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ABSTRACT

This study intends to explore how news organisational culture in Korean journalism deals with new policies introduced in an effort to resolve current problems. Several previous studies suggest that organisational culture contains contradictory facets: sometimes it functions as a bridge connecting individual members of an organisation to a new environment; at other times it restricts an organisation from adopting new strategies for problem-solving. In this respect, this study aims to identify how the established news organisational culture of Korean newspaper journalism relates to the specialist journalism that news organisations are introducing in order to deal with such problems as journalists' job prospects and Internet challenges.

For this purpose, this study posits three research questions, namely: "Why do news organisations intend to introduce specialism?"; "What does specialism have to do with the news organisational culture?"; and "Is specialism effective in providing 'better journalism'?". This study conducts four pieces of field research: 26 in-depth interviews, 2 focus group discussions, a survey, and a brief content analysis. Based on the field research, firstly, this study finds that specialism is a strategic choice which is arbitrarily adapted for problem-solving rather than an established culture. Secondly, specialism reveals some significant conflicts between specialists and generalist reporters regarding personnel management policies and the routines of news production. Accordingly, specialism is considerably restricted by the news organisational culture. Lastly, this study discovers that specialism does not necessarily provide better journalism, especially in terms of supplying mobilising information to guide audiences out of their grievances caused by government’s mishandling public policies.

To sum up, the current news organisational routines of Korean newspapers is related more closely to resisting changes rather than bridging the individuals of news organisations with newly emerging environments, and these routines do not provide effective systems for the newsgathering activities of specialist reporters.
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Part I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned with the interrelationship between specialism and the news organisational culture in Korean newspaper journalism. Specialism is a rather new system in Korean journalism, and accordingly it has to establish its existence within the news organisational culture. In the process of implementing specialism, the routines of news organisation management and news production seem to be contingent affecting factors, especially in the view of constraining journalists’ autonomy.

At the turn of the millennium, Korean newspapers are eager to introduce a specialist system. Most of them regard specialism as a competitive strategy for dealing with two urgent necessities: one relates to newsroom management of journalists; the other is a need to meet a changing new media environment.

On the one hand, most newspaper reporters these days in Korean journalism seem to prefer reporter's work to a management position in a bureaucratic hierarchy. This attitude is related to their job insecurity since promotion to management is highly difficult. Furthermore, a management position does not seem to guarantee a career future. They have experienced unprecedented redundancy due to the economic recession in the late 1990s. To be a specialist is therefore regarded as a means of protecting their job, and of providing stronger career prospects.

On the other hand, even if newspapers may not seem to be radically changing their traditional ways of existence, it is certain that historically, newspapers have adapted to the media environmental challenges brought on by new media. Like TV or Cable, the Internet also influences newspaper journalism. It provides newspapers with a chance to make news production
efficient. It also allows the audience to enjoy interactive news consumption, and more problematically, it brings newspapers into a crisis of losing their readers. Newspapers, however, appear to be confident that traditional newspaper characteristics are seen as competitive enough to cope with Internet news. Korean newspapers, in this sense, are employing specialism as a way of strengthening their core competence such as quality news or credibility. They consider that these qualities are absent in Internet news.

However, such purposes of specialism are unlikely to be readily achieved in reality. Even if implementing specialism needs a somewhat different treatment in management policies to that used for generalists, it is uncertain that the existing news organisational culture is ready to admit it. Various routines of news organisational management and news production in Korean journalism could affect the formulation and implementation of specialism in news organisations. One of the most manifest examples may be the routines of the beat system. The beat system is an efficient newsgathering means that allows journalists regular contacts with organisational sources such institution as governmental departments and regular supply of news information. Most journalists in Korean newspapers tend to protect their jurisdiction of beat territories from their colleagues. The existing routines of the beat system affect the embodiment of specialism's new ways of news production by blocking specialists' access to beats. The routines of news organisational control over reporters also effects significant constraints of specialist flexibility. These could ultimately impact on news produced by specialists. The resistance to change of the news organisational culture seems to be a critical issue regarding specialism in Korean journalism.

From this perspective, this study will explore how the existing news organisational culture in Korean newspapers deals with and accepts the new system of specialism. It pays attention to why and how the organisational culture of Korean newspapers is not easily compatible with a new policy of
specialism. With this in mind, this study will explore three points. The first is to investigate why specialism is required. The second is how specialism is adopted in the news organisational culture. The third is whether or not specialism means 'better journalism'.

1.1 Research Background

Present-day Korean newspaper journalism faces serious problems. Many Korean newspaper journalists are leaving their occupations to seek other jobs. They have come to recognise that their profession is not capable of affording as much satisfaction as they had expected (JAK, 21st February 2000; JAK, 7th March 2000; Mediaonul, 20th January 2000). This is linked with career uncertainty. The economic crisis in the late 1990s has left the threat of redundancy. Journalists are, furthermore, stressed by several factors of routine work. They are reported as the most stressed people in Korea (Dongallbo, 6th November 1996). Kim, S. N. (1999: 13) observed several stress factors for journalists, the most important one being concern about inefficiency in newsgathering activities. In his study, journalists assumed that the Internet challenge is a most unwieldy situation and beyond their handling capacity. Even worse, journalist working conditions have been deteriorating due to the unprecedented scale of job redundancies since the foreign currency crisis in 1997. According to a survey by the KPF (N & B, December 2000), journalists’ daily working hours have increased and burdens of routine work have also deteriorated. Consequently, journalists feel insecure about their job future (JAK, 4th April 2000).

Managerial inadequacy may be aggravating these problems. According to journalists, the bureaucratic attitudes of news organisations towards organising journalist resources eventually prohibit journalists from adapting to new environments rather than encouraging and developing a capacity to cope
with environmental challenges (JAK, 4th April 2000; Mediaonul, 20th January 2000). A survey conducted by the Journalists Association of Korea (JAK, 4th April 2000) shows that newspaper journalists consider their status as journalists to be fragile. They feel that present news work practices cannot cope with environmental challenges and they cannot expect to catch up with the changing situation. They conclude that the current situation of the newspaper industry is faced with a structural dilemma, thereby making it difficult to cope with the challenges from the Internet.

The Korean newspaper industry is now experiencing crises both internally and externally. Most Korean newspaper companies consider specialist journalism as a way of resolving this critical phase. The introduction of the system of specialism is aimed at strengthening newspaper competitiveness by improving the quality of news (JAK, 25th September 2000; KPF, 1998; KPF, 1999). For newspaper companies, specialism implies developing news quality. Previously, one Korean newspaper tried to introduce this system in an effort to reinforce its competitiveness by enhancing news quality. When the Joongang Ilbo recruited experts from outside as specialist journalists in 1994, they anticipated an advantage of improving news quality to compete with new media such as a 24-hour news cable television and online PC networks. Korean newspapers these days believe that the Joongang Ilbo's attempt has been successfully rewarded in several big events such as the reporting of the collapse of the Sung-Soo Bridge in 1995. Based on this assumption, they suppose that specialism is also effective in competing with the Internet challenge (JAK, 25th September 2000).

In this sense, most newspaper companies in Korea are promoting plans to introduce the specialist system (N & B, May 2000; JAK, 25th January 2000; JAK, 1st May 2000; JAK, 25th September 2000; Mediaonul, 24th August 2000; Mediaonul, 31st August 2000). They are tending to develop new personnel management systems and are restructuring news organisations in order to
import the specialist system (JAK, 25th September 2000; N & B, May 2000). Most of them are trying to establish new criteria for recruiting specialists, for instance journalist experience, fields of speciality, or differential payment systems. Several newspapers are providing an opportunity for developing abilities and skills necessary for specialism by means of further education courses at university or overseas studying. Many of them are also preparing a separate career system for specialists from that of general reporters.

This feature of specialism in Korean newspapers indicates that specialism has specific purposes. On the one hand, the introduction of specialism aims to build up the news quality needed to compete with the Internet challenge. On the other hand, it intends to appease journalists’ job insecurity. However, the implementation of this strategic choice seems to be impacted by news organisations’ attitudes towards who the specialists are, in other words by how news organisations appreciate the specialists. The way of recognising specialists may be approached in two terms: one is the status of the specialist, the other is the goal of specialism.

Tunstall (1971: 106) identifies specialist status as having three levels: an employee of a news organisation; a specialist gatherer of news from news sources; and a competitor-colleague within a group of specialists from other news organisations. It implies that a practical implementation of specialism could be approached in various ways. Of these statuses, specialists tend to see themselves as of ‘the specialist news gatherer’ status. However, this status is vulnerable to exploitation by the news organisation’s interests. Whereas the status of a specialist news gatherer is the goal of journalists, the status of the employee may be the primary objective of the news organisation. In this way, Tunstall concludes that the harshest tension experienced by a specialist is when dealing with news executives. This is because news executives prefer the news organisation’s goal to that of the specialist.

Tunstall (1971: 75-76) also observes that selection of some specialist fields
by news organisations is aligned with revenue goals or customer demand although other fields, such as foreign news, emphasise the non-revenue goals. In the more consumer fields of news, “the advertising goal is predominant and a major criterion for deciding whether or not to allocate a full-time specialist to cover such areas is the likelihood of attracting related advertising” (Tunstall, 1971: 76). The advertising goal is not the only criterion for selecting specialist fields, and the allocation of specialists is also influenced by the news organisation’s coalition audience goal and general news values. Selection of specialist fields by a news organisation is comprised of complex goals such as non-revenue, audience, and advertising goals. Despite that, Tunstall analyses news fields in accordance to those criteria, and in practice, the goals of specialism are inextricably linked.

