the critical number, things start to happen in the field of journalism. The journalism culture becomes feminised, which is seen by these scholars as a truly positive trend.

Liesbet van Zoonen problematises the conclusion that more women lead to better journalism in her article *Rethinking Women and the News* and argues that there are underlying problematic assumptions behind this way of thinking. There is a naive assumption that the individual journalist is sufficient to change the content, with little recognition of the organisational and societal context within which he or she works (van Zoonen, 1988). This is, of course, a critique directed to journalism research on the individual level, as discussed previously in the chapter. And most of these studies on women and news are done on an individual level within a liberal/pluralistic tradition (which includes liberal feminism). For example, they are often based on questionnaires, using statistical correlation-models, they use fairly simple theoretical models to explain gender inequalities of journalism without any discussion of deeper societal structures (like patriarchy and capitalism). The solution to these inequalities is, in van Zoonen’s (1991) words:

This assumption is reflected in the emphasis on strategies, which imply teaching and raising awareness of (male) media producers, and in the rather optimistic belief that media-institutions can be changed from within by female media professionals. That men — as radical feminists would argue — or consumer capitalism — as socialist feminists would argue — have vested interests in maintaining their power over women does not easily fit in the ideal of rational disinterested argumentation (van Zoonen, 1991:36).
Vibeke Pedersen (1999) attacks the assumption from another angle. In a comparative study of Nordic television hosts (-esses), she shows that the increase of women in television has also coincided with the spread of pair-wise Ken-and-Barbie presenters from America over to Europe. Women in television, she argues, have gone from being marginalised in public service television to being trivialised in commercial channels, e.g. through being pretty assistants to older and more experienced male colleagues. This has not yet taken place in Britain according to van Zoonen (1998b), because the British see this as an “Americanisation”, a conclusion which is interesting in the light of Patricia Holland’s (1998) analysis of the century long feminisation and sexualisation of the British press. “The politics of the smile” has been established in the UK, she argues, where it is presumed that men and women alike want and need the pre-package of smiling women, a decorative part of newspaper. And we are not just talking page-3-girls here. In the light of the comments from the British journalists I interviewed, I would argue that “the politics of the smile”, the demand for pretty smiling female journalists, permeates the entire British journalism culture.

van Zoonen (1996/1998) discusses yet another backside to the increasing numbers of women entering the field of journalism – it might become yet another “pink collar ghetto”, like Public relations. Feminisation in this respect equals a fall in status and salaries (Creedon, 1989; Robinson & Sain-Jean, 1998; Petersson, 2006). Obviously this has to be seen as the consequences of the Gender system in general. When women threaten men’s space (mental and physical), and move into a profession previously dominated by men, salaries and status tend to decrease. This must be understood as men’s wish to keep their space clean of women and thus seek to control women’s movements in mental and physical space (Connell, 1987; Hirdman, 1988; 1990). This has, however, yet to be verified – and certainly needs to be challenged (Robinson, 2004; Petersson, 2006).

One major conclusion I can draw from this dissertation (with support from other work) is that the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK are feminised in the sense that the number, as well as the rate of female journalists have increased during the 1990s. Facts. The so-called soft news has taken/been given more space in the media in Sweden and the UK. Facts. I do indeed believe that there is a connection between these two processes, but to name this entire process “feminisation” I find deeply problematic. It is problematic in its implicit presumption that there is a correlation between the popularised, unserious news and women – whether consumers or producers thereof. It is problematic in its underlying essentialist notion about women; that all women are by nature nurturing and collectively the same, and therefore seek the same objective. Would all women readers like the same newspaper content? Are all female journalists interested in the same issues? This is a far
too simplistic and naive way of seeing women, and women as journalists. One of
the main conclusions of my first dissertation (Melin-Higgins, 1996a; also Melin-
Higgins, 1996b; 1997) is that increases of women in journalism does not mean that
women as a collective is represented. Those women that have chosen to become
journalists tend to be white upper middle class, career minded, with a strong wish
to express themselves and develop their personalities. This is obviously a represen-
tation of only a few women in society. Furthermore, one of the main conclusions
in this dissertation is that female journalists have very different approaches to jour-
nalism in Sweden as well as in the UK. This leads on to two discussions; one on the
changing doxa of the journalism cultures of Britain and Sweden, and one on the
connection between feminisation and bourgeoisement.

1.2. Feminisation and Bourgeoisement

Continuing the line of thought above, several feminist thinkers (e.g. Rakow, 1989;
van Zoonen 1988; 1991; de Bruin, 1998; Hagemann and Åmark, 1999) have ex-
pressed a fear that the feminisation of the field of journalism will but strengthen he-
cemonic middle class values, and that far from representing and reflecting women’s
views in the media, female journalists simply reflect middle class values. Sean Dool-
ey, a spokesman for the British Guild of Editors commented on a similar issue:

If we are not careful we are going to have staffs dominated by classes of entrants
who have little in common experience with the people who they are writing
about. It is not a plea for working class journalists, it’s a plea for balanced news

At the conference Journalism for the New Century at London College of Printing,
the same Sean Dooley spoke on the same topic, but also voiced a fear that “highly
educated, middle class women are taking over journalism”.

As I have shown previously in this dissertation there is, indeed, grounds for
the fears expressed above, in the sense that another important trend in the fields
of journalism in UK and Sweden is a process of bourgeoisement, although more
pronounced in the UK field4. In both fields men are to a much higher extent from
a working class background, and women more from an upper middle class back-
ground. This process can hardly be explained (or blamed) by increasing commer-
cialisation as in the arguments above. Instead, I argue that both the bourgeoisement
of the fields in general, and the increasing number of female journalists can be
explained by the changing recruitment system – the increase in tertiary education
amongst journalists5. Indeed, Henningham and Delano (1998:149) argue that this
“must be seen as one of the most significant changed elements in the profile of the British journalist”.

The traditional way into journalism has been through personal contacts in the informal recruitment procedures that have characterised the media industry up until the 1980s in most countries. You started as an copy-boy, and worked your way up. The connections to the old boys network was, thus, of utmost importance to gain access to the profession, a system which seemed to enhance men’s chances to become journalists (Gallagher, 1980; 1995). Since the 1970s journalism programmes have started at university level and is now the main road into journalism in most western countries. In the US, Germany and the Nordic countries this has been a particularly noticeable trend, but the English and Scottish higher education systems are following suit.

That there is a generational shift is obvious if one takes into account that more than two thirds of young British journalists had a higher degree, whereas less than one in four of those over the age of 45 had any kind of degree (Henningham and Delano, 1998). And there is a similar pattern amongst Swedish journalists (Edström, 2007). There is of course also a gendered logic to this. As well as mainly coming from an upper middle class background, female journalists are younger, and have a higher level of education than male journalists (Henningham and Delano, 1998; Delano, 2003; Chambers et al, 2004; Ross, 2004; Djerf-Pierre, 2001a; 2003; 2007a; 2007b; Jönsson, 2005; Edström, 2007). And despite attempts by the social bankers in the field of journalism to stop women getting access to the new journalism schools and journalism courses (cf Petersson, 2006), women have been in majority amongst the students more or less since the start. This has therefore lead to an increasing number of women in the journalism workforce in these countries (Beasly, 1989; Holz-Bacha and Frölich, 1992; 1994; Wadbring, 1996; Melin, 1993; 1995b; Melin-Higgins, 1997; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; Robinson, 2005; Edström, 2007). The majority of women journalist students do, however, not match the increase of women in journalist workforce. Larissa Grünig (1989) argues that this is because of the infamous so called «glass ceiling», which forces women journalist graduates to look elsewhere than journalism for work.

Thus, another conclusion I would like to draw in this dissertation is that increased feminisation and increased bourgoisement interact and reinforce each other in the field of journalism. Women have grasped the opportunities opened up by the higher education system, to enter the field of journalism. Unfortunately, the tertiary education systems of Sweden and the UK still mainly attract students with middle class backgrounds (despite attempts to change this), and it is then only natural that the increasing amount of female journalists, who have been given access to
the field based on the ticket of a degree, have a middle class background. Now, what consequences does this have for the field? And, as Frances stated:

I was the first woman to do a daily program. Now four women are doing it on a regular basis. There have, though, been some letters saying that the radio is too middle-class and “why don’t the women talk about working-class women’s problems”? /…/ Yes, there are mostly middle-class women working as journalists, and they also have university degrees and degrees in journalism to a higher extent than men. But why is the class-issue offensive only when women are in it. Why don’t people react to “middle-class men”? (Frances, 1992)

2. DOXA: GENDERED GENTRIFICATION

The doxa of a social field might be taken for granted as the natural way of thinking, of being, but it is constantly exposed to threat and changes from within and from outside its field. The doxa of the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK is no exception. My material shows both a stability and change in the doxas.

2.1. Towards Coffee Latte Drinking Educators?

The first conclusion regarding the doxa I can draw from my studies – and from other researchers’ studies – is that the doxas of the fields of journalism in both Sweden and the UK have become stronger. With this I mean that those journalists that hold onto the doxa do so much firmer. This is shown in the Swedish studies in that more journalists agreed with statements making up the doxa in 2000 compared to 1989 (Djerf Pierre, 2001b; Jönsson, 2005) and even more so in 2005 (Wiik, 2007a), and that the UK journalists I interviewed a second time were clearer in their ideals and approaches to journalism.

The second conclusion I can draw is that there has been a shift in the doxa towards more of a subjective, analytical educator ideal. For the UK journalists it is difficult to get any statistical reliable comparison over time, but it seems that whilst the investigative and the adversarial roles are still going strong, a majority of journalists believe it is important to provide interpretation and analysis (Henningham and Delano, 1998) and in this there seems to be a shift since Köcher’s (1985; 1986) study a decade previously. The same shift can be found amongst the journalists I interviewed. At the second interview more of the journalists argued that it was im-
possible to be neutral and objective – even though one should always try. Also, more journalists seem to be aware that there were different ways of thinking journalism, of doing journalism. Acknowledging the *doxa* as such is a strike against the very core of the UK *doxa*. Amongst Swedish journalists, the shift that I (Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; 1996c) noted in 1989 has now strengthened – all the factors of the so-called educator ideal were stronger in the Journalist'2000 study (Djerf Pierre, 2001b; Jönsson, 2005) and yet again in 2005 (Wiik, 2007a). The Swedish journalism culture has become even less *doxic* than in 1989.

The first two conclusions are seemingly at odds with each other. In a Bourdieuan perspective, this is, however, not odd at all. When newcomers enter a social field the powerful in the field gather forces to combat the threatening newcomers. One way is to emphasise their belief-system – the *doxa*. The newcomers are mainly women and people from middle class backgrounds with university degrees. As I have shown in this dissertation, the educator ideal is stronger in these groups. I have also shown that female journalists are more inclined to *allodoxic* beliefs. That means that they are openly against the *doxa* and work against it in order to gain power. Put in other words, the feminisation and bourgoisement that I discussed above, can explain both that the *doxa* is stronger, and that the fields of journalism becomes less *doxic*, i.e. that there is an *allodoxa* alongside the *doxa*. This is more prevalent in the Swedish field of journalism.

Has this got anything to do with commercialisation? One would assume that commercialisation of journalism demands a sleeker, more efficient, less money-demanding, audience-oriented organisation, which needs well educated, professional, efficient staff. Commercialisation should bring about a craftsman ideal (Klausen, 1986; Puijk, 1990), or more of a popularisation ideal (Djerf Pierre and Löfgren Nilsson, 2004). Particularly as opposed to a money-demanding investigative bloodhound ideal. And according to Nicholas, there are indeed some tendencies toward this:

> Journalism has gone from an investigative campaigning journalist, they hardly exist anymore, to word-processing office-worker. Modern-days proprietors just aren’t prepared to pay for it, cause you can spend six months on a story and nothing comes out of it. It’s the same in television. *The world in action* doesn’t exist anymore. Now we have *Tonight with Trevor McDonald*, much more celebrity-driven. Not at all as good as *The world in action*, but the problem is that no-one watched it. The same with *Panorama*. It doesn’t occupy the central stage as it used to do. It’s been shunted off. Some interpret that as a statement from the BBC about investigative journalism, you know, serious journalism. Investi-
gative, campaigning journalism is not at all as common as it used to be, and is in danger of dying out. But that’s the way society works. People are not prepared to watch it. Society gets the journalism it deserves. (Nicholoas, 2002)

A similar reflection was made by the Swedish journalist Marianne Ekdahl (2006). In a column she writes about her fear that Swedish television (SVT) is wasting its inheritance of quality investigative programs by cutting down the news- and current affairs department and axing two important current affairs programs (Dokument utifrån and Faktum). And doing this by (of course) increasing the number of entertainment programs, docu-soaps and drama productions. All this in an attempt to catch the under-forty four-year olds. Ekdahl continues by stating that actually: “there are persons under 44 years of age who enjoys current affairs programs and investigative journalism” (Ekdahl, 2006, my translation).

If these views and experiences are true to reality is difficult to determine. On the one hand the journalist scholar Kent Asp (2007b) shows in his annual survey of Swedish television content that the supply of news- and current affairs programs are fairly stable between 1998 and 2006. A trend of decreasing home-productions of current affairs documentaries are balanced by an increased broadcast of foreign ditto (Asp, 2007b:56). On the other hand, later on in 2006, the now director of programme, Eva Hamilton, stated that SVT shall “also do the broad entertaining. Entertainment stands for such a large part of viewing. /…/ If SVT is stopped from making the broad entertainment programs our channels risk becoming a concert for those that are already actively involved in society” (Eva Hamilton, 13th October 2006, my translation).

A third conclusion about the doxa is that the alcohol-culture has changed dramatically. In Scotland only one journalist I interviewed in 2002 had a so-called “liquid lunch” during the interview, which was held at an Edinburgh pub famous for its clientele of journalists and politicians. As described in chapter two, the majority of male Scottish journalists did so in 1992. Several of the journalists I spoke to did also divulge a substantial change in the pub-culture, some did so with sadness, others with relief. I was given three explanations to this.

The first explanation, given by Edward and Nicholas, is about a change towards health-consciousness, and Edward points to the observation I myself did, that England is ahead of Scotland in this trend.

And the pub-thing about journalism is true, but that’s because changes are much slower to happen up here in the sense that, that’s a bigger area. When I worked down south people had already started to have salads for lunch, and mineral
water and things like that. It had been imported from the continent. They became much more health conscious. It took longer to reach up here. And they still drink, but not half as much as they used to. In the newsroom in Glasgow hardly anyone goes to the pub. When we met last time [1992] there were always a group of older reporters that had liquid lunches. Myself and my colleagues used to go to the pub after work and have four, five pints, but when we went last night ... we were talking about it ... it was the first time in six months. And we only had one pint. We are much more health conscious, like our brethren down south. I even go swimming once in a while. That was never heard of when I was a copy-boy, they would have thought I was a big girl. Then everyone went to the pub, cause that's where the business was done. A little bit of that still happens in Edinburgh. People meet politicians and so in pubs. But you've got to remember that the pub-culture has changed. We now have brasseries and coffee-houses. You can even have coffees in pubs. 15 years ago to order two pints of Guinness and a Cappuccino would have been astounding. And 15 years ago there were no women's loos either. They are much more gentrified now, and I think people enjoy that. The pubs are still a masculine environment, but the coffee houses don't want that. (Edward, 2002)

It all changed in the five years I went to Africa. When I went, I thought that every one in the newsroom was a lot older than me. They dressed in jeans, and they smoked a lot and they went off for very liquid lunches. And interestingly the newsroom had linoleum on the floor and there were late-middle age typist, you know. When I came back, they all seemed to be 19, they all wore collars and ties and seemed to be much brighter than me. They drank Perrier water. Nobody, nobody drank, as far as I was aware, particularly not at lunchtime. You can go off for lunch with your boss. It’s a generational change. It was reflected in wider society that just wasn’t accepted. It was a class thing. There was an interesting class difference. Whereas a large number of the people in the 1980s was recruited from Fleet Street and newspapers, and carried that culture across with them, the bulk of the new generation were BBC graduate trainees, who came straight from uni, very aspiring people, 15,000 applications for six jobs, the kind of people that got these jobs were a lot more focussed and stuffy in many ways. So there was a huge cultural difference. Such that, you know there were a couple of bars within this BBC-complex, well one of them has been changed into a crèche. A crèche for God’s sake! And indeed the other is a gym. (Nicholas, 2002)
There is no comparable data for Swedish journalists for the earlier part of 1990s. I know, however, from statistics that a majority of Swedish journalists at the end of that decade consumed alcohol more than once week and that it is much more than the general population. I also know that between 2000 and 2005 the rate of Swedish journalists that drank alcohol at least once a week increased from 60 to 71 percent. For Swedish the Swedish general public there was an increase from 34 to 39 percent (Johansson, 2001; 2007). I also know, however, that Swedish journalists have become more health-conscious during the same time-period; the percentage that is doing some kind of sports, or going out into nature have doubled, and that their lifestyle in general is active, cultural and urbane (Johansson, 2001; 2007; Jönsson, 2005). The journalist as a semi-alcoholic, working-class slugger, smoking like a chimney, is gone from the centre stage of the doxa.

I do not believe that this health-consciousness comes out of the blue, but is connected to other trends. Nicholas talks of a generational shift, and Edward said journalism has become gentrified. Putting on my Bourdieu glasses, it is easy to see this shift in terms of the new cultural class taking over journalism, and with that class comes its way of thinking, its way of defining the world and thus defining what journalism should be – all based on the new class’ habitus and its different types of capital aggregation. This class of cultural intermediaries and cultural practitioners want to distinguish themselves in social space, particularly against those lower down the hierarchical ladder. They do so by using life-style strategies (or tactics in de Certeau’s terminology) (Bourdieu, 1984; Featherstone, 1987; Hesmondhalgh, 2002). In Jon May’s (1996) interesting article about the way the new cultural class use exotic food as a strategy to distinguish themselves, I recognise a lot of these issues. Her account of an interview-session with George, a London media worker, who discussed “legitimate Italian style use of cappuccino” (p 61) made me laugh. I recall the 2002 interview with Charles, which took place in Momac a, then very trendy Glasgow café. We spent the first half hour discussing the «proper» coffee-machine, and how much espresso a «proper» latte should contain. Also, in 1992 the only cafés that could be found in Glasgow were either in shopping malls, or the 1950-s remnant Italian cafés (with kitsch cult-status). And in London I had several meetings at trendy coffee-bars, including one in the BBC. So British journalists seem to have realised that they have a wider choice. They used to choose between a cup of tea and a pint of heavy – or to be posh – between cona-coffee and nescoffee. Now there is a choice between cappuccino, espresso, latte, machiato, Americano... and for the very health-conscious: decaffeinated cappuccino. The steak-and-kidney pie, downed by a pint of lager, has vanished from the menus of journalists, to be
replaced by a wholemeal bun filled with woked veggies and goats-cheeze, downed with mineral water of European origin.

From this perspective I believe the term *bourgeoisement* is too limited a concept to catch the fundamental changes in the field of journalism. Edward uses – in an everyday language – the concept *gentrification*. If seeing a social field (*champ social*), like journalism, in the more concrete French way, then bringing a cultural geographical way of thinking into the equation might increase the understanding of the processes in the field (*champ*). That Stoke Newington have gentrified enclaves, which enjoys proper cappuccino and exotic (equals different) food (May, 1996), then the field of journalism in Britain and Sweden could have *gentrified* enclaves, getting big enough to change the culture. In a geographical sense, it is important to point out that the British journalists I interviewed all lived and worked in big cities. This but strengthens my argument.

Another issue Nicholas mentions is that these new stuffy university-educated journalists were much more focussed. This ties in with Ailsa’s and Steve’s argument, that the pub-culture is outed because it is deemed to inefficient by those really in control of the media.

Guys going for a liquid lunch, well they’re in minority now, and I think you’ll find they’re really frowned upon. And I think they’re lucky they’re in a job. It’s all so changed now. It’s just heads down now in papers, there’s no buzz. The pubs near the newspapers that used to be really buzzing and crowded, where you met people and you heard stories, well now it is just the old hands that go there. The young ones don’t go much, they don’t even know there is a pub where you hear stories. /…/ I don’t think life in a newspaper is as good as it was. You know I had more freedom and more fun. Now it’s head down every second and don’t even have lunches. Now they seem more scared in the newspapers. I think probably accountance has taken over. Money is more important and I think, going for lunch is frowned upon from management to journalists. /…/ In the newspapers not even the editors have control. It’s people with grey suits, the accountants that have control of it. (Ailsa, 2002)

*M. Is there still a difference between England and Scotland regarding pub culture?*

*Steve:* Not anymore, It’s not the same. The demands of the job make it impossible. People have clamped down on it. The opportunities during the working hours of going to the pub don’t exist anymore. It’s not possible. Also, it’s more
competitive now. We’re fighting for the audience. It’s advertise or not advertise to reach the audience. (Steve, 2002)

This brings me back to the discussion of commercialisation of the media. If increased competition in the field of journalism forces those in power to reconsider ways of doing journalism, to become more efficient, and thus beat competitors, then from that follows that the doxa will change accordingly. Additionally (or possibly alternatively) the demand for efficiency and the demand for new audiences have resulted in a drive amongst media-executives to employ university educated staff, which brings with them another culture, which in turn reinforces the media-executive’s wish for change. Café latte instead of a pint of lager. Working over-time and writing another copy, instead of working over-time and going to the pub.

Charles gave me yet another bit of the jigsaw-puzzle, as he explained that the changing journalism culture in its rejection of pub-culture was caused by the increasing numbers of female journalists.

/The pub-culture/ seems to have died away. It’s because there are more women now, and they are there in sufficient numbers not to feel pressured into talking men. For years, women news reporters have felt a terrible pressure to go out and drink, to be one of the lads, and now they don’t anymore. It’s not that we’ve got rid of the old, kind of stick in-the-mud, they’re still there, but they’re outnumbered. By women. Under the new editor things have changed. Now we have a new week-end section, it’s very good and lively, and it’s staffed almost exclusively by women, younger women. Still, women journalists, particularly on the news-desk, have had a terrible time. And having children. Then they have terrible problems. They are seen as not being as serious about their job because they tend to go home, rather than go to the pub. (Charles, 2002)

That the changing pub-culture is a consequence of feminisation of the field of journalism brings with a series of other issues regarding the doxa and feminisation, the doxa and female journalists. Will the doxa change if more women become journalists? Is that why Swedish journalists have become more of interpretative educators rather than distant bloodhounds? Does this mean that there is a male doxa and a female allodoxa, a male and female journalism?
2.3. The Gendered Logic of Doxa

The social field of journalism has by many feminist scholars been called a man’s world and the dominant journalist values are seen as masculine (cf. Smith, 1980; Creedon, 1989; Lafky, 1989; Beasley, 1989; Abrahamsson, 1992; Frölich & Holzbach, 1993; 1994; Eide, 1995; Gallagher, 1995; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; van Zoonen, 1996/998a; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Chambers et al, 2004; Robinson, 2004; 2005). In this dissertation I have shown that many of the British journalists I interviewed believe that female journalism differs from normal journalism. The same values exist in Sweden, definitely in the curriculum of journalist schools, and probably more widespread in the field of journalism general (Melin, 1993; 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1997a; Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a).

Bourdieu does not recognise the gendered nature of the field of journalism as such, although he argues in La domination masculine (1999) that there is gendered dichotomy visible in every field. In the social field (of journalism), players are positioned hierarchically depending on the capital and habitus they have aggregated. Seeing gender as two habitus, the gendered nature of the hierarchical structure becomes obvious. The masculine habitus dominates in the dominating group, which has the economic power over media-organisations (e.g. as owners) and has symbolic power, i.e. is able to control the structure of the organisation and the doxa.

The masculine values and approaches are geared towards honour and status seeking, directed towards the public sphere, and the female values are extensions of the traditional nursing, educating mothering values and directed towards the private sphere, or dominated parts of the public sphere. And, as is always the case with doxa, it is never seen as such, i.e. as the dominating group has symbolic power to control the doxa, masculine values are never seen as such. They are hidden in the guise of normality. Feminine values and ways, on the other hand, are always the other, what needs to be pointed out. We talk of female doctors, female engineers, female priests, female journalists. But whoever talks of male doctors, male engineers, male priests, male journalists? Basing his analysis of masculine domination primarily in 1960s Kabyle society, (and some later French studies) the black-and-whiteness of the male-female dichotomy is not surprising. What is (perhaps) surprising is that this can be almost directly translated into journalism. In the 1990s.