From these perspectives, it can be said that specialism is affected by a news organisation’s way of organising and involving reporters including specialists and generalists for news production. The way of manoeuvring reporters is conducted on the basis of news organisational culture related to news production. News organisational culture especially involves various routines of news production process. News organisations would like to routinise the news production process in an attempt to make it efficient (Shoemaker and Reese, 1996: 108). In this sense specialism needs to be approached in relation to news organisational culture.

1.2 Theoretical Foundations

1.2.1 Sociology of Journalism

McNair defines news as follows:
Any authored text, in written, audio or visual form, which claims to be (i.e. is presented to its audience as) a truthful statement about, or record of, some hitherto unknown (new) feature of the actual, social world (1998:4).

News, therefore, has to assume truth and to be new. Above all, news is "contextualisation around a set of assumptions, beliefs, values" (McNair, 1998:5) of a journalist. News is an authored and ideological text produced by a journalist. The assumptions, beliefs, or values can be said to be a frame of "a window on the world" as said by Tuchman (1978:1). Journalists see the world through this window frame. However, news is made through a series of struggles between journalists and sources, journalists and changes of socio-political environment, or journalists and news organisational culture. As McNair states, news is thus "an arena of struggle between competing ways of sense-making" (1998:7). It indicates that news is not reality itself, but constructed by several factors which are interested in making the world as news. Journalists stand at the centre of this struggle. Tuchman, in this respect, argues an importance of examining "how the organisations of newswork and of newsworkers are put together" (1978:1).

This thesis, in this sense, tries to analyse the system of specialism in Korean journalism in relation to a news organisation's news production practices. It focuses on the journalistic practices of the specialist in particular. One of the early studies of how news organisations produce news may be research into the role of the 'gatekeeper' or the editor (White, 1950; Gieber, 1964). White (1950: 383-390) observes that news is subjectively influenced by the gatekeeper's own set of experiences, attitudes and expectations. Gieber finds that typical editors are "concerned with goals of production, bureaucratic routine and interpersonal relations within the newsroom" (1964: 175). Their studies indicate that news executives could significantly impact on the news production process of journalist.
However, news production is a complicated process and goes beyond the gatekeeper’s influence. As mentioned by Schudson, “news items are not simply selected but constructed” (1996: 142). Factors intervening in this process are complicatedly interrelated. In spite of this complexity, the gatekeeper approach minimises the complexity of news production to an issue of selecting news items in terms of quantity, not quality. One of the other perspectives to understand the news, proposed by McNair (1994) and Schudson (1996), is organisational approach. This concerns news organisation itself in understanding news, especially focusing on the relationship between journalists and a news organisation. Both of them have interests in the news organisation, journalist occupation, and the construction of an ideology implied in the news. An organisational approach also focuses on a conflict among these factors.

McNair understands that organisational approach focuses on the professional constraints on journalists. Schudson also maintains that “this perspective tries to understand how journalists’ efforts on the job are constrained by organisational and occupational routines” (1996: 143). That is, the study in organisational approach provides answers to the question of why news organisations ‘oppress’ journalists as well as how complex the news production process is in the view of various relationships between journalists and news organisations. McNair suggests the main interests of an organisational approach, such as “the limitations imposed by the news form; constraints imposed on journalists’ ability to gather news; and the routine professional practices of journalism” (1994: 50).

In fact, news organisation inevitably intervenes in a journalist’s news making process. However, there are also aspects of co-operative relationships between them. Just as news organisations cannot achieve their business objectives without organising journalist resources, so it is not possible for journalists to perform their jobs without being part of a news organisation. These two inter-related features impact on the news product. As Schudson
holds, the news is an outcome of this relationship between a news organisation and the journalists:

If, on the one hand, the creation of news is seen as the social production of 'reality', on the other hand, it is taken to be the social manufacture of an organisational product, one that can be studied like other manufactured goods (1996: 149).

Molotch and Lester (1974) emphasise the aspect of news in terms of 'an organisational product' rather than a 'social production of reality'. According to them, news does not directly reflect a real world, but is instead an outcome of a reflection of practices of those involved in determining the experiences of others.

The nature of the media as formal organisation, as routines for getting work done in newsrooms, as career mobility patterns for a group of professionals, as profit-making institutions, all become inextricably and reflexively tied to the content of published news (Molotch and Lester, 1974 cited in Tumber, 1999: 39).

That is, news is an organisational product defined by the way in which it comes to the awareness of a news organisation. This observation suggests that when news is manufactured within a news organisation, the problem of how both news organisation and journalists build their relationship may be one of the critical issues in understanding the news. The way in which a news organisation manages specialist journalists in news production is one of the basic grounds for a specialist news production environment. The relationship between news organisation and journalist is structured in the form of a rather legitimated institution (Tuchman, 1978: 4). News is an institutional method of making information available to audiences. Moreover, "news is inevitably a product of newsworkers drawing upon institutional processes and conforming
to institutional practices” (Tuchman, 1978: 4). News production can, therefore, be assessed by news organisational practices. The practices of news production could involve structured routines, and so it may be difficult for journalists to be free from them.

More specifically, Schudson (1996: 147-151) suggests two issues which should be paid more attention to in the organisational approach: the reporter-official relation and the reporter-editor relation. The former refers to the beat system as the major way of newsgathering. The latter regards the news executive’s control over journalists. This study, in this respect, focuses on these two issues in analysing the relationship between specialism and news organisational practices.

In spite of the importance of the organisational approach, the study of newsgathering practices does not seem to be usual in journalism studies. As mentioned by Negrine (1996), there are surprisingly few studies about news organisation’s newsgathering activities or the work of journalists. Tunstall’s research on the work of specialists still features prominent findings about news organisations and journalists’ work, even though it was conducted in the mid 1960s. This is the same case in Korean journalism studies. According to Moon (2001: 99-127), during the period of 1990-2000, there was not a single study about news organisation practices. 42% of journalism studies are about news content analysis. By contrast, a study in the light of news organisational sociology, that analyses the work of journalists as producers of news messages, is hardly found. One reason for this may be a difficulty in accessing to news organisations and journalists at work.

1.2.2 Organisational Culture

A news organisational approach normally deals with the routines that are carried on by journalists. The whole picture of news production routines can
be, therefore, grasped more clearly by understanding how the routines work within the frame of organisational culture. Eldridge and Crombie define organisational culture as follows:

The culture of an organisation refers to the unique assessment of norms, values, beliefs, ways of behaving and so on that characterise the manner in which groups and individuals combine to get things done. The distinctiveness of a particular organisation is intimately bound up with its history and the character-building effects of past decisions and past leaders. It is manifested in the folkways, mores, and the ideology to which members defer, as well as in the strategic choices made by the organisation as a whole (1974: 89).

This observation indicates that organisational culture implies two aspects. Organisational culture is a series of metaphors to be developed for understanding how organisations work. Along with it, it is an objective entity in that all features of an organisation include its systems, policies, procedures, and processes.

Organisational culture presents stability as well as dynamic features. Organisational culture, on the one hand, provides stability focusing upon continuity of patterned way of behaviours. First of all, organisational culture is an understanding that is shared with members of an organisation. It emphasises structural stability in the organisation that leads to developing patterning or integration of the elements of practices into a paradigm that ties the members together (Schein, 1992: 10). Structural stability might be possible by the forcefulness of organisational culture. Schwartz and Davis hold that the beliefs and expectations based on organisational culture produce norms that "powerfully shape the behaviour of individuals and groups in the organisation" (1981: 33). This indicates that members of an organisation cannot be free from organisational culture. The constraining aspect of organisational culture seems to be presented by typical pattern of routine works. According to
Drennan, "it [organisational culture] is what is **typical** of the organisation, the **habits**, the prevailing **attitudes**, the grown-up pattern of **accepted** and **expected** behaviour" (1992: 3). The organisational culture is made up by a series of routinised work practices. Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 108) see that news organisations desire routinisation to improve efficiency in the news production process. While this feature of 'sharing' is positive in terms of organisational stability and efficiency, it could be a constraint upon developing a new strategy. It is because the members are discouraged to show any behaviour against the organisational culture. For instance, if some journalists were allowed full autonomy in the newsgathering activity, it could cause conflicts with other journalists who might see this as unfair.

On the other hand, organisational culture has dynamic features. It is perceived as living, vital, and organic. It develops and changes situation around the issues of economic survival and growth. In this way, organisational culture functions as a problem-solving base. Schein maintains that:

> A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation to and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (1992: 12).

Organisational culture connects strategic performances of an organisation to the environment. According to Kung-Shankleman (2000: 16), organisational culture firstly focuses on how environmental developments are perceived by members of an organisation, and secondly on how members of the organisation react to the strategies designed to respond to those environmental developments. This assumption suggests that organisational culture affects and is linked to an organisation's strategic process.
Schein (1992: 51) understands that organisational culture relates to two categories of problem-solving functions. One is the external problem associated with survival in and adaptation to its external environment. The other is the internal problem related to integration of its internal processes to ensure that it can survive and adapt. Organisational culture refers to how an organisation perceives its environment and the strategies judged as appropriate to respond to it (Kung-Shankleman, 2000: 17).

More importantly, organisational culture is concerned with both product and process. Kung-Shankleman elaborates that:

As a product it embodies the accumulated wisdom of previous group members. As a process it is continually renewed as changing circumstances force assumptions to be re-assessed, and re-created as new members are introduced to, and question, ‘old’ assumptions (Kung-Shankleman, 2000: 12).

From this observation, it seems clear that organisational culture penetrates into the product through the production process. In the case of news organisations, organisational culture could govern news reporting by regulating newsgathering practices.