A Gendered Dichotomy of Approaches to Journalism

Thus, turning towards the field of journalism, a number of studies from all over the world have during the past tree decades looked at journalist values from a gender perspective. The findings of these studies are strikingly similar. Female journalists tend to have a more participant educator or advocate approaches. Female journalists are involved and committed. It is important for them
to be "a guardian of democracy", "to express themselves", "to reveal injustices", and to "influence and help the audience". The choice of journalism for many (middle class) women is as a strategy for personal development. However, there are also differences between countries. In Germany, the advocate ideal for women is a socially engaged journalist, who has the obligation to propagate new ideas to an audience perceived predominately as opinionated and intolerant. In Britain, female journalists have a different advocate ideal, which entails a different view of the audience they want to educate. This approach towards the audience is also reflected amongst Canadian women, as they much less than their male colleagues are willing to badger the public to get information, or use personal information without permission (Johnston et al, 1976; van Zoonen & Donsbach, 1988; Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1991a; 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; Löfgren Nilsson, 1993; 1994; 1995; 2007a; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2005; 2007a; Chambers et al, 2003; Robinson, 2004; 2005).

Male journalists tend to see journalism as a job, pretty special, but still a job, where the process of finding and disseminating news (read information) is important. They are interested in searching for the Truth, and presenting it objectively and neutrally. In the hunt for news, ethical considerations and concern for the audience have not the highest priorities, and particularly British male journalists seem to be willing to break ethical codes to get information. There is furthermore a tendency for male journalists to be more focussed on the business aspects of media activity, favouring roles related to profit making (van Zoonen & Donsbach, 1988; Weibull, 1991; Melin-Higgins, 1991a; 1996a; 1996b; 1996c; Löfgren Nilsson, 1993; 1994; 1995; 2007a; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2005; 2006; 2007a; Chambers et al, 2003; Delano, 2003; Robinson, 2004; 2005).

Although these studies vary in time (1985-2005) and space (America and Europe) the significant similarities in result indicate that men see journalism as finding facts and making news and being neutral and objective whilst doing so. To women, journalism means both a personal expression and commitment to social involvement; in either case, ethical values and rejection of the neutrality ideal is important.

And in this dissertation (see chapter three) the same pattern emerges. The description above could have been voiced by the journalists I interviewed (Britain), or asked questions (Sweden).
Female Journalism – and Male Journalism?

So is there a distinction between female and male journalism? In chapter two (page 38) I briefly touched on the work of Henrika Zilliakus Tikkanen (1990; 1993; 1997). She has gone further than talking of approaches to journalism. Based on secondary sources (interviews with journalists) from the Nordic countries, and interviews with Finnish journalists, she (and the journalists interviewed) have identified seven characteristics of female journalism, which includes the prioritising of soft, or female subjects, personal involvement, and empathy for the people that are treated in the news, a combination of personal and professional identity. Again, this could be a summary of the views held by many of the UK journalists I interviewed, and again probably by Swedish journalists (cf. Löfgren Nilsson, 2007a). But none of them talked of male news, or male journalism. «Female journalism» is often discussed amongst scholars and journalists alike, as is evident in this dissertation, though then often presented as an alternative to «proper» journalism (see also Melin, 1993; 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1997a; Steiner, 1992; Chambers et al, 2004). That «male journalism» is omitted from any such discussions is, however, not surprising. In fact, this omission is built into the very core of the gender system. To make the system work means to hide the system from any insight or analysis. And with that follows that also masculinity must be hidden at all cost – in journalism, in (journalism) education, and in research on journalism (cf.Connell, 1987; Jónasdóttir, 1991a; Hirdman, 1988; 1990; MacKinnon, 1989).

Thus, rather than talking of male – female journalism or male – female news, the distinct division is made between hard news (with high status) and soft news (with low status). The gendered nature of this dichotomy is hidden in everyday language, is taken for granted and becomes part of the every day experiences of journalists. But again, soft news is outspokenly also called feminine or female in nature, but hard news are just given to the guys. By birth right.

These differences must be conceived as social constructions, constructed and reconstructed in a gender system that is inherent in contemporary patriarchal and capitalist society. If not, there could never be a male journalist wanting to do so called “female journalism”, nor any full understanding of women who, indeed as shown, does “male journalism”. The first step in recognising this is a language one, namely acknowledge the gender differences as masculine and feminine journalism or values — and not male and female. These are learnt in a bildung process and internalised into male and female habitus with their own hexis. In her analysis of Swedish television since the 1950s until 2000, Monika Djerf Pierre (2003:45; 2006:423; 2007:97, and chapter 2, page 38 in this book), puts words to the silence. She summarises and maps out the dichotomised gender logic in journalism.
So, back to the question of whether there is a clear distinction between male and female journalism. The evidence I have presented in this book does indeed indicate the existence of such in the minds of Swedish journalists and the journalists I interviewed in the UK. Indeed, some interviewees have shown such strong essentialist views that I have sometimes found it hard to textually deal with their citations. I have also found strong evidence of behaviour along the lines of the gender dichotomy. This is, of course, not surprising, as there are strong links between attitudinal and behavioural components, also of the doxa. One acts along the lines one thinks.

Yes, and…? What’s the problem?

The problem with living this gendered dichotomy comes with the power-play that surrounds it. The problem arises when some (groups of) people decides that one side – ours – is better than the other, and that others should be forced to accept the other side, which is then decided to be not so good. But what if the others do not want to accept the identities, behaviour and positions given to them?

As can be seen throughout chapter three in this book, I have found strong evidence of the power-play and the use of symbolic violence to ferment this dichotomy of gender logic. One issue that I would like to put the spotlight on again is that of split identities. Now, if one is a man, who has been traditionally fostered into, or learnt masculine ways of being, i.e. accumulated substantial masculine capital (in Bourdieu’s terminology), and this masculine man wants to become a journalist – a successful journalist – then this dichotomy is no problem. In fact, it exists to his advantage. He does not need to ponder about the suitability of being a man and being a journalist, of the problems of entering into a partnership (providing he is heterosexual) or even creating a family. All this is the normal state of being. It is the norm. It is part of the doxa of the field of journalism. However, if one changes any of the above traits, or adds something, like black, or homosexual, or catholic (in the UK), then the situation changes completely. He has become the other.

Change. A woman enters the scene. A woman, who – like most, but not all others – are fostered to become a (feminine) woman, and who wants to become a journalist. A successful journalist. This is when conflict arises, either in the organisation, or inside herself. The identity as a successful journalist and the identity as a woman clashes, as van Zoonen (1998b) and de Bruin (2004) show in their research on journalists from the Netherlands and the Caribbean respectively. De Bruin argues that depending on circumstances and incentives either the gender identity or the professional identity could be shifted into a lower position in the personal identity hierarchy. Thus, one sees oneself as a woman first, and then a journalist and suffers the status-wise consequences of thereof, or one is a successful journalist that has to compensate for being a woman with other means.
2.4. The (Im)Possibility of Changes to the System – Amor fati

These role- and identity games raise the question if there are any possibilities of changing the doom-and-gloom image of the field of journalism that has been painted. Bourdieu (1998a; 1999) readily gives an answer to this: change is exceedingly difficult to achieve. All dominated habitus (e.g. women) or dominated groups (e.g. female journalists) are weak in capital and power and thus their weapons are always weak, and they are symbolically condemned to submission (amor fati). In fact, women are their own worst enemies as they keep up the order of things (hexitis and doxa), which could be exemplified in women forcing their daughters to undergo circumcision, or female managers forcing female journalists to stick to soft news as their beats (cf. De Bruin, 2004). On top of that, Bourdieu (1998a) argues that the field of journalism is near doxic, with a powerful dominant culture and no strong oppositional groups (cf. van Zoonen’s, 1998b, discussion of the difficulties of change). Thus, Bourdieu concludes in La domination masculine (1999), that gendered change and the defeating of symbolic violence is impossible to achieve by willpower or consciousness rising alone, as dispositions are engraved in the body (hexitis).

Nonetheless, as I have shown throughout this book, gendered change has taken place in society and within the field of journalism. The most important factors for gendered change in society at large, Bourdieu argues (1999) is 1) women’s increased level of education, 2) increased economic independence, and 3) the change of family structure mainly through divorces. In journalism, the arguably most important factors for gendered change are 1) the establishment of the now huge number of journalist colleges and university (tertiary) level journalism courses, and 2) the general gentrification and professionalisation of journalism. As a consequence (although these factors all interact) there is now between 20 and 50 percent women journalists in the western world, Britain being at the bottom end (see chapter 3). This would, of course, sufficiently constitute the magical number (33 percent) acquired to make possible changes within journalism (Robinson et al, 1998; Smith et al, 1989; Ziliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; van Zoonen, 1991; 1994). No, says Boudieu (1999) – again. Gendered changes are always relative; there is a consistency through change, and the structure of differences are always maintained through the logic of the gender system according to three practical principles:

1) The functions available to women are in the areas of the extension of the private sphere: hence soft news, female ghettos, marionettes, one-of-the-girls, et cetera (cf. Hirman’s, 1988; 1990, logic of segregation).
2) A woman cannot have power over men, hence the very low number of female managers in journalism (cf. Hirman’s, 1988; 1990, *logic of male primate*).

3) Men have monopoly in dealing with technique and machines, which can also be read as a metaphor for the machinery of organisations, or for the field of journalism (cf. Connell, 1987 *political economy of masculinity*; and Rakow’s 1988 discussion of *tool makers–tool users*).

Back to square one: no change possible (Bourdieu 1999; see also van Zoonen, 1998b)! And throughout chapter three, I have given plenty of evidence of the stability of the gendered nature of the *doxas* in the fields of journalism in the UK and Sweden to support Bourdieu’s arguments. Bourdieu’s field theory is, however, never static, and he does provide for change. He argues that gendered change is possible through radical change of the social conditions for productions of dispositions (Bourdieu, 1999).

So, whilst waiting for a Bourdieuian revolution, which seems more like a Kuhnian paradigm shift, should the feminist movement stop bothering and start accepting destiny? Should women and men journalists, who wants to change their own working-conditions, give up and give in to symbolic violence? No, definitely not, I say! Michel de Certeau (1984) is more optimistic than Bourdieu. Oppositional groups, de Certeau argues, have time on their side. And by using guerrilla warfare (that can be very effective and oppositional groups are therefore not as weak as Bourdieu points out), they can make change happen. And I argue that change in social structure does not just take place out of the blue, but is foregone by substantial amount of critical work (cf. Kuhn, 1997), which is what the feminist movement and feminist academics have been and are doing.

Also, I have shown in book, through the studies I have conducted, that the *doxas* in the fields of journalism in UK and Sweden *have changed*.

### 3. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS:
**ESSENTIALISM AND EDUCATION**

Stating that the *doxa* has changed, does that mean that the entire journalism culture is changing? Monika Djerf Pierre (2003; 2006; 2007a) would answer the question with a «no». The *content* of the dichotomised gender logic of journalism might change, she argues, but the logic itself remains, as she has seen in Swedish journalism in the 1900s. In other words, there is stability *in* change. Or, thinking with Mi-
chel de Certeau (1984), all strategies get a response. And all tactics get a response. I have chosen two strategies, from the various strategies used by Swedish journalists, and the UK journalists I interviewed, which I will discuss in more detail. The reason for my choice is the interesting dynamics between strategies and tactics that I have found in my research material. The strategies are essentialism and education.

3.1. Essentialism – Male or Female Capital

In essence, my argument is that we cannot talk of inherently male and inherently female journalism, nor of inherently male and inherently female doxa. It is a matter of power. The dominant group in journalism (the elite) consists of white, protestant, middle-class males. They bring with them their habitus, and hexis, which becomes the foundation for the doxa of journalism. Doxa is socially constructed. Yes, mainly adhered to by male journalists, but that is because it carries with it status and power. To protect their power position, they need to uphold a distinction between themselves, as powerful, and the others. As half the population consists of women, and thus constitutes a tangible threat, upholding the gendered dichotomy becomes a central strategy in their defence of power. In this sense, Yvonne Hirdman’s (1988; 1990) logic of segregation and logic of the male primate of the gender system can be seen as strategies. Patricia Holland writes this use of segregation of sexes:

A politics of sexual fantasy, which opens up a gap between women and men by reinforcing men’s ‘sex-right’ over women’s bodies continues to imply a political allegiance which ultimately undermines democratic participatory rights, and which continues to link the feminine with the trivial (Holland, 1998:31).