Despite the fact that organisational culture is a base for solving an organisation’s problems of external adaptation and internal integration, it is also inevitable that it constrains journalists by intervening in the news production process as well as the news product. This assumption lies on the premise that “journalism is the result of a production process centred on the newsroom, and that the working environment of the newsroom is the starting point for the individual journalist’s activity, defining its routines and limitations” (McNair, 1998: 62). Journalists’ work cannot be performed beyond the limit of organisational boundaries since they are employees subordinate to constraints of a news organisation management, for instance by routine practices or organisational bureaucratic regulations. A restrictive
organisational culture could involve limitations on the news form, constraints on journalists' newsgathering activities, and setting routine practices of journalism.

Particularly, routine professional practices appear to significantly influence the news product. As noted previously, Tuchman (1978: 4) identifies that news is institutional output that is inevitably a product of journalists drawing upon institutional processes and conforming to institutional practices. One of the most notable professional practices is objectivity, implying that journalists should present both sides of news events, provide evidence, quote authoritative sources, and separate facts from opinion (Tuchman, 1972: 660-679). Of course, objectivity has been regarded as a guarantee of news quality and appeal for trust, even in situations where the facts may not be fully known (McNair, 1998: 65). It was a by-product of a developing commercial market for journalism in the nineteenth century. Journalists are not always concerned with objectivity. As labelled by Tuchman (1972: 661), the professional routine practice of objectivity is just a 'strategic ritual'. This observation also testifies that journalist's efforts on the job are constrained by the organisational routines.

This feature of organisational restriction on journalists seems to be clearly presented at the organisational setting of news production. Negrine argues that "the process must be organised, routinised, and freed from a haphazard supply of news so that the news vehicles appear professionally produced and at set regular intervals" (1994: 123). Regardless of whether it constrains journalism or not, the organisational routines related to news production are a rather inevitable necessity. The routines are more efficiently systemised by the beat system. Tuchman (1978: 44-45) understands that for maximising the returns of investment, the news organisation routinises news coverage through the establishment of news beats. In this sense, she introduces a concept of 'news net' as systematising general features of newsgathering practices. These features illustrate how news organisations manage to routinise news.
production through the routines of beat reporters on key beats and through territorial and organisational distribution of responsibilities. The organisational routines seem to be institutional regulators of news production.

News organisations exercise a great deal of powers to materialise routines. Negrine, thus, sees news organisation as a main actor of deciding which areas to be covered. He elaborates the importance of organisational considerations in news production (1994: 124-125). Firstly news organisations are hierarchically and bureaucratically organised so as to manage the flow of news with a system to control, process, and routinise the production of news. Secondly, to regularise the flow of news and to use journalist resources efficiently, a news organisation places journalists in institutions that guarantee a regular supply of news. This indicates that a news organisation regulates by intervening in and controlling journalists’ jobs throughout all the steps of news production process.

To sum up, news organisational culture assumes two features: maintaining stability and continuity as well as problem solving. News organisational culture could not only constrain a journalist’s individual activity but also provide grounds for dealing with problems. The successful introduction of a new policy, such as the system of specialism, into the newsroom depends on which aspect of organisational culture a news organisation pays attention to: stability or problem-solving. If organisational culture aims at maintaining stability, new policy introduction could be in difficulty since a journalist’s individual flexibility could be constrained. The rigidity of news organisational routines is an important factor to be examined in order to understand how specialism adapts to news organisational culture. Otherwise, a news organisation’s desire to solve problems can develop new policies with ease. If a need to resolve current problems exceeds the rigidity of the routines, news organisational culture could play a problem-solving role by embedding specialism. An examination of how journalists assess news
production routines and confront problems can identify how a news organisation implements a new policy. In this sense, this study will focus on specialism in terms of the rigidity of news production routines and a need to reorganise these routines.

1.2.3 Specialism

Studies about specialism are rare, especially in terms of specialism's newsgathering activities. The most outstanding study on specialism may be Tunstall's research of British specialist journalism, *Journalists at Work* (1971). He defines specialist as: working full-time for a news organisation; being assigned on a permanent basis to a specific field; and devoting over half of one's working time to a specific field. A specialist is a journalist who is responsible for covering a specific field (1971: 76).

Tunstall is particularly concerned about newsgathering practices, journalistic roles, and the contribution of different kinds of news to a news organisation. He reveals how specialists are influenced by their colleagues, their source networks, and news organisations' goals such as sales revenues, advertising revenues, or prestige goals. Based on these, he finds the extent to which news is reliably prepared and institutionalised by routine management. Hess's study of 'Washington Reporters' (1981) is an American equivalent to Tunstall's work. It also investigates how specialism is related to newsgathering activities. Hess explores the conflict between specialists and their editors, manipulative news sources, competition with other journalists, job satisfaction, autonomy, time and space, and other factors relevant to newsgathering activities.

With content analysis of the performance of the broadsheet press in the coverage of the British Aerospace takeover of the Rover group in 1988, Negrine (1996) examines more elaborately how specialism involves news coverage. For
this purpose, he proposes three questions such as: Which specialists cover which areas and why?; Does the content vary according to specialisms?; Does specialisation lead to 'better' media? (1996: 98). Through these analyses, Negrine finds that the specialists' news involvement has to do with the organisation of newsrooms as well as the nature of news events. It indicates that the crucial factors of specialism are related to practices of the specialists' news involvement. However, he concludes that how the specific factors of specialism are related to journalistic practices is open to debate.

These studies indicate that news products of specialism can vary according to news organisation routines. Specialism, to a certain extent, is affected by the news organisational culture regarding production routines even if it deals with news events in different ways from the generalist.

Manning (1999: 313-336) approaches specialism in terms of a change of society, to be more concrete, an extension of government. His study about the decline of the British labour and industrial correspondents' groups indicates that specialism is related to 'new ways of thinking' propelled by expansion of government. For instance, in the 1930s "new ways of thinking began to emerge about the role of the British government in relation to economic and industrial problems which fully unfold in the post-war settlement" (Manning, 1999: 315). This change led news organisations to demand appropriate categories of knowledge. News organisational demands for specialism can be explained by how a news organisation is related to social changes.

From these studies, it can be argued that specialism is closely related to news organisational culture including newsgathering practices or journalistic traditions as well as circumstantial changes surrounding the media. Accordingly, it may be possible to assume that the need for specialism seems to lie on news production efficiency to cope with these problems. Negrine also focus on an aspect of the newsgathering efficiency of specialism. According to Negrine, with specialism, "reporters could become knowledgeable about
specific areas of work and generate and process news more quickly and more regularly” (1996: 80).

Besides this, the multiplicity of news events is another need for specialism efficiency (Seymour-Ure, 1968; Negrine, 1996). Negrine maintains as follows:

On the one hand, news organisations seek to create specialisms in order to divide up responsibilities and so ensure a supply of news from a multiplicity of sources; on the other hand, they seek to ensure that those who supply that news have a degree of familiarity with the areas they cover (1996: 82).

Proliferation of state government involvement in many features of everyday life is widening journalistic responsibilities. The growth of the Internet has also accelerated this trend in that it expands individualised or specialised information.

The unpredictability of news also requires an efficient newsgathering system. News organisations inherently have to make rapid decisions caused by the unforeseeable business environment in order to treat unpredictable news events. Soloski elaborates that:

The news department as subsystem of a news organisation must deal with a highly unpredictable environment - news. Decisions about news coverage must be reached rapidly, with little time for discussion or group decision-making. Thus the structure of the news department must be fluid enough to deal with a constantly changing news environment (1989: 208).

Along with this, Tunstall (1971: 27-28) proposes other aspects of unpredictability of news production. The first one is an ‘exceptionality’ of news production. Journalists normally encounter exceptional events in their works, and moreover they value the ‘exceptionality’ of the news event. The second is the non-logical or non-systematic features of newsgathering activities.
He said that "'search' is not logical, systematic, or analytical ... and search procedures in journalism stress on a non-systematic 'personal' basis" (1971: 27). Soloski argues that specialism is a more efficient method for controlling such a highly unpredictable newsgathering activity (1989: 209). Specialism can afford the use of discretion to make the unpredictability of news production circumstances more predictable.

Besides newsgathering efficiency, the need for specialism is related to personnel management on journalists. Soloski explores a relationship between specialism and news organisations in the view of personnel management. He examines that specialism has the role of an efficient and economical method where news organisations can control the behaviour of journalists. The nature of journalism is so unpredictable that journalists have a discretionary power to deal with news events. Due to this, news organisations need a means to control journalists. According to him, "to further limit the discretionary behaviour of journalists, news organisations have developed rules - news policies" (1989: 208). Specialism controls the behaviour of journalists in two ways: firstly it sets standards and norms of behaviour; secondly it determines the specialist reward system. The norms control specialists by establishing elaborate rules and regulations for them. The reward system of specialism is an effective method of 'cooling out' promotion conflict within news organisations. Specialism controls journalists as regards newsgathering activities and personnel management.

In journalist management, most journalists also desire specialism. It seems that most journalists consider the specialist status as one of the ultimate types of job prospects. As Tunstall (1971: 35) states, general reporters are mostly opposed to permanently remain ordinary general reporters. They want to become specialist newsgatherers, or feature writers even though there are the other group of reporters who want the job of the news editor posts in a
hierarchy. This relationship between specialism and a journalist's future career prospect indicates that specialism involves journalist management.

For instance, it is used to maintain journalist loyalty in the midst of promotion competition within a news organisation. According to Soloski (1989: 217), by providing opportunities for upward movement to specialist positions, the news organisations are able to maintain journalists' loyalties. Otherwise, there are probably conflicts, which result from efforts to access the power hierarchy of the management ladders. Ordinarily, as their reward many journalists prefer the specialist positions to the management status. The specialist status can offer greater freedom of engaging in their specialities, instead of greater authority such as promotion through the management power hierarchy. Specialism is an effective method of dealing with journalists who have been unable to advance within the management power hierarchy. Therefore, this observation indicates that specialism could afford a flexibility of personnel management.

To sum up, these explorations suggest that specialism can effectively respond to the challenges of the new environment. It enables news organisations to efficiently organise journalists for news production. It is also a management strategy to control journalists within personnel management. It is eventually related to the news product. Therefore, for the purpose of identifying how specialism has relations with the news product, it needs to centre on how to develop specialism in the practices of the news production process.

1.3 Korean Journalism

1.3.1 Changes in Korean Journalism
Korean journalism has experienced a significant change after the democratisation in 1987. Democratisation was a turning point moving Korean journalism away from the tight control of the military regimes towards the chance of freedom of press and freedom of business. For nearly three decades, military regimes had controlled the media in terms of media industry structure as well as journalism routines. The military regimes imposed such structural measures as the arbitrary cancellation of registration and the imposition of a press cartel. The press cartel had characterised the Korean newspaper industry for 26 years until democratisation. It was introduced in 1961 by the military regime in a bid to control newspaper journalism when it established the Korean Newspaper Publishers' Association. It was a combined newspaper bond comprised of newspaper companies to control the market, to keep the price of newspapers and subscriptions at a certain level, and to exclude free competition between newspapers. The cartel controlled the size of editions into three groups in accordance with their output (Seo, 1988: 47). The press cartel provided the existing papers with governmental protection and support leading to growth, particularly in quantitative business terms.

However, it paid the price. The military government imposed harsh actions against the press in the name of social responsibility of the press. In spite of the apparently justifiable principles of press control, in fact it restricted the role of journalists and deteriorated the routines of journalism. The governmental authorities tried to domesticate the media by monitoring and censoring the routine mechanisms of news production. They appointed key persons in the media companies as agencies of control over the media. Furthermore, journalists were under routine surveillance by the police or other security agencies. Governmental institutions such as the Ministry of Culture and Information regularly issued highly detailed press guidelines on how events should or should not be reported. These guidelines specified the page, headline, and even the relative importance of stories (Lee, 1993: 60-61).
Undoubtedly, these controls over the media under the press cartel prohibited newspapers from operating an efficient reporting system. The cartel regulated the supply of paper, besides the control of the size of editions and pages to be published. Those problems eventually indicated that newspapers did not have enough resources to develop their own individual characteristics and accordingly they closely resembled to each other (Kim, C. Y. 1993: 197).

Democratisation in 1987 produced significant changes to Korean journalism. The new government implemented several policies in an effort to lessen media control. These policies were aimed at increasing the efficiency of the 'invisible hand' in the media market by abolishing state interventions and controls over the media. More concretely, these policies resulted in three main changes: a development of press freedom and media autonomy due to minimising state intervention; an increase of commercial competition among media companies as a result of new entries into media business; and the NGOs' pressures on the media for a democratic role of journalism (Yang, 1995: 113).

These changes led to unexpected problems. Firstly, a development of press freedom provided journalism with political power. Yang observes that the level of press freedom after the inauguration of president Kim Young-Sam in 1993 was higher than during the military regimes. State intervention in journalism was no longer problem in respect of their activities. According to Yang, journalism had more political power than any other groups in representing public opinion that had been oppressed during the military regimes. Kang, M. K. (1994) also argues that a transformation of journalism into political power group can be identified by journalists' entry into political sector as politicians. Lee, H. S (1993) also points out that journalists were interested in strengthening their political power.

Secondly, Korean journalism became dominated by market competition for commercial profits because of lessened state intervention. For 5 years after
democratisation in 1987, the number of daily newspapers was doubled. The increase in the number of competitors in the market eventually led to reductions of revenue and profit. Newspapers companies were struggling to keep their market share by increasing the number of pages, which in return worsened production costs. The increase of production costs resulted in a fall of profit. This was a vicious circle. Jang (1995) argues that the cartel under government control was replaced by competitive oligarchy. The newspaper industry was segmented into the major and the minor papers. Therefore, market competition created a two tier system of newspaper industry.

In the meantime, such transformations of Korean journalism under the civilian regime created different types of governmental control over the media from those of the military regimes. Yoon (1995) explains this as follows: firstly from oppressive obedience to voluntary co-operation; secondly legal and ethical regulation; and lastly regulations on business activities. Political, social, and economic controls over journalism are still carried on in various ways after democratisation.

With the termination of the press cartel in 1987, Korean journalism seemed to have a good opportunity to develop more distinctive characteristics. Yet, in spite of the removal of the political controls, it failed to suggest distinctive changes from the past. The peculiar tradition of the hierarchical practices of news organisations discouraged positive changes. Seniority practices continued to dominate newsroom management. Under seniority practices, the hierarchy in a newsroom was determined by time served or pecking order of having entered a news organisation. Routine newsgathering activities were also highly dependent on seniority. It was a conventional rule that the senior reporters took advantage of newsgathering activities compared with their juniors, for instance in accessing news sources or being involved in important news events. Even in disputes between the senior and the junior, the blame was on the junior only because the junior protested against the senior
(Kim, C. Y., 1993: 210). In this circumstance, journalists did not find persuasive motivations to improve their work.

News organisation structure, especially of communication in a news organisation was criticised as being vertical rather than horizontal. Journalists pointed out that these structures significantly affected their news production. According to Seo and Kang's study (1990: 21-23), the structural control of news organisations was indicated as the most manifest factor in regulating news context. Desk news executives offered most definitive suggestions for news content as well as newsgathering activities. More than 3 out of 4 journalists were reported as having had their writings revised by the desk executives without their consent.

Kang's analysis (1992: 33-67), which was conducted after 3 years of democratisation, observes that democratisation increased control for the managerial group in hierarchy or for the ownership within the newsroom, since democratisation opened up free market competition by terminating the press cartel. Kang maintains that consequently the newsworkers' autonomy was restricted since market competition led news organisations to focus on making commercial profit by requiring journalists to conform to a profit-oriented news production strategy. This study indicates that the control of the desk news executives was still dominant across all aspects of newsgathering activities and the news production process. Although the democratisation in 1987 apparently removed political oppression over journalism, it seemed to fail to bring Korean journalism into autonomy within a news organisation, particularly in relation to transforming the existing routines or practices of news organisational control. Journalists were still under oppressive practices within a news organisation.

The democratisation in 1987 brought a fierce market competition between newspapers. However, the beneficiary was not journalists but the ownership. Kang (1992: 47-56) concludes that the market competition based on
democratisation strengthened the control of the ownership that makes news organisations focus upon business efficiency. Democratisation was not so relevant to journalists' routines. The gap between journalists' expectations on improvement of their autonomy in news production and their reality was ever wider. In particular, communication within the newsroom and participation in the decision making process was seen as being highly prohibited. As assumed by Kang, these outcomes were closely related to the hierarchical practices in the newsroom.

The hierarchical practices of news organisations are linked with the emphasis on promotion to bureaucratic positions in hierarchy. When the news production process and its decision making is strictly dependent upon the news executives, then it seems essential to be promoted to that position. Under this circumstance, to remain as a reporter without promotion to executive positions in hierarchy until retirement is an unthinkable resolution for journalists. Of course, promotion is also based on the seniority practice. Regardless of ability, the most critical factor of promotion is the length of work experience. Journalists generally become anxious about promotion once they have worked more than 10 years, since the failure of promotion suggests losing a promotion competition with their colleagues. Under these circumstances, specialism has been highly unlikely to be developed. As mentioned by Kim, C. Y. (1993: 207-214), a journalist's speciality has been largely ignored in such a hierarchical news organisation.

In the meantime, Korean journalists' professionalism has been criticised in several aspects even after democratisation in 1987. According to Auh et al., Korean journalists admit their undesirable and unprofessional journalistic practices such as "unfair reporting, accepting chonji (financial gratuities offered in exchange for special consideration, including playing up or down a news story), infringement on privacy rights, voluntary compliance with political elites, withholding or playing down certain stories under lobbying or other
outside pressure, and finally, heavy reliance on government news releases for story material" (1998, 62). Among them, chonji may be the most problematic aspect of Korean journalists' professionalism. A survey of the KPF (2001) reveals that 62.5% of respondents agree with that chonji is routinised in the journalism. Chonji is accepted for the most part simply because of custom. It naturally impacts on news reporting. More than half of respondents (50.6%) confess that chonji leads to positive coverage1.

Korean journalists still worry about their editorial independence even after the government's oppressive intervention was abolished. According to the survey of the KPF (2001), the most urgent task facing journalists is editorial independence (51.6%). 9 out of 10 respondents indicated that editorial independence should be guaranteed by an institutionalised system. In addition, 36.8% of respondents suggested that editorial independence should be shared with all the members of a news organisation rather than monopolised by the editor. They also pointed out interventions of advertisers and the owners. The most worrying factor is pressure from advertisers and interventions of ownership and management.

These observations indicates that Korean journalism is still experiencing difficulties in developing a democratic role of journalism. The difficulties come from various sectors compared with a unilateral control by government interventions under the military regimes. In particular, the intervention is related to economic factors such as advertising or commercial competition and news organisational factors such as ownership or organisational routines. This situation makes it difficult for journalists to deal with journalistic practices.

1.3.2 Specialism in Korean Journalism

---

1 Chonji is delivered by various sources from government agencies, politicians, and private companies to PR agencies. It is broadly divided into three forms such as cash, presents, and banquets. After a booming of IT industry in 1999-2001, company stocks were also offered as a means of chonji.
Normally, a specialist is considered to be a journalist who covers a specific field with specialised knowledge about it (Oh, 2000: 20-29). Specialism is a relatively new phenomenon in Korean journalism. Discussions on specialism in the early stages were firstly presented by the newspaper industry itself. They approached specialism in terms of news production efficiency. They focused on social changes, which headed for division of labour and job diversification due to technological developments (Lim, 1968; Son, 1983; Kim, Y. H., 1995; Park, K. S., 1995). In the 1980s, Korean society was entering a stage in which social systems were specialised. Korean journalism was required to provide news about new issues. Journalists should be specialists in certain areas rather than having an encyclopaedic knowledge. Social change was such that one journalist could not appreciate every subject by him/herself. The newspaper industry recognised that a journalist should be prepared to grasp the diversified and specialised world by specialising in a specific subject. In spite of the need for specialism, it did not materialise at that moment.