In Bourdieuan terms, the elite uses symbolic violence to uphold the essentialist dichotomy, and I have found several ways of doing so (see chapter three) all of which evoke responses from the women this symbolic violence hits. Belittlements and pretence endearments, like “girly”, “hen”, “darling”, “sweetie-pie” I see as ways of telling the women it is directed to, to stay in place, i.e. the other not so important place. I have furthermore found evidence of outright sexual harassment, which could be seen as a way of telling women that they are women, i.e. sexual beings, and as such belong in the intimate part of the private sphere, and not in serious journalism.

Again as I have shown, some women accept this put-down as par for the course in becoming and remaining a journalist. They play on their femininity and sexuality, play on acting or being the “sweetie-pie”, the “cutie”. This tactic, that I named sexy marionettes, has been used throughout (journalism) history (Chambers, et al,
...and is a common tactic in journalism in more patriarchal societies like Israel (Lachover, 2005) and African countries (Opuko-Mensa, 2004). And in the UK.
The tactic is successful, in that the women that play along with the gendered rules of the field manage to create a career for themselves often by choosing a niche that is part of the «pink/velvet ghetto», and as such is removed from the scrutinious eyes of the field-elite as it is deemed unimportant. Thus, it becomes a niche where these journalists are left in peace to get on with the job – and their career.

Another response to the essentialist dichotomy-strategy is, again, to play on one’s femininity, but to so head-first into a fight for the status of femininity. I named this tactic *one of the girls*, as it implies an alliance with other women journalists. As Liesbet van Zoonen (1996/1998a) I show that women who choose this tactic want to create a Bourdieuan revolution within the field of journalism. Whilst in many cases agreeing with the essentialism of the gendered dichotomy, they try to overturn it, and raise the status for feminine journalism. They try to change the *doxa*. As I show in my studies, this seems to be a tactic used in the UK and Sweden alike (see also Egsmose, 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007), and evidently also in other Nordic countries (Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1990; 1993; 1997) and in the Netherlands (van Zoonen, 1996/1998).

It is arguably a very successful tactic as the doxa is changing to reflect what is considered «feminine journalism», in both the fields of journalism of Britain and Sweden (see also van Zoonen, 1996/1998; Wiik, 2007a; 2007b). On a field-level, that is. On an individual level, all the fighting, the everyday warfare, the consequences of symbolic violence, and the burden of the split-identity of being both a woman and a journalist, takes its toll. All of the UK journalists I interviewed, which in 1992 used this tactic, had in 2002 either changed tactic or left journalism. Also the male journalists I interviewed that had chosen this tactic had had a hard time and had suffered career wise for their choice. The fact that I have found men that have chosen this «female tactic» is yet an argument for a social constructivist view of the gendered dichotomy.

**Why Can’t a Woman Be More Like a Man?**

As there are men that choose a «female tactic», there are women that choose to accumulate male capital, and assume a male hexis to become *one of the boys*. This, I have found, is a tactic used to try to avoid the belittlement and sexual harassment strategies, and it is definitely a way to avoid the entire essentialist dichotomy by stepping over the gendered barrier and enter into the domain of masculine journalism. Denying one’s femininity, aggregating male capital and hexis, learning the rules of the game and playing it well, thus securing good position on the field is a
tactic historically used in many male-dominated fields (Lovell, 2000). And it is a tactic historically used by Swedish and British women journalists (Stål, 2002; 2003; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Chambers et al, 2004; Tusun, 2005).

When women answer the call of Professor Henry Higgins in Pygmalion “Why can’t a woman be more like a man?” and actually start wearing the trousers, they are met with yet other strategies than simple belittlement. A career wise successful woman clad in power-suit simply frowns on someone calling her cutie. Instead I found in my UK study (a finding that is supported by other UK studies, eg. Eggmose, 1993; 1998; Christmas, 1997; Chambers, et al, 2004) that these women receive other kinds of name-calling, are punched in their faces, and perhaps mainly stabbed in their backs. *Bitch!* Their assertiveness is re-named aggression. *Dyke!* Their sexuality is questioned and they are made more *other* by being a homosexual woman. *She’s slept her way to her job!* Their competence is questioned. *She is more of a man than I am!* Their femininity is questioned, as the impossibility of being a woman and a journalist is underscored. In Sweden the response seem to be similar, but on a different level. The Scottish journalist Frances said in 1998:

> I hate third-level discrimination. Someone can say “I don’t like women that dye their hair white”. Somebody else can give you this pointed look all through a meal. Is there actually any difference? One of them is completely out of order immediately, but those others … someone can come and say hello to us and not give us any eye contact. It’s lots of ways you can close people down without saying “I don’t like women”. (Frances, 1998)

These words focus on a more politically correct form of symbolic violence, which is none the less violence. Throughout this book I have referred to Swedish primary and secondary statistics, and to anecdotes to indicate strategies of symbolic violence, and tactics to face and fight it. I can, thus, only tentatively draw conclusions about the power-play on the field of journalism regarding these specific strategies and tactics. This is, then, I would argue, an excellent and important area of future research.

### 3.2. Education – The Interplay Between Social and Educational Capital

Another field where dynamics between strategies and tactics are tangible is education. In Bourdieuan terms, education gives educational capital to those that partake in it. However, having gone through a Swedish private school education myself and having lived for decades in the UK I know that education also distribute social capi-
Wearing the old school tie, like Edward, one of the UK interviewees, literary did is an important social marker in the UK. With a network of old schoolmates, who can help you in (to) your future career, which school you go to is paramount. Different fields rely on different school-network. The main way into the field of journalism in both Sweden and the UK used to be apprenticeship, or starting as an office boy and working one’s way up the hierarchy in the newsroom. Thus, knowing someone that knows someone that knows my father, or knowing someone that one went to school with, is vital for being accepted by the social bankers, the guardians of the entrance to the field (or concretely into the newsroom). As I have discussed (in chapter three) this network is sometimes referred to as the old boys network. As these terms imply these networks are almost exclusively male, and the men have succeeded (and still does) to keep others, like women, away from the field.

Another strategy that I talked of in chapter three was the keeping of journalism education in-house (through the media-organisation) or through the trade unions, which again was the way things were in both Sweden and the UK. Thus, it was those already in the trade that could benefit from journalism education. That is, social bankers had a strong say in whom should be educated and who should be a journalist. And social capital of the journalism kind was more important than educational capital. When journalism education moved into the echelons of universities and higher education, i.e. into the power structure of another field entirely, and one which has had a history of tension with the field of journalism (Bourdieu, 1988) yet another strategy was needed to protect the field from newcomers, and more importantly to protect the doxa. Thus, the structure and the curriculum of the new journalism courses becomes a male, patriarchal project (something that fits neatly into the existing academic order). Journalism education on all levels can consequently, I argue, bee seen as strategies used by the dominating groups on the fields of journalism.

So, how is this received or challenged by dominated groups? I will restrict my analysis to the group I have studied: women journalists. From a historical perspective pioneering women journalists in Sweden and the UK have had an upper middle class background, and have had a university degree (Stål; 2002; 2003; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Chambers et al, 2004; Tuson, 2005). In other words they tried to compensate for the disadvantages of their female habitus by using other kinds of valuable capital (like social-, educational- or cultural capital) when entering the field of journalism. And although they did not have access to the old boys network, they had connections, and a social capital; they also knew someone who knew someone that knew their father. But they were not many.
The real break in getting access to the field of journalism was when tertiary journalism education started and opened up a large enough gap in the fence of the field for women to cease the opportunity and crash in. Journalism courses have from the start had a majority of female students, which as I have shown in these studies (see chapter three) have had strong ambitions to get a career in journalism. And these women have spited the patriarchal structure and symbolic violence that has been plentiful in these courses (see chapter three) and graduated with, often, high marks. Journalism courses have become a tactic for women.

So is this a successful tactic? Does aggregating educational capital help women in the field of journalism? Yes. Of the women I interviewed in the UK that advanced their careers during the 1990s, at least two of the following criteria seem to be necessary. One, they had to comply with the doxa. Two, they had to come from an upper middle class background. Three, they had to have a postgraduate degree or an Oxbridge BA. Four, they need a strong social and professional network. To succeed in breaking the glass ceiling of Swedish journalism similar criteria is needed, although the degree needed is one in journalism (Djerf Pierre, 2006). These educational differences are not surprising. A tertiary journalism education entered the scene much earlier in Sweden than in the UK, and consequently the flood of women into the Swedish field of journalism came during the 1980s. Given the increase of journalism courses during the 1990s, I expect the same process to happen in the UK during this present decade.

Amongst the male UK journalists I interviewed, the connection between class, education and a successful career was the opposite of that of female journalists. Indeed, the career wise most successful journalist (Dave) was working-class and had no higher education – and he was proud of it. The idolisation of the working-class hero still lives strong in UK journalism, and, as I showed in chapter three, most of the male journalists I interviewed did not think much of higher education, which is an indication that educational capital has not been necessary for a career in journalism. If you are in possession of a male habitus, that is. In Sweden the situation for all journalists is quite different. Educational capital has become increasingly important (Edström, 2007). Amongst the top of the media elite (almost exclusively men) a business degree dominated, amongst editor in chiefs a degree in journalism was an almost necessary requirement, and amongst mid-ranking editors degrees in journalism, social science or the arts were equally important (Djerf Pierre, 2006).
3.3. Struggling to Find Strategies?

Retorting to this indeed very successful tactic has probably been problematic for the dominating group. As I have shown (in chapter three and previously in this chapter) there is a certain degree of disgruntleness over the situation of more and more highly educated young women entering the field and the news room. The appearance of women en masse has, as I have shown, taken place at the same time as a restructuring of the media system. Sweden saw, for example, an end to the public broadcast monopoly in the early 1990s, the introduction of cable television, at the same time as digitalisation of the printing presses made possible the introduction of sectionalised newspapers. In the UK similar trends can be found, the consequences of which I discussed previously: commercialisation and feminisation. In the UK this has affected the very particular strategy of the pub. This was evident during the interviews I did in 2002, during which many of the UK journalists talked of the changes to the pub culture. Brian was one who was outraged by these changes, and his statement is a good summery of the comments on the pub culture I received in 2002:

Pubculture? NO! That’s not allowed now. We don’t do liquid lunches anymore. There’s been a big change. There used to be three bars here at the BBC, and one of them has turned into a crèche. A crèche – would you believe it! There’s still one good one left, and people go there sometimes. (Brian, 2002)

In this quotation he is stating four important things. One, drinking alcohol is no longer accepted (I discussed this in a previous section). Two, the strategy of male networking and socialising in pub in direct connection with (or continuation of) the working day is very difficult. Three, a crèche has replaced a pub on the BBC premises, meaning that young women’s needs have been given priority by the organisation. Combined, this is a hard blow to the famous and infamous pub culture that has been used as a previously very successful strategy of excluding women from the core of the newsroom. The fourth statement is that the pub culture lives on, albeit in much smaller scale.

A strategy that has, and is, successful is the glass ceiling (cf Grünig, 1989; Djerf Pierre, 2006; Göransson, 2006). This entails women being excluded from the echelons of power in the field, apart from the odd token woman. Indeed, Bourdieu (1999) talks of masculinity as nobility, a necessary characteristic of reaching elite positions, of becoming a manager. With a female habitus, it is very difficult for women to reach these positions. Women that do manage to get a managerial position do so mainly in dominated fields, and Bourdieu counts journalism as such a field. Monica Djerf Pierre (2006) shows that within the field of journalism there
is a similar distinction. Men, whilst vastly dominating the elite, they manage to reach the most status filled elite positions – mainly in the commercial side of the organisation. Women, on the other hand, take the dominating positions even in the media elite; they are mainly found in the non-commercial, editorial sector of the media. These findings actually put a gender perspective onto the only conflict that Bourdieu (1998a) recognised, that between audimat and autonomy. Or between the commercial and non-commercial sectors of the media, i.e. according to Djerf Pierre’s findings, between men and women.