Contrary to an industrial approach, academic research paid attention to a more macro aspect such as the relationship between the media and politics, practices of news production or journalistic function in society. Many academic researchers examined why specialism has not been established in Korean journalism. This, according to Kim, C. Y. (1993), was due to the practices of Korean journalism.

[Firstly] the press cartel [of the number of pages]...has resulted in limiting the development of the unique characteristics of individual papers...also resulted in superficial coverage since there has been insufficient space for in-depth coverage. [Secondly] the 'Kijadan', a circle of reporters, largely discouraged independent coverage by individual journalists. [Thirdly] the hierarchical organisation of newsrooms has been another major obstacle to the existence of specialists because all reporters are promoted automatically by their length of work experience, ignoring their speciality or interest and competence.
[Finally] journalists are not encouraged to specialise under the rotation system (Kim, C. Y., 1993: 226-227).

This analysis implies that a series of structural conventions or practices of Korean journalism are the main problem blocking specialism. In spite of these persistent practices, there was another motive for specialism. As observed earlier, the press cartel was an outcome of political control over the press. Under the oppressive political control during the 1970’s and 1980’s, Korean newspapers did not need to establish their own competitive strategy. However, the newspaper industry began to be involved in harsh market competition after the democratic progress in the late 1980s. Peng (1990) argued that specialism was regarded as an essential condition for the newspaper industry’s entrepreneurial freedom, since it permitted newspapers to develop their individual character. So, the discussions on specialism in the 1990s could be seen as a result of market competition in Korea.

The value of specialism for market competition seemed to be related to the new media environment. For efficient competition with new media, newspapers concluded that they should develop the quality of news (Kum, 1994; Lee, 1994). A turning point was probably an introduction of 24-hour news cable television (Kum, 1994; Lee, 1994; KPF, 1998; KPF, 1999; Oh, 2000). In 1995, a 24-hour cable news television ignited competition in news business. One year before its start, the Joongang Ilbo recruited 17 experts as specialist journalists to prepare to cope with the cable news channel. Many newspapers followed the Joongang Ilbo’s attempt so that there were 32 specialists in 5 national papers in 2000 (Oh, 2000: 29).

The Internet is probably the latest challenge to newspapers requiring specialism (KPF, 1998; KPF, 1999; Oh, 2000). In line with journalism, the Internet’s impact on newspapers seems to involve a lack of confidence in the capability of newspaper journalists to deal with the new environment.
Newspaper journalists worry that the existing way of news production may be incapable of coping with the new demands of audiences caused by the Internet (Mediaonul, 20th January 2000; JAK, 4th April 2000). As they did at the moment of cable news introduction, newspapers assume that to develop the quality of news is the only way of coping with the Internet (JAK, 4th April 2000). Along with the Internet's impact, demands for quality news have been increased by the economic crisis which occurred in 1997. Media critics held that a lack of specialised news coverage on the economy was one of contributory reasons for the failure to deal with the crisis. They contended that the existing news production practices could not provide proper information and solutions to the crisis (Oh, 2000: 29-40). This failure seemed a trigger for the need for specialism in Korean journalism. Specialism was considered a problem-solution way of creating quality news. Based on such observations, 'quality news' in Korean journalism seems to be considered as in-depth reporting or investigative analysis which is capable of solving problems.

Some academic studies on specialism see that specialised knowledge and newsgathering skills are the bases of specialism in order to provide quality news which generalists cannot supply or specialists can accommodate more than generalists (Seo, 1998; Kim, Y. U., 1999). Seo states that a specialist, with these qualities, can produce news reporting that satisfies objectivity, informational usefulness, and readability. Newspaper managing editors elaborate the prerequisites of a specialist as: specialised knowledge acknowledged by outside; newsgathering skills drilled throughout long-term journalist experiences; and influence over the policy decision making process (Monthly Chosen, September 1999). From these observations, it can be summarised that specialism in Korean journalism refers to provision of news quality in the view of addressing problem-solving, which is based on specialised knowledge, newsgathering skills, and influencing the news sources or their audiences.
1.4 Research Questions

From these perspectives, this study places the research interests on what the relationship is between the news organisational culture and specialism. Understanding of this specific relationship could more clearly figure out a picture of specialism. For this purpose, this study will firstly focus on the needs for specialism, especially in terms of why journalists' job insecurity and the Internet challenges require newspapers to introduce specialism in Korean journalism. By examining the seriousness of journalists' job insecurity and the Internet impact on traditional journalism, it can apprehend characteristic features of Korean specialism. It will, secondly, pay attention to the news organisational culture such as newsroom management and newsgathering practices. It provides the answer to the question of how a news organisation organises and operates its journalists, especially specialist journalists for news production. Lastly, this study will try to identify how specialism addresses the routines of news selection. At the same time, this will be linked to the question of whether or not specialism serves audience interests.

Based on this assumption, this study posits three research questions to answer:

Q1. Why do news organisations intend to introduce specialism?
Q2. What does specialism have to do with the news organisational culture?
Q3. Is specialism effective in providing 'better journalism'?

This study also premises three research hypotheses relevant to these research questions as follows:

H1. Specialism is adopted for personnel management and newsgathering efficiency.
H2. Specialism is restricted by news organisation routines.
H3. Specialism develops better news in an effort to pursue audience interests.

This study borrows some definitions of the main concepts from Tunstall's research. Tunstall (1971: 6-8) defines several key concepts such as a 'news organisation' and 'newsgathering activity' in practical terms. Firstly, a 'news organisation' refers only to editorial department including reporters, news executives, and managing director in the newsroom. A news organisation is distinguished from a media organisation, which encompasses the marketing department, production department, and the other organisations. Secondly, the newsgathering activity is contrasted with that of news processing. Newsgathering is related to news source organisations and individuals, and performers outside the news organisations, while news processing involves work within news organisations. Thirdly, the members of the news organisation could be divided into two groups: news executives and reporters. The news executive group is comprised of the managing editor, deputy managing editor, sub-managing editor, and desk news executive. The managing editor is in charge of the entire process of news production including newsgathering and news processing with the assistance of two or three sub-managing editors or deputy managing editors. The desk news executive is the boss of the desk. Desks are divided into specific departments such as Home news, Politics, Economy, Culture, Sports, and other sectors. Reporter groups directly belong to news desks in routine works. They cover news events under the control of desk news executives ranging from the selection of news issues, covering news events to the decision of their final copy. This study, here, uses the term 'journalist' as having the same meaning as 'reporter'.

1.5 Methodology
Given the research questions and research hypotheses, the central problems this study needs to examine include: why, how, and whether or not the news organisational culture of Korean newspapers is compatible with a new policy of specialism and for what reasons. These questions require examinations of more than news stories. It is necessary to bring in the types of evidence that provide a grasp of the fundamental intention of a news organisation, journalists’ attitudes towards the new policy of specialism, and verification of the efficiency of specialism in practice. For this purpose, this study uses articles from various journals and data as well as four pieces of field research. Materials from the media industry include news reports of the 3 major media journals in Korea, ‘JAK Journal’, ‘Mediaonul’, and ‘Newspaper & Broadcasting’ (N & B), as well as data supplied by the Korean Press Foundation. ‘JAK Journal’ is a weekly paper published by the Journalists Association of Korea, an organisation representing most Korean journalists except news executives and other management groups. ‘Mediaonul’ is also a weekly paper, which is the only full-fledged commercial media critic in Korea. ‘N & B’ is a monthly journal published by the Korean Press Foundation. These three journals cover subjects ranging from media policy to media production. Especially, they are the only sources to tell about news production practices in Korean journalism.

However, the major materials of this study are obtained from field research conducted by qualitative and quantitative methods. This study carried out four pieces of field research such as: in-depth interviews, two focus group discussions, a survey, and a brief content analysis of news stories. These multiple approaches are combined for the purpose of taking advantage of both qualitative and quantitative methods.

Qualitative research refers to the discovery of what occurs where, in which context, discussed in which terms, using which vocabulary or terminology. For this purpose, the major task of qualitative data analysis lies in “‘keeping track’ of what came from where in the body of data, what was
related to what, which terms were used by whom, which ideas arose in relation to what observations, and so on" (Hansen et al, 1998: 312). As qualitative research, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions provide not only a deep and rich set of knowledge about a particular phenomenon such as conflicts or control of newsgathering activities, but also they allow an investigation of cognitive and affective aspects of specialism, for instance news values. Additionally, they permit an introduction of significant concepts from colloquial aspects that can present unexpected findings in the theoretical observations. Given that the research into the specialism is rare, this flexibility of the qualitative method is appropriate for the exploratory research into specialism.

However, this method contains some deficiencies as regarding validity and generalisability. With the qualitative method, it is a difficult to determine the truthfulness of findings because of the relatively low sample numbers. These problems can produce the claim that the findings are not representative of the population as a whole. This criticism can be avoided by employing the quantitative method.