The members of this discriminated elite need to pay for their for being selected a token, need to pay for their exclusiveness, argues Bourdieu (1999), through constant attempts to live up to the extra expectations forced on them, and to ban all sexual connotations that could possibly arise in their bexit e.g. way of dressing. Furthermore, they need to pay for their success through failure on the family front (no children, higher degrees of divorce, celibacy, problems with children, etc). In journalism, this is not only true for female managers but also true for most career wise successful female journalists, which is what I have found throughout my studies (see chapter three).

Needless to say, women have found tactics to try to counteract these strategies as well, and again one tactic is based on the accumulation of valuable capital to counteract their female habitus, namely social capital. Using the tactic I called one of the girls literally means taking advantage of one’s female habitus and gathering in female groups of various kinds. It means creating one’s own social and professional network, to counteract the all-exclusively male old boys network. In her study of the Swedish media elite, Djerf Pierre (2006) shows that women who are part of the media elite have a much larger social network (capital) than media elite men. They furthermore have more support from their spouse and close relatives than other professional women. The reliance on a social network for support, both professional and private, is nothing new. Throughout the history of journalism women have used this tactic, be it in the UK (Chambers et al 2004; Tuson, 2005) or Sweden (Stål; 2002; 2003; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a). And today there are important networking organisations in Britain (Women in Journalism) and Sweden (Pennskaften).

Now, if women manage to cheat social bankers and use educational capital to gain wider access to journalism, and if they manage to aggregate useful social capital to threaten the glass ceiling, then what strategy will the dominating group use next to protect their place and power? This I have no answer to, and I see it as an interesting and important new area of research, particularly in Sweden, where women have come further and achieved more place and power than in the UK, albeit still being a dominated group.
5. CONCLUSIONS

CREATING AND UPHOLDING GENDERED JOURNALISM CULTURES

In this book I have aimed to seek an understanding of the way fields of journalism work, and the gendered nature this. I base the thesis on three studies: a survey study of the journalist field of Sweden in 1989; a thematic interview study of 33 national journalists in the UK (England and Scotland) in 1992 and again in 1998 to 2002. To these studies I have added secondary research material about journalism in Sweden and the UK. All this enables me to draw conclusions on Swedish and British journalism cultures in the 1990s.

1. THEORETICAL CONCLUSIONS

Theoretically this project has gone through an abduction process, with this book as a final (?) product. In chapter two I summarised this zig-zagging spiral movement through different theoretical fields with an image (Figure 11).

With this image I mean to show that the theoretical origin of this project is traditional sociology of journalism, particularly that of organisational theory. The first analysis of the 1989 Swedish study was made from this perspective (Melin, 1991a; Melin-Higgins, 1996 a; 1996c). The results did, however, tell me that a gender perspective is essential when studying and attempting to understand the mechanism
of journalism. Feminist theory in general and feminist media studies thus informed the analysis of the British studies (e.g. Melin-Higgins, 2003; 2004) as well as the re-analysis of the Swedish study (Melin-Higgins, 1996b). From feminist theory the step toward Cultural Studies was not far. The design of the British studies was informed by a combination of feminist methodological thinking and the interpretative methodologies used in Cultural Studies. And in the centre of my theoretical thinking lies Journalism Culture, a concept developed in the early 1990s (Melin, 1991), but theoretically fertilised by my zig-zagging spiral moving between the three theoretical fields of sociology of journalism, feminism and cultural studies.

Conclusion 1: In order to fully understand journalism, a feminist perspective is a pre-requisite. Indeed, both feminism and cultural studies bring a much needed vitality-injection to the traditional theoretical field of sociology of journalism.

As culture is notoriously difficult to study, the conceptual standpoint of this project lies in the feminist appropriation (see Moi, 1999) of the theoretical world of Pierre Bourdieu and Michel de Certeau. The following model is a visualisation of the standpoint I have used in this book:
**Journalism Culture:** what a particular body of journalists at a point in history feel, think, act and are. Journalism culture is creation and re-creation of meaning and reality, constantly negotiated and determined power. It is a shared world-view for a group of journalists. To me it is also a way of seeing journalism as culture.

**Journalist:** a person that acknowledges a professional identity as a journalist, and who has acquired a professional life through some formalised learning process, which entails internalising the ideals, values, ethics, codes of conduct and practices of the journalist culture to which s/he belongs.

**Social field:** a structured, limited space of embodied meaning, and systems of belief, guided by laws that need to be mastered by the players of the field. *Symbolic bankers*, the gatekeepers of the field, have monopoly to decide who can become a member of the field (become a journalist).

**Habitus:** a system of social dispositions, internalised through our social background and way of life.

**Hexis:** embodied habitus. Our social background and way of life written in our bodies.

**Capital:** recourses that we aggregate through our life. Some capital is inherited, others learnt or acquired. Economic, cultural, social, and educational capital are mentioned in this book.

**Doxa:** What we believe about the world and ourselves. It contains not only thought-patterns, but praxis patterns as well: beliefs, attitudes, behaviour ingredients. These are so natural to us that they are seen as common sense. Conflicts within fields are mainly about the doxa of the field, about the right to define reality. Opposing worldviews are called alldoxa.

**Strategies and tactics:** in Michel de Certeau’s (1984) eyes the social world is a battlefield. Dominating powerful players have a power base, a place from which they use strategies to ward off unwanted others. The dominated powerless others have no such power place, and use resilience, vigilance and time as a weapon in their guerrilla warfare; they use tactics.

**Gender:** a form of habitus, a system of dispositions and a system of hierarchical power. Gender is socially learnt, but not in an abstract way. It cannot easily be deconstructed, as it is impregnated into our bodies, thus hexis is also fundamentally gendered. Gender can furthermore be capital in the sense that one can aggregate more masculine or feminine capital.
2. CONCLUSIONS ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO JOURNALISM CULTURES

A first problem I was facing in studying journalism culture in Sweden and Britain was that the British journalism culture could be seen as many. Britain, or the United Kingdom, is one state but several nations, one monarch, but several parliaments. In the UK study I have indeed found differences between the English and Scottish fields. Scottish journalism had stronger links between journalism and the consumption of alcohol, misogyny and homophobia, and was also generally more left-wing and less politically-correct and less stressful than English journalism. But in terms of placing cultures next to each other to enable a contrasting, the similarities substantially outweigh the differences, and I therefore speak of one UK (or British) journalism culture.

If then, putting the two journalist cultures of Sweden and Britain the 1990s next to each other and looking at them in turn, my argument is that one finds major differences regarding the fields, doxa, strategies and tactics. I support this on the Swedish study from 1989 plus a number of secondary studies on Swedish journalism (based both on statistics and on interviews) and the two UK studies plus secondary studies on UK journalism (based mainly on statistics). This, I argue, allows me in this conclusive chapter to draw theoretical generalisations in a hermeneutic way.  

2.1. Fields

As I see it, there are three major differences between the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK. The first is the structure of the field, which in Britain had more pronounced hierarchy and adherence to routines and focus on competition, whereas flat organisations and editor’s availability were the more the word of the day (or decade) in Sweden. The second difference is the path into the field, which in Britain relied more on a traditional social network, i.e. whom you know was important, one’s habitus and social capital, whereas in Sweden a degree in journalism was more important, i.e. your high level of educational capital was the key to the profession. And the third difference follows from the first two, namely the social structure of the field. Swedish journalists are generally more educated than are their British colleagues. Swedish journalists received their education at universities, or from diploma courses (folkhögskolor) whereas British journalists received their education through trade unions and media organisations’ in-house training. This has led to the rate of journalists from a middle class background being higher in Sweden than
in the UK. There is also a significant difference, which, I argue, follows from all the previous differences, namely that the rate of women was (and is) much higher in Sweden than in the UK. Another cause for the gender differences is the fact that the field is always a reflection of the surrounding social space. As a consequence the balancing act of having a family and a career seems far more difficult in the British field than in the Swedish. For women that is. They were hit by the double effects of a traditional (British) patriarchal society, were there was little support for working mothers regarding maternity leave, day care and after school care, and where the structure and routines of the media organisations made it necessary for many to choose between having children (or even getting married) and a career. This was not the case in Sweden.

2.2. Doxa

There are some obvious differences between the doxas of British and Swedish journalism – again placing the fields side by side and looking at them in turn. First, the British field of journalism was almost doxic, meaning that there was one generally accepted way of defining journalism. In Sweden on the other hand, there was indeed one strong doxa, in the 1980s, but over the decade of the 1990s the field became more heterogeneous and by the mid 2000s there were obvious competing allodoxa.

The second difference is the approach to journalism. To simplify, one could say that the doxa of a Swedish journalist was more of an Educator, whereas the doxa of a British journalist was more that of the Bloodhound (see Figure 13).

More concretely there is a different stance in the neutral-participant divide. The British doxa put a greater emphasis on neutrality, hunting the objective Truth, and the disregard for ethics in this process. The Swedish doxa(s) allowed for a subjective stance, and stressed personal creativity and educational aspects of news much more. A third obvious difference is that whereas co-operation, and a healthy
way of life, were more noticeable in the Swedish doxa, the darker side of (journalism) life was glorified in the British doxa. Tough work situation, stress, lots of alcohol feature freely in, as did sexism, racism and homophobia.

2.3. Strategies

There are three strategies that were used differently in the fields of journalism in Sweden and Britain. The first is the use of social bankers. In British journalism they had a more direct control over who entered and not, as, still in the 1990s, the reliance of the old-boy’s-network loomed so very large over British journalism. And they used this power. Which is one reason, I argue, that the number of women, and minority groups, such as Catholics and people of colour, have been so low. The second strategy that was more pronounced in the British culture is the news room culture. Open sexism, racism and homophobia are commonly used in everyday encounters between journalists. This serves to subjugate non-desired groups of people (like women). These strategies were not visible in Swedish journalism culture. Not visible. I argue that they are also found in Sweden, but they are hidden under PC-ness, parental leave, and equality-regulations. The third strategy that differs was indeed visible. In Britain – but not at all in Sweden – was pub-going a widely used strategy. The newsroom culture and banter continued after work-hours in the pub, which was also a meeting-place for journalists and their sources. Pubs both as social and professional spaces were (and are) innately masculine. Placing meetings in pubs is therefore excluding, and a directly hostile act, against women journalists.

2.4. Tactics

Out of the various ways of defending themselves against the strategies used towards them, there was only one tactic that I found in one, but not the other journalism culture. It is evident that some British women journalists used what I call the Sexy Marionette tactic. As a response to subjugating sexism and belittlement, these women chose to emphasise their female habitus, and even to acquire more female capital. Being aware of its lesser status they aimed their work towards the audience, and kept a low non-threatening profile. This gave them individual advantages of freedom, power, space and place to do journalism, but in the process they accepted the status quo. They accepted the doxa and the field as it was. And in return they were left to get on as female journalists and were thus able to advance their careers.
3. CONCLUSIONS ON SIMILARITIES: STRATEGIES AND TACTICS USED TO FIGHT FOR DOXA ON THE FIELD OF JOURNALISM

The differences outlined above are very much what one could have expected with some knowledge of Britain, Sweden and the media systems in those countries. More interesting are the similarities I found, despite differences in cultures. This can be summarised as:

**Conclusion 2**: Similarities between the fields of journalism in Britain and Sweden outweigh the differences. In effect the gender order permeates every corner of those fields of journalism. And there are similar ways in which the gender order is defended and challenged. I can truly talk of gendered journalism cultures with gendered power-play.

3.1. Fields: Feminisation, Commercialisation, Gentrification

There are three main changes discernable in the fields of journalism in Britain and Sweden during the 1990s: feminisation, commercialisation and gentrification.

The fields of journalism were feminised in the sense that there was a substantial increase of women during the 1990s. This does not mean that men and women have become more equal. I have looked beyond the statistics, beyond the body-count and seen that a) there was still very much a vertical separation between men and women. The infamous glass ceiling was firm, and very few women manage to climb to the top of the hierarchical ladder. b) There was also still very much a gendered horizontal separation, meaning every space (or thing) of status is seen as a space (or thing) for men. From this follows the particular gendered logic of journalism (cf. Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2006b; 2007a) that permeates the fields of journalism.