The quantitative method, such as survey and content analysis, allows flexibility in the treatment of data in terms of comparative analyses, statistical analyses, and the repeatability of data collection in order to verify reliability. This approach assumes several advantages. Firstly, it is strong in measuring descriptive aspects. Secondly, it allows comparison and replication. Thirdly, it provides reliability and validity by being determined objectively. These benefits create a basis for validity and generalisability of the qualitative method. In spite of these advantages, the quantitative method also has a few weaknesses. The most significant deficit may be the inability to ascertain deeper underlying meanings and explanations of the research subject. This inadequacy can be remedied by the qualitative research. In this sense, Russo summaries the advantages of combining research methods that "multiple methods provide
generalisable results and comparison to prior research as well as detail to interpret findings and offer recommendations" (1998: 82).

Multiple methods are conducted for this purpose in this study. Firstly, this combining method enables a development of an overall picture of the research subject by the qualitative method such as the in-depth interviews and the focus group discussions. This research ranges from the Internet challenges of newspaper journalism to news organisational culture. The qualitative analyses could establish a whole connection between them. Additionally, this method permits unexpected developments to be related to the whole framework of the research subject. Secondly, quantitative analysis can efficiently assess the descriptive attitudes of journalists towards specialism. For instance, ‘pre-requisites of specialist journalist’ can be presented by the form of ‘rank’. This enables the findings of the qualitative analyses to be shown effectively. The third advantage is that the quantitative method enables the representativeness of a sample for the qualitative research to be confirmed or denied. This provides a chance of verifying the validity or the generalisability of the qualitative research. That is, the quantitative analysis complements for deficits of the qualitative research.

Of these field studies, this study uses the in-depth interviews as primary material. The other methods supplement the insufficiency of the in-depth interviews. For instance, the survey is analysed in an effort to statistically verify the outcome of the in-depth interviews. The focus group discussions, which were operated with two different groups, are also conducted in order to affirm the results of the in-depth interviews. This study assumes that a group discussion among more than 6 discussants could present some significant discrepancies or incongruence through the interactions between the discussants that would not be possible in the individual talk of in-depth interviews. By analysing these discrepancies or incongruities, it identifies uncertain findings of the in-depth interviews. This study carries out a content analysis on the
newspaper reporting related to the Health care reform dispute in Korea in 2000. This seeks to verify whether or not specialism provides 'better journalism'.

1.5.1 In-depth Interviews

Twenty six journalists were chosen as a purposive sampling from 9 out of the 10 national newspapers in Korea. One of this study's intentions is to make comparisons of attitudes towards specialism between different groups, namely generalists, specialists, and executives of news organisations. For this purpose, the interviewees did not need to be representative. However, this study employed the survey method in order to have external validity by reaffirming the results of the in-depth interviews. The other reason for the purposive sampling was a difficulty in having access to journalists. This difficulty discouraged the other ways of sampling but the purposive sampling. With regard to the accessibility to the interviewees, this way of sampling is efficient since the researcher is a senior journalist of the Munhwa Daily, one of 10 national newspapers in Korea.

Twenty six interviewees were broadly divided into 3 categories of journalists: generalist, specialist, and executive or management group, as can be seen in Table 1. Eight interviewees belonged to the category of generalist journalists who were comprised of junior reporters and senior reporters. Five senior journalists had more than 10 years' experience as journalists while 3 juniors had less than 10 years' experience. Ten specialist journalists were interviewed. Three of them were unofficial specialists designated by 'the mouth' of the Editor whereas 7 out of 10 specialists were designated as specialists by the institutionalised specialism system run by a special committee with specified designation criteria in news organisations. Of these seven, five were recruited from the outside who were former experts such as medical doctors, and 2 were former news executives recruited from inside news
organisations. Eight interviewees were journalists who belonged to a management group. They were divided into two levels: managing editors and desk news executives. A managing editor group is called the editorial board, usually made up of sub-managing editor, deputy managing editor, or the managing editor. Desk news executives are in charge of the desks. This study interviewed 6 managing editors, and 2 desk news executives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Interviewee Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Journalist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Journalist</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Designation by System</td>
<td>Internal Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unofficial Designation by the Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Editor Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk News Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most interviews were conducted in the newsroom interview rooms, from 31 January to 20 February, 2001. Interviews usually took from 55 to 115 minutes with an average length of 80 minutes. The degree of rapport during the interview was high. It might be because the researcher is a senior journalist who shares understanding of news production practices with the interviewees. All the interviews were audio-taped.

Questionnaires for the in-depth interviews were designed in the form of open-ended questions. The questions cover three categories such as the Internet challenges on newspaper journalism, newsgathering practices, and
specialism. The in-depth interviews were conducted under conditions of anonymity as requests of interviewers.

1.5.2 Focus Group Discussions

The focus group discussions, operated with two different groups, were conducted in order to affirm the results of the in-depth interviews. This study assumes that a group discussion among more than 6 discussants could lead to the presentation of a range of perspectives that may be absent in an interview with just one journalist. By analysing the range of perspectives offered, it becomes possible to verify the content of the one-to-one interviews.

Two focus group discussions were conducted by a scheme similar to that of the in-depth interviews. The focus group discussions were assumed to be complementary to the in-depth interviews. Sample discussants were composed of junior and senior generalist reporters from various desks who usually had 5-15 years of experience. Discussants were sampled in two ways. On the one hand, 6 discussants of the first group were members of the editorial board at the JAK. This discussion was held at the JAK meeting room on 13 March, 2001 for 110 minutes. These members of the editorial board were selected by the JAK out of 10 national newspapers, and 1 news agency. They, as members of the editorial board of the JAK Journal, were the well-informed about specialism since the issue was a prevalent interest in Korean journalism at that moment. With such discussion, this study could obtain the generality of the issue on specialism. This discussion was coded as FJAK. On the other hand, 7 discussants of the second group were sampled at a middle range newspaper, the ‘Munhwa Daily’. At the 205 minute long discussion held at the meeting room of the labour union on 28 February, 2001, the discussants showed concentrated discussions on the topics because they were colleagues of the same company. They developed the discussion in terms of acting plans for
specialism. Those discussions were coded as FUMH.

This study encountered a problem in respect of some discussant reluctance to discuss certain topics. In the discussion among ‘Munhwa Daily’s reporters, two junior reporters reluctant to discuss, argue or deny their seniors’ statements. For instance, when a senior reporter mentioned source-reporter routines on a specific beat, these juniors were reluctant to present their own opinions. This could be related to the fact that junior reporters usually consider that senior reporters’ newsgathering experiences were better than their own. Or it could be that the junior reporters respected their seniors too much to contradict them. However, there were not many occasions where such reluctance could be identified and, in any case, the moderator intervened and induced the juniors to present their thoughts without hesitation.

Based on the results of the in-depth interviews, the questions for these groups focused on two issues: the impact of the Internet and the management of the specialist journalism. All these discussions were also audio-taped. As with the in-depth interviews, focus group discussions were conducted under conditions of anonymity.

1.5.3 Survey

The survey research handled 131 journalists of 2 middle range group newspapers of the 10 national papers targeting all sorts of journalists within the newsroom. The self-administrated survey questionnaires were completed by 131 journalists representing 32.3% of total journalists of 406. Two surveys were conducted by means of site visits with permission from the Editors. It took 2 weeks from 5 March, 2001 to 19 March, 2001. The response rate of the Kyunghyang Daily’s journalists was 31.8%, completed by 62 out of 195 journalists. On the other hand, the respondents of the Munwha Daily showed a 32.7% response rate, completed by 69 out of 211. Unfortunately, there was
one journalist from the managing editor board. Most executives of the editor board were reluctant to reveal their opinions.

Results of the in-depth interviews and the focus group discussions provided grounds for the survey questionnaire. The questions contained 24 items of 4 categories such as the 'relationship between newspapers and the Internet', 'newsgathering activities', 'specialist journalism', and demography. Many questionnaires were made of non-ratings in order to get information about the journalists' attitudes towards the topics rather than estimates of respondent size. While this survey cannot suggest the detail, it, however, allows verification of the results of some questions in accordance with the demographic characteristics.

1.5.4 Content Analysis

This study analysed 303 news items in two major newspapers, the Chosun Ilbo and the Joongang Ilbo. The clipped and coded items dealt with the development of the case of the Health care reform as their primary concern in the period from 1 July to 15 November 2001. This data was collected with the key word of 'separation of dispensing medication' from KINDS, a newspaper article database run by the KFP. This issue was adopted for two reasons. It was directly related to public concern about consumer grievances. This aspect matches with one of the intentions of this study to reveal the relationship between the active approach over public policy and specialism.

More importantly, medical reporting is the first and most well established area of specialist journalism in Korean journalism. In accordance with growing consumer interests to health, medical reporting is required to be more diversified. However, Korean journalism recognises that news production based on generalist approaches to medical subject cannot provide enough information to meet consumer demands. Compared with other areas that are
dealt with by specialists as well as generalists, most members of news organisations admit that medial subjects need to be covered by specialists. Given that Korean specialism has only recently been introduced, it needs to analyse an established subject of specialism rather than subjects under development.

Meanwhile, it might be difficult to generalise all the results of analysis based on medical specialism to other specialist areas. Medical specialists in Korean journalism are mostly expert-rooted specialists who are recruited from outside the news organisations. They have different backgrounds and newsgathering skills from internally recruited specialists, formerly senior generalists. Nevertheless, the outcomes of this analysis have significant findings that are applicable to Korean specialists, since expert-rooted specialists are also one of the main types of specialists in Korean journalism.

There are not so many papers which employ medical specialists. Among them, the Chosun Ilbo and the Joongang Ilbo are known as having well established medical specialist system. Therefore, this study chose these two papers as case study samples. The sampled period involved various events related to this issue such as implementing new systems, consumer inconveniences, conflicts among different sectors, intervention of NGO, negotiation, and governmental response.