The fields of journalism were furthermore feminised in the sense that soft news increased substantially during the 1990s. This was, according to many journalists, tied to the second trend, that of commercialisation, that both Britain and Sweden saw in the 1990s, and that has influenced journalists’ ways of thinking and acting. I found this connection both interesting and problematic. The expansion of soft news, it was argued, could be explained as a function of the fact that media has started seeing women as a group of consumers, i.e. as a potential huge market-segment. This implies an assumption that all women want soft news. Men want “cow-boys-and-indian stuff” and women want “emotional sorts of questions” (quoted
from interview of Dave, an English editor, in 1998), the latter being of lesser status. From this follows, so the argument goes, that newsrooms need more women journalists. Underlying this is an assumption that women journalists are better at doing soft news. Thus, whereas «tough, neutral, important, public domain, hard news and good journalist» was said in one sentence, «nurturing, emotional, lesser status, private domain, soft news and women» were fused into one breath.

Throughout this project I found that the experiences of this differed between men and women; most women experienced it as problematic to be forced into lesser status beats for the only reason they were women. Most men saw this as the natural state of affairs.

This pattern was the strongest in the UK, but despite a levelling-out of the horizontal separation in Sweden during the 1990s, the pattern remains the same even there.

**Conclusion 3:** The fields of journalism in Britain and Sweden saw strong trends of feminisation and commercialisation during the 1990s. By most journalists in the fields, these trends were seen as connected, and thus women journalists were on the one hand continually given lesser status soft news to cover because of their sex, and on the other hand blamed for the lowering of standards in journalism.

**Gentrification, Generations and Gender**

The third trend is that of gentrification. The 1990s saw an explosion in journalism education on tertiary (higher) education level. The traditional way into the field, of knowing someone that knows someone that fixes you a copy-boy job and then working your way up the hierarchy, still lingered in Brain during the 1990s. However, even by the early 2000s, it was obvious that a degree in journalism was the way into British journalism, as it already was in Sweden.

There was also a discernable generational shift. The new generation of British and Swedish journalists were young, middle class, and well educated. They brought with them habitus (a set of dispositions) and capital (recourses) into journalism, which already by the early 2000s changed the fields and their doxa. And they were seen as a threat by the old guard, as was evident in the British interviews.

This is also a gendered issue, as this new generation holds a larger number of women than previously. The reason for this is mainly that women have ceased the opportunity journalism courses have opened up to them and entered into the field carrying with them higher valued habitus (often upper middle class) and more educational capital, than men, who then perceive these new colleagues as a threat. They enlarge the numbers and enlarge the effect they have on journalism, and they
make women scapegoats for commercial changes on the field. There are of course large numbers of younger men with a middle class background and a degree. These are not seen as a threat.

**Conclusion 4:** During the 1990s journalist courses increased substantially in numbers both in Sweden and particularly in the UK. These have attracted people with different habitus from the old type of journalism: more women and more persons from the middle classes. Thus, feminisation, i.e. more women in journalism, interacted with gentrification of the fields.

### 3.2. Doxa: Stability and Change

The *doxas* in the fields of journalism in Sweden and the UK show both stability and change.

**Stability: The Gendered Logic of Doxa**

Stability in both fields is mainly twofold: one, the *doxas* have grown stronger. Two, they are inherently gendered.

First then, those that hold onto the *doxa* have a firmer hold. Despite what I previously pointed out as a difference (the Swedish *doxa*, as opposed to the British, being centred on a participant educator ideal) the so-called *Bloodhound ideal* (which entails objectively hunting for the Truth, and the end justifying the means) thrives and as become stronger in both cultures. I argue that this shift towards a firmer hold in *doxas* is tied to the trends of feminisation and gentrification in the fields. Namely, if the powerful groups feel under threat (as I have shown they did), they respond by tightening their hold on *doxa*, i.e. the definition of what journalism “is”.

Yet another indication of stability, and indeed a tightening hold on *doxa*, is the fact that the gendered logic of *doxa* lived on both in the minds and behaviour of journalists in both the British and Swedish fields. The figure Monika Djerf Pierre (2003; 2006; 2007a) drew up (see page 38) was indeed *lived*. Essentially, then, most British and Swedish journalists have an essentialist way of seeing gender, which is tangible in connection with the everyday work life of journalists. As pointed out, women were seen as *the other*. Men were one with... journalism. But one did not see men as equalling journalism. Men and masculinity were the norm, and hidden behind neutrality. This is how the *doxa* and gender system alike function. Thus not surprisingly, *none* of the journalists interviewed by me, or others, in Britain or Swe-
den mentioned *male or masculine* news, but many mentioned *female/feminine* news and saw it either as a problem or as an opportunity (both as essentialist).

There is, in fact, a substantial reason for believing in a separate male and female kind of journalism. As I showed in the Swedish study (Melin-Higgins, 1996c, see Figure 14), women differ from men in that they – regardless of general approach (which includes having a Bloodhound ideal) – have a more participant approach to journalism. The follow the ethical codes strictly and take responsibilities for the consequences of their journalism, thus thinking both of sources and audience. In this they generally differ from their male colleagues.

Interestingly, this evidence bares obvious parallels with the arguments for a feminist methodology as carried forward by for example Feminist Standpoint theorists (e.g. Harding, 1986; 1987).

It is important to point out that what I have discussed here is journalists’ views, not my own. I believe that there is no such thing as an inherently male or female journalism (or *doxa*). Underlying the *doxa* are, I argue, values that the dominating group, with their particular set of habitus, hexis and capital, bring with them. *Doxa* is, then, socially constructed, as is journalism, to suit the dominating group, and serve to give it status and power. And, as I have shown, in the centre of this lies an essentialist beliefs of what man “is” and what woman “is”.

This creates a problem on two levels. One, on a field level, is that of power. Who should decide *doxa*, what is journalism? As I have shown, the powerful group is not left to get on in peace, but is continually questioned by oppositional groups, that have their own set of dispositions, and their own beliefs of what journalism is – their *allo.doxa*. And they fight for it.

The other problem is on the individual level. Most women experience split identity problem, as woman+successful+journalist is an anomaly according to the gender logic of *doxa*. The solution on the individual level is to prioritise one factor above the others.

---

**Figure 14:** Differences in approach to journalism between men and women journalists in Sweden 1989.

**Legend:**
The factors gender and education are shown in relative terms and the figure should be read as e.g. more women than men hold a participant ideal.
The solution to these two problems is to allow for changes, but this is impossible, according to Pierre Bourdieu, whose analytical tools I use. Women are hindered by *amor fati*, in that they are their own worst enemies and continually re-produce the gender logic. And indeed, I found this to be the case in both Sweden and Britain. Furthermore, one’s dispositions (habitus) are engraved in one’s body (hexis) and cannot be deconstructed just like that. We carry with us the way we have learnt to be a man, or a woman. Or to be a woman journalist.

**Change: Gendered Gentrification**

On the other hand I found evidence of a noticeable change in the *doxas*. I have already mentioned increased possibilities for tertiary education, gentrification, and more women. I have also shown that in Sweden the, so-called, Educator ideal grew stronger. In the UK more journalists recognised and problematised the existing *doxa*, and in 2002 more journalists recognised subjectivity as a preferred approach to journalism. This is in fact evidence of *allodoxa*, an alternative *doxa* of dominated, oppositional groups, growing stronger. I argue that this is thus close to a Kuhnian paradigm-shift in journalism, which can be explained by the new groups of journalists that have entered the fields and that have brought their habitus, hexis and educational capital with them. A process, that has led to life-style changes. There was namely, in addition, a considerable shift towards rejecting alcohol during work-hours (discernable mainly in Scotland) and towards a general healthy way of life. And a more efficient way of working. Again, in Scotland this change is remarkable.

**Conclusion 5:** There is stability in the change of *doxa*. Whilst substantial changes have taken place towards a more subjective and participant ideal, a more healthy lifestyle with less alcohol, and where the working-class, semi-alcoholic news-hunting slugger is almost gone from the centre stage of the *doxas*, there was at the same time a strengthening of the core of the *doxa*. The bloodhound ideal is held onto much firmer, as was the gender logic of journalism.

### 3.3. Strategies and tactics: Fighting for Doxa on the (Battle)Field of Journalism

Pierre Bourdieus’s doom-and-gloom view fits poorly with my own more optimistic outlook. Despite his war allegory, I therefore find Michel de Certeau’s (1984) way of seeing the dynamics of the field more useful in my final analysis. And it fits with the results of my studies: there were substantial changes in the fields, and the *doxas*. 
Strategies

The reason there are warlike battles on any social field is the fight over the symbolic power to define *doxa*. Having the power to define reality, in this case to define journalism, gives naturally a whole series of benefits: status, money, more power, to name but a few. When the existing dominating group, which in both Sweden and Britain comprises of mainly white, (middle class), protestant men, feel their power being threatened they need to defend their power-base. They do so by the use of a series of strategies. In this book I have mainly studied gendered power play, but I want to point out that *women* in my analysis easily can be exchanged for Catholics, Muslims, people of colour, immigrants, et cetera. The main strategies found were:

- **Social bankers**, the gatekeepers of the field, that had traditionally a big say in who could enter the field through the apprenticeship system, but more and more work through social networks and education.
- **Social networks** had an important part in helping a select few into jobs, and up the career-ladder. In the UK it was notoriously known as the *Old-boy’s network*. Thus, what was important for your career in journalism is whom you know.
- **Education** has also been used, as a way to control both who could become a journalist and what a journalist should be. I found the curriculum on journalist courses to reflect the *doxa*. Arguably a new educational strategy in Sweden is a business degree.
- **Essentialism** was a base for the dichotomised gendered logic journalism, and continues to be central to the *doxa* of both Sweden and Britain. Essentialism can also be seen as a strategy in that the dominating group uses symbolic violence to enforce the dichotomy upon women. Soft-hard news, *female* journalist, belittlement are a few examples.
- **Daily routines**, and indeed the entire structure of the field of journalism, were turned against women, which made it difficult (in Sweden) or near impossible (in the UK) to have a family. And most British women journalists have been forced to make a choice between a career and a family. On an every-day basis the *morning meeting* functioned as continuous preservation of the gendered logic of journalism, with regular fights as a consequence.
- **Harassment** was another daily weapon, but used differently in the UK and Sweden. In the British field of journalism I found everything from slander, name-calling, belittlement to outright physical sexual abuse. In Swedish journalism everything was much more politically correct.
- **The pub** (in the UK only), a manly territory used as an excluding social and professional space with machismo overtones. Having been a very strong strategy it is now retreating as a main strategy and from the central stage of *doxa*. 
• The glass ceiling was a final way to stop women from entering the higher echelons of journalism. And I found it to be a successful strategy in both cultures.

**Tactics**

In order to enter into the field of journalism, to get a place and a career, and generally to cope with everyday symbolic violence, oppositional groups (mainly women in my studies) use a variety of tactics, which de Certeau (1984) likens with guerrilla warfare. The tactics I have found in Britain and Sweden were:

• **One of the boys**, a career-wise successful tactic. Women internalised doxa and the rules of the game of journalism and played it well. But they opposed, often aggressively, the gendered logic of journalism and indeed turned it upside-down by aggregating masculine capital, and changing their hexis towards a more manly way of being. Both in Sweden and Britain a degree in journalism was common amongst those who chose this tactic.

• **One of the girls** was a tactic used by women (mainly) and men alike, who strongly and vocally opposed the doxa. Instead they fought for their own set of beliefs, allodoxa, which included a subjective, ethical method, and fighting for a special cause. They had lots of educational and social capital, and created their own social network as a way to fight for space. Most of them had also chosen to have a family and a career. On an individual level the career was a failure, as the careers of both men and women suffered from the use of this tactic. On a field level, however, it was perhaps the most successful tactic, as the allodoxa of One of the girls-tactic, is possibly the up-and-coming doxa.

• **Flight** was, again, a tactic used by women and men alike, as a final escape from the symbolic violence of the newsroom and a way to create space and freedom to continue journalism, to have a family and work as a journalist, or to capitalise on one’s journalistic capital and enter into other social fields. It meant going freelance, working in public relations, or as a lecturer in journalism on one of the many journalist courses.