In determining codes, there was a difficulty in defining category boundaries, especially of judging active terms such as 'defining problems', 'attributing blame', 'revealing debates', 'evaluating remedies', and 'providing advice'. The researcher set a boundary between codes in accordance with clear expression as well as the nuances of the material indicating aspects of these codes. If news stories contained risks or inconveniences caused by the health care reform dispute, it could be categorised as 'defining problems'. 'Attributing blame' was coded when news items included interest groups relevant to the issue such as doctors, pharmacists, or government officials.
Besides including interest groups, news stories with these groups’ assertions were coded as ‘revealing debates’. ‘Evaluating remedies’ was defined as assessing interest groups’ claims. Finally, ‘providing advice’ was coded when news stories contained reporter’s own recommendations. Therefore last two codes could normally be presented in commentary or analysis.

The coding was conducted by two coders who were graduate students studying communications at University in Korea. Before coding, the researcher trained them using the coding scheme and category system. When the coding was complete, 60 news items out of 303 were reanalysed by the researcher to estimate consistency between the two coders. Two coders judge a subsample of 60 items and agreed on 54 of them. Intercoder reliability coefficient in content analysis was 90% when using Holsti’s formula. Thus, reliability of content analysis can be argued to be an acceptable level.

1.6 Summary of Chapters

This study is broadly divided into 5 parts: ‘Introduction’, ‘Why specialism’, ‘News Organisational Culture’, ‘Deciding What News is’, and ‘Conclusion’. The first part, Chapter 1, provides an introduction of this study. It deals with the research and theoretical background, context of the study, methodology, and research questions. It discusses such concepts as the sociology of journalism, organisational culture, and specialism. It also explains the context between them in relation to the theme of this study.

The second part is ‘Why specialism’. It analyses why news organisations want to import specialism by examining relevant situations inside and outside a news organisation. For this examination, this part is again subdivided into Chapter 2 ‘Journalists’ Job Security’ and Chapter 3 ‘Internet Challenges’. Chapter 2 deals with the basic causes of specialism in Korean journalism. It
discusses that news organisations introduce specialism for newsroom management. Job insecurity and promotion competition within news organisations are also discussed. Chapter 3 explores the other reason for introducing specialism for more practical terms. It deals with how the Internet challenges are related to demands for specialism. It probes why a newspaper regards specialism as a strategic institution to develop its existing competence.

News organisational culture related to specialism is the subject of part III, the main interest of this study. It inquires into how news organisational culture underpins the new policy. It concentrates on two issues: 'Journalists’ Status' in Chapter 4, and 'Journalists’ Routines' in Chapter 5. While Chapter 4 relates to the static aspect of news organisational culture, Chapter 5 illuminates its dynamic features presented in newsgathering practices. Chapter 4 provides analyses about the rigidity of news organisational culture by exploring personnel management policy for specialists. Chapter 5 puts forward assessments of journalist routines in newsgathering activities, especially by focusing on the beat system. It examines how the beat routines impact on specialism. It also investigates the aspect of control over the specialists. A news organisation’s emphasis on teamwork is one of subjects of this Chapter, discussing various aspects of news organisational culture that restrict development of specialism.

The fourth part, 'Deciding What News is' analyses how specialists select their news through probing their news sources and news values compared with that of generalists. In this sense, Chapter 6 'News Selection', analyses the routines of source-reporter relations, and of news values. More concretely, this Chapter focuses on both the specialist’s individual approach and the organisational control process in news selection. Chapter 7 'Better Journalism' assesses whether specialism works for 'better journalism'. It discusses on how specialism accomplishes its purposes in terms of developing news quality in practice with a brief case study of content analysis. It includes analyses
mobilising information (MI) of the specialist's news reports in terms of the active approach in news reporting.

The fifth part, Chapter 8 is a conclusion. It briefly summarises the main points of the study and discusses some remaining issues to be studied further.
Part II. WHY SPECIALISM?

As examined above, specialism can be assessed in terms of newsgathering efficiency and personnel management over journalists. Korean newspapers are undergoing some significant transformations due to the economic crisis and the Internet challenges. An unprecedented scale of job redundancies is constantly threatening journalists’ job stability while newspaper journalists feel seriously unable to deal with new Internet environment. News organisations are trying to resolve these dilemmas of personnel management to settle down labour disturbances and cope with environmental challenges. Korean newspapers are introducing specialism in an effort to tackle this situation.

Based on this perspective, this part of the study will investigate why Korean newspaper journalism would like to introduce specialism. Chapter 2 and 3 will examine these issues inquiring into the first research question of “Why do news organisations intend to introduce specialism?” In this mood, the first hypothesis is posited as “Specialism is adopted for personnel management and newsgathering efficiency”.
Chapter 2
JOURNALISTS' JOB SECURITY

2.1 Vulnerability of Journalists' Jobs

2.1.1 Redundancy

Korean newspaper companies are these days confronted with some managerial problems. The origin of these problems seems to be related to the uncertainty of journalist job security. This has led journalists to demand more secure job stability. Specialism is considered a reliable prospect to counter the anxiety about job insecurity. Journalists' appetite for specialism is apparently a universal phenomenon. Tunstall's study of specialism in Britain (1971: 35) finds that most general reporters do not want to remain permanently as ordinary general reporters, but rather become specialist newsgatherers, or feature writers. Of course the other group of reporters want to become news editor in a hierarchical ladder. However, the extent of Korean journalists' appetite for specialism seems to be much stronger and more urgent than in British journalism due to job insecurity.

The prominent cause of job insecurity for Korean journalists occurred during the foreign currency crisis in 1997. The issue of job insecurity has become even more important during and after that economic crisis (N & B, May 1998; N & B, July 1998; JAK, 21st February 2000; JAK, 4th April 2000; JAK, 1st May 2000; JAK, 7th May 2000; Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002). This crisis resulted in such considerable economic recession in the newspaper industry that journalists feared for their jobs. Newspapers coped with this crisis by saving on personnel expenditure. The average pay level was cut by at maximum of 75%. An even worse story was redundancy. For five months after the outbreak of the crisis, around 10% of all journalists in Korea were dismissed.
Newspapers reduced the number and the scale of organisations by merging and separating from the mother-company.

Particularly, this fear was far worse for senior journalists since they received higher wages comparing with junior reporters (N & B, May 1998; N & B, July 1998). Nearly 70% of redundant journalists were senior journalists who had worked for more than 15 years. Even after the economic situation improved, the threat of senior journalist redundancy still remains. One news executive says that the retiring age for journalists is 45 years old (Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002). Job redundancy is the most concerning threat to journalist job security. According to research by the KFP (N & B, May 1998), redundancy is so prevalent across all newspaper companies, regardless of whether major or minor papers, that it has become a general phenomenon. The National Union of Journalists (Mediaonul, 21st January 1998) states that this situation has brought journalists into psychological panic.

Redundancy worsens journalists’ working conditions (N & B, September 2000; Mediaonul, 20th January 2000). Besides their own responsibilities they have to take over work that has previously been done by their colleagues. After the economic crisis, the volume of journalists’ daily work increased by 20-50%. The workload of local paper journalist increased by up to 50%. One assistant news executive of a national paper’s political desk says that he works for 12 hours a day. After the economic crisis, his newspaper decided to delay a deadline in order to extend the working hours. Another assistant news executive of the Cultural desk insists that he had 3 days’ holidays a year in 1999 and 2000. A junior reporter of the City desk works for 15 hours a day. This workload is believed to sometimes lead to premature death. An assistant executive of the Economy desk of the major paper stated that:

I have to work from 7am to 3 am the next day. I have to give up seeing my family during weekdays. The relationship with my family is on the brink of
break-up. To be worse, I am no longer a journalist. With this harsh workload situation, I cannot properly carry on my journalist job. How can I see things with a critical mind in such a short time? Now I am a deliverer of press releases (Mediaonul, 20th January 2000).

Such an increased workload pushed journalists to leave their jobs, since the devastating working environment caused significant frustration in carrying out their jobs. After the recovery of the economic crisis in 2000, there was an exodus of journalists (Mediaonul, 20th January 2000; JAK, 21st February 2000; JAK, 7th March; Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002). Most of them moved to the 'Dot Com' venture companies (JAK, 21st February 2000). Nearly 3% of national newspaper journalists left to join venture companies. Most of them were reporters from the Economy, Politics, and Home news desks, regarded as the major desks. Newspapers had a shortage of resources, leading to an increased workload for the remaining reporters.

Specialism is a sort of safety valve for protecting journalists from redundancy. Moreover, it functions to preserve and improve the quality of news work. As a result of increased workload, most journalists complain about the deterioration of their working environment since they have insufficient time to improve news production. Therefore, the demands for specialism are related not only to more secure job stability but also to better working environment.

2.1.2 Personnel Management Crises

Another reason of journalist's exodus is a failure of personnel management. Many journalists complain about an unprincipled personnel management. One junior reporter of the Home news desk has moved 6 desks in 8 months (Mediaonul, 20th January 2000). Even if he wanted to work at the Cultural
desk, the editor would never listen to him. Due to lack of reporter resources, news organisations have a difficulty in allocating reporters in accordance with reporters' demands.

That situation created an identity crisis among journalists (JAK, 7th May 2000). A former senior reporter confesses that journalistic ideology is so disrupted by unexpected redundancy and a deteriorated work environment that he has lost a motive to work for journalism. According to the JAK's survey (JAK, 1st May 2000), 3 out of 4 journalists responded that they would consider leaving their jobs if there was an alternative. Nearly 50% of respondents anticipated that a social status of newspaper journalists would deteriorate in future. Even worse, there are not enough other jobs for journalists to go to due to the economic recession. Journalists have no choice but keep working as journalists. This situation has led journalists to specialise some subjects (KJB, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001).