• **Sexy marionette** (in the UK only) as I discussed earlier was a way to use one’s female habitus and aggregate more feminine capital in order to play the gendered game and thus secure a niche to work in piece.

**Dynamic Battles Between Dominating and Dominated Groups**

I have some general reflections on these four tactics. *First*, it is interesting to note changes on the individual level. The British women I interviewed changed their tactic depending on their situation, i.e. they did not choose a tactic for life, but instead adopted according to what was most beneficial for them at the moment in
time. de Certeau talks of the powerless catching the moment of time to strike in order to achieve as good a position as possible. I believe this is probably true also in Sweden.

Secondly, oppositional groups, women in these studies, not only cease the moment and the opportunities of gaps in the fences around the field, but actually take strategies and turn them around. For example, women create their own social networks, which then becomes a successful way of supporting each other (as I have shown was the case in Britain) or as a way of managing to get a good career (as Djerf Pierre, 2006, shows was a prerogative for women in the elite of Swedish journalism). Another example is how tertiary journalist courses have become a tactic for women both to enter the field and as a way to escape the newsroom (as lecturers).

A third reflection is that in order to succeed to break the glass-ceiling of journalism women need to fulfil two out of four criteria:
1) accept the doxa, and become one of the boys, which really means challenging the gender order, but playing by the rules of journalism,
2) come from an upper-middle class background – i.e. have a useful habitus,
3) have a postgraduate degree from Oxbridge (the UK) or a journalism degree (Sweden), i.e. the right educational capital,
4) have a strong professional and social network – i.e. lots of social capital.

Conclusion 6: I argue there is stability in changing the strategies used to retain power. With the changing winds sweeping over the field, the powerful need to adapt their strategies to remain in power. And the new strategies, I argue, will be directed towards strengthening the glass ceiling, upholding the gendered enlightenment dichotomy and using more politically correct symbolic violence, and thereby keeping women in place or leave the field. Education will probably continue to be a strategy, with business degrees in addition to journalism courses.

Regarding tactics used by the powerless groups, mainly women journalists, I argue they are used opportunistically. Namely, on a general level new tactics are being thought up continually, and old tactics are revised – depending on their usefulness and efficiency. So, for example, journalist courses and social networks are two avenues being explored and integrated into tactics. On an individual level, almost all the interviewed female journalists changed their tactics over the decade, clearly as a way to maximise their opportunities. The successfullness of their career depends very much on capital gained. Female journalists must compensate for their disadvantageous female habitus, by having or gaining more valuable types of capital. The choice of tactic for doing so is imperative.
4. VISUALISATION OF GENDERED JOURNALISM CULTURES

Finally I present this image of the Gendered Journalism Cultures of Sweden and Britain in the late 20th century. It is a visualisation of my findings in this book.

Thus, the summary of the summary goes:

The social field is a reflection of the surrounding larger social space (in my specific example these are the social spaces of Sweden and Britain). In the social fields of journalism there is a constant battle going on over doxa, i.e. a belief-system of
what journalism is, how to do journalism and how to be a journalist. This is decided by the dominating group in the field. This elite consists mainly of white middle class, protestant male journalists, and the doxa is a reflection of their dispositions, i.e. habitus, hexis and aggregation of capital. When being attacked by new groups entering the field they use a series of strategies to defend their powerbase (to define doxa). These are (apart from the entire structure of the social field) daily routines, social bankers and social networks, essentialism as in a gendered logic of journalism, educational institutions, harassment of different sorts and finally a tight glass-ceiling to prevent unwanted persons to climb up the career ladder.

However, there are several of those unwanted groups that manage to enter the social field of journalism. In order to gain access to the field, to get opportunities to get space to do journalism, and to cope in their everyday work, they use a series of tactics. These are not fast; they change over time depending on opportunities. The tactics I have found are the use of social networks, aggregating masculine capital or alternatively (more) feminine capital, bringing with them or acquiring educational capital. Creating a niche free from insight is another tactic. Some (but not all) oppositional groups have an outspoken belief-system themselves, an allodoxa, for which they fight.

Looking ahead

This book has had a perspective of hindsight, looking back. Now I would like to look forward. Having analysed the cultures over a decade, I have found the changes both on a field and on an individual level thrilling. By the early 2000s there were clear evidence – both in Britain and Sweden – of the traditional doxa and an allodoxa living side by side. Are we observing a Kuhnian paradigm shift in journalism? However, the fields are continually changing. New strategies will be thought up and used against women and other groups. New tactics will be developed in response to them. The fight for doxa will continue.

The past year or so I have observed discussions in media, statements from famous journalists and anecdotes from newsrooms. They tell me that strategies that I thought were gone, or at least on the way out, such as manifest sexism, racism and homophobia, seem to find its way back into favour among the powerful journalists. This is in Sweden. The land of equality. I do, however, have faith in the power, resilience and ingenuity of so called “powerless” groups to find ways of articulating this and fight back.

These developments will be fascinating to follow. They will serve as the ground for more exciting research.
NOTES

CHAPTER 1

1 This book, together with the two texts, make up a Swedish doctorate thesis in Journalism and Media and Communication Studies. Within that formal context, this book both presents empirical analyses not published previously and serves as the framework (in Swedish “kappa”) for the whole doctorate thesis.

2 This method was also used successfully by Einat Lachover (2005) in her study of Israeli women journalists.

CHAPTER 2

1 These “problematics” are 1) ownership and control, 2) employment, 3) professional identity, 4) news sources, 5) representation, 6) narrative forms and practices, 7) feminisation and sexualisation, and 8) news audiences (Carter et al, 1999).
It is notoriously difficult to get an accurate number/share of gender, and to compare with some reliability is almost impossible. The reason is that the sample frame of studies varies dramatically. If the sample frame is full time employees (Köcher, 1985; 1986) the share of women will be very low. If it is trade union membership as in the Swedish journalist studies, and the trade union encompasses most journalists, the share of women will be higher. One example is the number of female journalists in France, that is said to be 20 percent by McMane (1998) and 45 percent by Marchetti (2005). And the time period for the studies is supposedly the same. Thus, these comparative figures must be read cautiously.


The classic enlightenment dichotomy puts male, active, strong, aggressive, objective, rational, public, et cetera on one side and female, passive, weak, nurturing, subjective, irrational, private, et cetera on the other (as the other). And the male side is consequently seen as the important, status-filled side.

The countries that includes having been studied from a gender perspective are Canada (Robinson et al, 1998); USA (Johnstone et al, 1976; Robinson, et al, 1998), The Caribbean (de Bruin, 1998), Finland (Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997), Sweden (Löfgren-Nilsson, 1994; 1999; Melin-Higgins, 1991a; 1996a; b; c) Germany and Britain (van Zoonen and Donsbach, 1988) and the UK and the US (Chambers et al, 2004).

Gendered working conditions in journalism is discussed by e.g. Löfgren-Nilsson, 1995; Melin-Higgins, 1996a; c; Robinson et al, 1998; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997.


The limitation of women’s space in journalism is discussed by for example Beasly, 1989; Smith et al, 1989; Egsmose, 1993; 1998; de Bruin, 1998; Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; van Zoonen, 1998b.

A comparative study of television hosts and hostesses was done in Denmark by Vibeke Pedersen (1999), in Sweden by Ulla B Abrahamsson (1999), in Norway by Kathrine Skretting (1999), and in Finland by Tarja Savolainen (1999).

Audimat stands for audimètre automatique, a tool mainly used for measuring broadcast viewers and listeners. Audimat is, however, also the results from the measurements, and even book- magazine- and newspaper readership measured by readership studies (Bourdieu, 1998a), studies often used with commercial objectives.

It is clear that the essays Sur la television from 1997 and L’emprise du journalisme from 1994 are refined written essays, where the arguments are likewise expressed verbally in his lecture Champ politique, champ des science sociale, champ journalistique, delivered at the l’Université Lumière in Lyon 1995 but published posthumously (Bourdieu, 2005).


17 In *La domination masculine* Bourdieu terms these invisible structures that organises perception *matrix*.


22 The perhaps strongest critique against Bourdieu for being a determinist structuralist comes from Judith Butler’s (1997) discussion of his work. She argues that he makes social institutions static and fails to understand the possibilities of social change. Albeit giving interesting critique, she and Bourdieu has such different views of production and reproduction of identity and of social change that it becomes impossible to meet in any discussion. One could say they belong to different paradigms in a Kuhnian sense.

23 The gender system (or the hierarchical nature of social space) with its masculine domination cannot be sustained without the acceptance of this by the very groups that loose out the most, the dominated (by colour, class, gender).

24 In a posthumously published work on Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field gender is only mentioned three times: once by Bourdieu himself, as mentioned above (2005:37), once by Dominique Marchetti (2005:74) who points to the gender division in special fields (soft-hard news), and once by Eric Darras (2005:162) who says on the topic of media consecration of the political order: “We therefore
cannot blame journalists for the absence of female invitees: if there were only 11 female politicians in the whole history of L’Heure de vérité (1882-1994), this is above all due to their exclusion from the political battlefield”. All in all the book is a notable exclusion of important scientific factors (like gender) from the battlefield of journalism by the authors, a collection of white Western males.

Bourdieu discusses gender in several of his texts, and gender enters his analysis particularly in The Logic of Practice, Distinction, and Homo Academicus, albeit quite sketchily. In his later work La domination masculine, he draws his thoughts and empirical work on gender together in this very interesting, and indeed highly political essay on the masculine domination of the social world.

Those are industry/business, politics, social service, organisations, media, culture, academia, and the media room, i.e. media content.

I am indebted to my colleague Monika Djerf Pierre for the discussion about ‘culture’ and ‘journalist culture’ we had whilst writing a joint paper (Melin-Higgins & Djerf Pierre, 1998), which was an attempt to make a comparison between cultures and across time possible (Britain 1990s – Sweden 1950s).

In his work La Distinction Bourdieu discusses different types of capital and their use in positioning oneself in social space, through classes. Cultural capital is the possession of cultural codes, i.e. to enjoy opera, modern dance, avant-garde art, chess, Bach etc. – High Culture, the best of the best. Social capital is etiquette, i.e. how to behave in certain circumstances, but also the social network one knows (e.g. old boys network). Economic capital is money, and power through money, i.e. the most material of capital, and – what gives the most power in society, albeit not the most status.

Different classes, or fractions of classes possess different quantities of capital, e.g. the dominating fraction of the dominating class (or les nouveau riches) has a lot of economic capital but not enough of others. The dominated fraction of the dominating class (or the cultural elite) has plenty of cultural and social capital, but not enough economic capital (to satisfy their taste). There is thus a battle going on, where the dominated and dominating fractions fight about positions, and fight about taste definitions (Bourdieu, 1984).
Everyday French is helpful in understanding the underlying connotations – and thus the meaning Bourdieu puts into the concepts – of social space, espace sociale, and social field, champ sociale. Champ is a more limited concept, and connotes a field with visible borders, e.g. a fenced-in field with grazing cows. Champ can also be used to circumscribe a metaphoric visible field e.g. a “champ de recherche”, “champ d’informatique”. A space, espace, is bigger and is comprised of several fields, champs, i.e. a group of champs becomes an espace. That way they can easily be compared. An espace (fields of root vegetables – carrots, parsnips, and potatoes) are compared with another espace (fields of corn – wheat, rye, oat). In French, a concept like champ du journalisme is thus closer to the everyday use of the words than is the case in English.

In writing this paragraph I have been inspired by primarily the following texts: de Beauvoire, 1949/2002; Connell, 1987; Hirdman, 1988; 1990; MacKinnon, 1989; Jónasdóttir, 1991a; 1991b; Badinter, 1992; de Bruin, 1998; Hagemann & Åmark, 1999; de los Reyes & Mulinar, 2005; Göransson, 2006.

CHAPTER 3

For theoretical comparison see de Certeau, 1984; Bourdieu, 1984; 1986; 1998a; Rosengren, 2002.

Using the adjective Scotch instead of Scottish is highly offensive on par with nigger. Scotch is a drink (whiskey). Scottish is a people.

Ich ken yer fether (I know your father) is a Scottish way of saying “don’t think you’re better than I, we’re from the same background”, i.e. of social control and putting someone down. In Sweden and Denmark the same way of thinking is called Jantelagen.

The book The Global Journalist, edited by David Weaver (1998) is the most obvious example of this perspective, as it is describing the generalised characteristics and roles of journalists from 21 countries.

SNP is Scottish Nationalist Party and has grown substantially during the 1990s to become the second largest party in Scotland, and should not be compared with BNP, The British Nationalist Party, which is ultra-right wing.
6 There are testimony to alcohol playing a much larger role in the culture of Swedish journalism. See e.g. Reimer’s (2002) historic account of sports-journalism.

7 I refer here to the studies done in 1994, 1995, 2000 and 2005 by the Department of Journalism and Masscommunication at Göteborg’s University.

8 Delano (2003:273-274) quotes four different surveys of British journalists from mid- to end 1990s, and the numbers vary from 25 (women working with news) to 40 percent (women working in media organisations). The latter number, thus encompass women working in jobs I have not defined as journalists.

9 Anthony Delano (2003) interestingly argues in his article Women Journalists: What’s the Difference? that women journalists today have achieved equality. Save for less salary, lower status positions, experienced sexism and ageism, increased problems with childcare … etc.

10 When Mary Stott agreed to the interview she answered my statement about being anonymous that I was indeed allowed to use her real name, as it would be hard to hide her identity in any case. Furthermore, Mary Stott gave me her memoires (Stott, 1973) to use in my research. And her life has been discussed by e.g. Steiner (1998) and Chambers et al (2004). Thus, Mary Stott is the only journalist whose real and full name I use.

11 To give references to studies that have found evidence of gendered separation between soft and hard news is difficult — basically every study that have studied journalism and taken sex or gender into account have found this. Some references are Beasly, 1989; van Zoonen, 1994; 1998; Melin-Higgins, 1995; 1996a; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Eide, 1993, Schlesinger, 1978, Robinson & Saint-Jean, 1998; Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2004; 2007a.

12 England and Scotland have separate and somewhat different school- and higher education systems.

13 See Chambers, Steiner and Flemming, 2004: chapter 3 for facts about educational systems for journalists in the UK and the US. See also this text for a discussion between the NCTJ and the AJE.
For a European comparison see Frölich and Holz-Bacha, 1993; 1994; for UK and American comparison see Steiner, 1992; Chambers, Steiner and Flemming, 2004.

For European, UK and US comparisons see ibid.

I am talking here of name-calling directed towards female journalists. I understand there are similar name-callings towards homosexuals and coloured people, but I have too little evidence in my material to further analyse this.

To these stories I can add my own. During the interviews with several of the male journalists I had my bottom stroked, hands put in a too-familiar way on my shoulder or on the small of my back. I have had men flirting openly with me during the interview. Men showing me off to colleagues at the company bar. And worst, an editor putting his hand high up on my thigh (under my knee-length city-shorts) and whilst looking me straight in the eyes, asking me if it is true that Swedish girls are so good at sex.

Swedish Television (SVT) is the Swedish public broadcast company.

Bourdieu (1998a) does, however, point to the conflict within journalism between the audimat and autonomy.

Jan Guillou is (along with Jan Josefsson) the most famous and admired investigative journalist in Sweden, see Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a.

During the 1990s, despite having equal opportunities of parental leave, women took 90 percent of the leave offered to both parents.

I realise that there are issues regarding the informers essentialist view that I have not touched upon in this chapter. I will however do that in chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

1 A comparative study of television hosts and hostesses was done in Denmark by Vibeke Pedersen (1999), in Sweden by Ulla B Abrahamsson (1999), in Norway by Kathrine Skretting (1999), and in Finland by Tarja Savolainen (1999).

2 This has been shown by a number of scholars, for example by Smith, 1980; Zilliakus-Tikkanen, 1997; Holland, 1998; van Zoonen, 1998; Henningham and Delano, 1998; Pedersen, 1999; Delano, 2003 Djerf Pierre, 2003; 2007a; Ross, 2004; Djerf Pierre & Löfgren-Nilsson, 2004, Jönsson, 2005; Edström, 2006b.


4 Of British journalists, 45 percent are from upper middle class background, 12 percent from middle class background and 31 percent from working class background – add to that 7 percent working in the media sector. The question these numbers was based on was “When you were growing up, what kind of work did the main breadwinner in your house-hold do (Henningham and Delano, 1998). Of Swedish journalists in 1989, 32 percent said to come from working class background, 32 percent from middle class background 21 percent from upper middle class background, and add to that 10 percent from the background of company ownership (Weibull, 1991). The pattern of one third from a working class background has persisted into the 2000s (Djerf Pierre, 2007b). Swedish journalists were asked a different kind of question: how they would describe the class background they were brought up in, i.e. a subjective class statement (Weibull, 1991; Djerf Pierre, 2007b). Two different measurements, in other words, and caution is necessary when comparing these figures.

5 In the UK the number of journalists with higher degrees has risen from 30% in the 1960s (Tunstall, 1971) to 49% in mid 1990s, and a further 20% have attended some kind of tertiary educational institution (Henningham and Delano, 1998). In Sweden 60 % attended some form of higher education 1989 and the figure rose to 75% in 1999 (Jönsson, 2005) and 79% in 2005 (Edström, 2007).

Pennskaften was a derogatory term for women journalists at the turn of last century. The American equivalent is Sob Sisters.

CHAPTER 5

I think of a hermeneutic analysis as a part reflecting the meaning of the whole. For example, an archiologist could say something about a stone age culture from analysing the find of anb axe. The axe is embodied with cultural meaning, as is each individual journalist I have interviewed.
# APPENDIX

## An Overview of the Interviewed UK Journalists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Work-situation 1992</th>
<th>Work-situation 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ailsa</td>
<td>Scottish, working-class, husband a journalist, her age: 37/47</td>
<td>Fashion editor on Scottish tabloid</td>
<td>Freelance fashion editor, runs model agency, stylist and fashion photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair</td>
<td>Scottish Catholic middle class, divorced, one young son, age: 28/38</td>
<td>Crime reporter on Scottish tabloid</td>
<td>Invalid pensioner, stress related illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Irish upper middle-class, boarding school, husband a media editor, age: 40+/50+. Widow.</td>
<td>Editor of Women's page at Scottish broadsheet</td>
<td>Moved to London – freelance. Moved back to Scotland – freelancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Scottish protestant working-class, married with 2 teenage sons, age: 47/57</td>
<td>Crime reporter for Scottish tabloid</td>
<td>Invalid pensioner, alcohol related illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Name   | Class        | Education                  | Current Position                          | Previous Position | Notes                                                                 
|--------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------  
<p>| Brian  | English, middle-class, MA English | Deputy intake editor, home news, BBC TV | Head of news-gathering, BBC |                  |<br />
| Bob    | Scottish working-class, BA arts | General reporter on Scottish broadsheet | Senior political reporter on Scottish broadsheet |                  |<br />
| Charles| Northern English working-class, BA Eng. litt. | Popular culture reporter on Scottish broadsheet | Arts columnist on Scottish broadsheet, sports commentator plus comedy presenter Radio Scotland |                  |<br />
| Clarissa| Scottish middle class, married, two young/early teen-age daughters | Editor of large weekly magazine, Glasgow | Freelance journalist, news and current affairs. Later deputy editor of Scottish tabloid. |                  |<br />
| Dave   | Poor working class, grammar school, married 1 child | Associate news editor and feature editor at English tabloid | Editor of English tabloid |                  |<br />
| Diana  | English working class, 3 year journalist college course, husband social service director, 2 step children/2 young children of her own | Home affairs correspondent at English broadsheet | Part time political columnist for large weekly magazine, part time writer plus being at home with children. |                  |<br />
| Edward | Scottish upper middle class, English boarding school, but no university, married, later two children, age 35/45-ish | BBC, Scotland correspondent | BBC Scotland, general reporter |                  |<br />
| Elisabeth| Scottish upper middle-class, husband graphic designer, age: 46/56 | Chief feature writer Scottish broadsheet, presenter Radio Scotland | Chief feature writer Scottish broadsheet, presenter Radio Scotland, BBC Scotland presenter |                  |<br />
| Flora  | English upper middle class, BA French &amp; Russian, husband a journalist, 1 / 2 children, age: 41/51 | Editor of Woman’s magazine on BBC Radio | Management consultant, runs BBC media management courses |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>English middle class, BA economics at Bath, Scottish wife, 1 baby, age 32/42</td>
<td>ITV Scotland Correspondent</td>
<td>Left ITN. Moved to BBC, London working as finance correspondent, but mainly radio. Stood for parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Scottish upper middle-class, BA, husband film director, no children / 3 young sons, age 28/38</td>
<td>General reporter on Scottish broadsheet</td>
<td>At home with children, plus working as part-time web-journalist for the BBC, plus writing novel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Scottish working-class, wife a student, 2 young children, age: 40/50</td>
<td>News editor at Scottish tabloid</td>
<td>Left 1995. Have not found him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>Scottish middle-class, MA sociology + English, MA journalism, husband musician, age: 37/47</td>
<td>Free lance court journalist and feature writer</td>
<td>Free lance court journalist and feature writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Scottish middle-class, wife shop manager, two young children, age: 37/47</td>
<td>General reporter at English tabloid</td>
<td>Early retirement. Moved back to Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Scottish middle class, BA history and sociology, NCTJ course in journalism, husband investment analyst, no kids/ two kids, age 29/39</td>
<td>Social affairs correspondent at Scottish broadsheet</td>
<td>Housewife in London with two children. Wants to get back to work. In 2004 worked with web-journalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Scottish protestant rural middle-class, married, two adult sons, age: 46/ dead</td>
<td>Political reporter for Radio Scotland + BBC radio</td>
<td>Senior political reporter for Radio Scotland + BBC radio Deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ethnicity/Background</td>
<td>Education/Profession</td>
<td>Work History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>Scottish working class, no education, wife English, no kids, age 40/50</td>
<td>Political correspondent for ITV Scotland</td>
<td>Left 1994. Have not found him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>English/Norwegian upper middle-class, PhD in French history, girlfriend psycho-analyst, age: 30/40</td>
<td>Special correspondent at English broadsheet</td>
<td>1998 foreign correspondent at English broadsheet 2002 PR Director for Microsoft, USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margret</td>
<td>English upper middle-class, BA, husband managing director, 2 young children, age</td>
<td>Reporter at Scottish broadsheet, Then PR officer</td>
<td>Lecturer in journalism, freelance feature writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Northern English upper middle-class, Wife and two young daughters, age: 45/55</td>
<td>News editor on Scottish broadsheet</td>
<td>Early retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>English middle-class, husband journalist, one adult daughter, age 70+</td>
<td>Retired. Previously editor of Womens’ page on large English broadsheet.</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Scottish working-class, NCTJ, single/later married to judge, age: 47/57</td>
<td>Current affairs reporter at BBC Scotland TV-news</td>
<td>Current affairs reporter at STV. Early retirement in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>English middle class, married, two school/teenage children, age 40/50</td>
<td>BBC television presenter and foreign correspondent</td>
<td>BBC television presenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Middle class, single, aged 40/50.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiator and chairperson of women journalists’ network. Freelance feature writer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polly</strong></td>
<td>Scottish working-class, BA philosophy, Married with two teenage/adult children, age: 44/54</td>
<td>Women section + foreign affairs feature stories for Scottish broadsheet</td>
<td>Freelance journalist, research assistant, writer, worked for women’s organisation. Deceased 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ray</strong></td>
<td>English middle-class, Engineering degree, single, age: 31/41</td>
<td>Photographer, camera man, ITV Scotland</td>
<td>Left ITN to work freelance. Moved to London and occasionally writes for newspaper and magazine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rose</strong></td>
<td>English middle-class, BA European Studies, Social worker, Diploma in Radio Journalism, husband TV-journalist, 2 young sons, age: 40/50</td>
<td>Channel 4 Foreign news editor</td>
<td>1997: Freelance consultant Radio editor, web-page editor and in 2002 director at BBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruth</strong></td>
<td>English lower middle-class, BA politics at Oxford, husband school teacher, 1/2 small children, age: 33/43</td>
<td>Producer at BBC radio</td>
<td>Producer at BBC television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steve</strong></td>
<td>Scottish lower middle-class, married, two teenage/adult children, age: 47/57</td>
<td>General reporter at BBC Scotland TV news</td>
<td>Forward planning desk at STV news room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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