The problem of job security is the same for younger reporters. While senior journalists are directly faced with promotion competition and redundancy that relates to job insecurity, junior journalists are highly conscious about specialist journalism since they have to work for more years than the senior journalists (LY, arts specialist interviewed 2001). They seem to have no confidence in job security during such a long period of work. They consider that specialist journalists can survive because they have their own subject of work. Even if they are laid off, they can work as freelances relying on their speciality to produce reporting (KOH, senior generalist interviewed 2001; KJB, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001). Tunstall’s study (1971: 94) also acknowledges the generalists' feeling of insecurity. He observes that journalists experience rapid job mobility before specialisation while there is a pattern of job immobility after specialisation. Specialist journalism appears to be a way of guaranteeing journalist job security.

In relation to specialism, journalists' awareness of job insecurity is related
partly to weakened seniority practices, which they have depended upon as the major principle of personnel management. From salary to promotion, news organisational culture in Korean journalism has been ruled by the principle of seniority practices. Seniority is decided by the order of entering a news organisation regardless of age or performance. A junior generalist described it as follow:

Personnel management, including promotion, of Korean newspapers largely depends on a seniority practice, which is decided in accordance with the order of entering into a company especially by passing a regular intake examination. This seniority practice prohibits news organisations from imposing an efficient management system to organise journalists. Seniority is so rigid that it would never admit a labour policy that could be an obstacle for preserving it. In this situation, journalists who are left out of promotion are regarded as losers. If they fail to be promoted at the right time according to their pecking order based on seniority, they are considered losers in a promotion competition. This stigma of loser follows the rest of their career. Most journalists, therefore, regard the promotion as the only way to go for job security (KCH, interviewed 2001).

From this seniority perspective, the senior journalists' job security has become highly vulnerable after the economic crisis in 1997. A news executive confesses that “I am always anxious about my future since the retirement age of journalists is getting younger” (Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002). The number of senior posts was lessened in an attempt to save expenditure, as examined before. This resulted in a curtailment of promotion chances. Consequently, it infers that senior journalists' job insecurity could be more serious.

Furthermore, there has been a change of promotion practices. The traditional practice based on seniority is gradually being discarded by news organisations. Even if, in the past, more senior journalists used to be
promoted earlier than junior journalists, this expectation is no longer effective. Senior journalists are now in crisis in terms of both redundancy and the destruction of seniority practices. Most journalists in their 50s are being expelled from their jobs when their juniors are promoted to a senior status (Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002).

As a result, the age span from a first newspaper job and the prospect of becoming an editor has been narrowed. This change is, of course, welcomed by junior journalists who, otherwise, would have to wait for more than 20 years to become editors. Some journalists justify this as a shift in generations and the introduction of a merit system rather than a seniority system. They consider this phenomenon as newspapers' adaptation to a changed environment (Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002).

In spite of these positive aspects, the changes in seniority practices significantly impact on senior journalists. They have not prepared for this change because they have been used to living under seniority practices. A sub-managing editor says that "maybe journalists over 45 have no alternatives but as journalists" (JAK, 3rd July 2000). Giles maintains that "typically, those who are middle-aged and in middle management will feel a sense of discontent if they look ahead and see no opportunities for promotion" (1991: 458). He also points out that "it is particularly painful to be disappointed at middle age and to discover that the system that selects leaders no longer has as much regard for age or seniority" (1991: 457).

As mentioned by a news executive (Mediaonul, 2nd May 2002), senior journalist discontent is related to both their situation and the news organisation. On the one hand, they are discouraged that they are unable to compete with their junior colleagues, especially when they cannot adapt to the new newsgathering technology which juniors seem to master quite easily. A senior generalist stated that:
Though journalists should be good at dealing with new technology like computers for producing different news from the existing news stories, I am so bad at computers. Speaking frankly, I am baffled by the speed of information flow in the Internet. I cannot focus on a specific issue for a while, since new stories follow too quickly to inquire into related aspects of the issue. However, my juniors who are mostly from the computer generation are surprisingly not bothered by that speed" (KHJ, interviewed 2001).

This senior generalist had given up competing with the junior, and instead depends on promotion to managerial positions for his survival. Another senior generalist (KYM, interviewed 2001) insisted that newsgathering and reporting news relates not only to new technology but also to traditional methods of reporting. Most senior generalists interviewed in this study were undeniably worried about their lack of fitness with new technology. This implies that the emergence of new newsroom technology has created conditions for senior journalists to define themselves as quasi-losers in relation to young journalists. Although senior journalists agreed that new technology is an inevitable advancement, it seems to disregard the human consequences such as senior journalists' work environment, the definition of work, and ultimately their status of individual newsgatherers (Hardt, 1998: 179).

On the other hand, senior journalists complained about news organisations' inhospitable treatment of them. They felt anxious that they could be discarded by a news organisation at anytime, due to a reduction of managerial positions since the economic crisis. Senior journalists were anxious that news organisations were not prepared for this problem (KIM, music specialist interviewed 2001). They considered that news organisations simply force sacrifices from senior journalists rather than design strategy to use these senior journalists' skills and knowledge. Senior journalists were unhappy with both their own inadequacy and the news organisation's neglect. With this regard, Giles observes that:
An assistant managing editor, upon learning that he or she will not achieve the goal of becoming managing editor, may experience a mixture of feelings. It may occur to the assistant managing editor that the current position will be the height of his or her attainment, that what was sought was only partly won. There may be anger, both toward one's self for failing to achieve the goal of becoming managing editor and toward the organisation that demanded the sacrifices along the way and then awarded the plum to someone else (1991: 457).

Senior journalists in Korean journalism these days seem to be in a state of high job insecurity, and this has become one of the most problematic issues in personnel management. In this sense, specialism is regarded as a solution to provide senior journalists with an alternative where they can continue their jobs not as management but as reporters. A junior generalist described a senior journalist's relief about specialism:

By designating a specialist, a news organisation guarantees journalists' employment for a fairly long time. Sometimes specialists think that this status relates to life-time employment until their retirement age. In fact, it indicates nothing but the guarantee of employment. This is, however, regarded as the most important protection of their job security. Given that news executives above assistant news executives are on the standing list of redundancy these days, to become a specialist at least relieves journalists from this threat (CUS, interviewed 2001).

Specialism is viewed as capable of easing the management dilemmas of news organisations. It is used to maintain journalist loyalty in the midst of promotion competition. According to Soloski (1989: 217), by providing opportunities for upward mobility for specialist journalists, news organisations are able to maintain journalists' loyalties. Otherwise, there could probably be
conflict caused by promotion competition for the hierarchy of the management ladder. Specialist journalists preferred the reporter's status to the hierarchical management position as their reward. The specialist ladder can offer greater freedom of engaging in their specialities, instead of greater authority such as promotion through management power hierarchy.

In conclusion, Korean journalists' demands for specialism are closely related to their job insecurity. The economic crisis has brought journalists into a chaotic situation in terms of job stability, one which they never worried about before. This problem, in turn, provides news organisations with the managerial dilemma of dealing with promotion competition and securing experienced journalist resources. In this sense, specialism is understood as an effective method of dealing with such problems by permitting journalists an alternative to hierarchical promotion.

2.2 Career Prospects

2.2.1 New Perspectives of Journalist Identity

The destruction of seniority practices in Korean journalism has brought a revolutionary change of news organisational culture. Seniority practices are no longer a principle that provides journalists with an expectation of personnel management. As examined before, the news organisational culture of Korean journalism has been heavily focused on hierarchy. Seniority practices are the rudimentary base of a hierarchy in practice, and the most important criteria to decide most managerial issues from salary to promotion. Newsgathering routines are also affected by it. Usually the seniority practices are called a pseudo-military system, which the senior makes most decisions regarding news production process (Kim, C. Y., 1993: 211).

News organisational culture in Korean journalism has largely been ruled
by the principle of the seniority practices. Demolition of those seniority practices by the turmoil in the newspaper business environment has led journalists to transform the understanding and practices of their job. It has also forced news organisations to prepare substitute personnel management policies. Specialism is presented as an alternative to a journalist's career prospect. By far, in Korean journalism, a journalist's career plan has oriented to promotion to editorial positions. Specialism opens another route for journalists. However, not all journalists want to be specialists even if the majority of journalists would like to prefer it to management positions. Three out of 8 executives and one out of 8 generalists in this study supported the editorial ladder rather than a specialist status. There was a manifest difference in objectives between the two jobs. Those who try to take the editorial ladder tend to focus on the power to control journalists and to regulate news flow in the context of the whole paper. By contrast, those who want to be specialists prefer to remain as newsgatherers or reporters. A senior generalist of the Home news desk, stated that:

This is the sixteenth year since I started my journalist job. It seems too early to be an assistant executive. As an assistant executive, I cannot cover news events on my own like other reporters since the responsibility of an assistant executive is to support desk news executives in the office. As matter of fact, I would like to work as a reporter in the field. However, I would not say I dislike this job. I am satisfied with desk work because I can co-ordinate reporters in accordance with my own strategy. News contents can be changed according to my decision. This is a power, influential power. My power influences reporters, sources, and news contents (KHJ, interviewed 2001).

As far as he was concerned, specialist-seekers are regarded as promotion losers. A desk news executive argued that:
The necessity of the specialist indicates that they are losers of promotion competition. Specialism is a kind of refuge for them. From my experience, I cannot imagine that those who lose promotion competition for an editor position can be better reporters. Editors are the best reporters (HHP, interviewed 2001).

All the proponents of specialism have different opinions. A music specialist stated that “even though I cannot say I am in a favourable status compared with my colleagues in promotion competition, I do not care about it since I can keep the music specialist’s job until I finish my career” (KIM, interviewed 2001). A journalist can view specialism as a new path in career management. A clear career management structure serves mutual benefits for both the organisation and individual employees providing an opportunity to develop their careers.

This suggests that, owing to a specialist path, a journalist’s career plan can be diversified since journalists have a chance of continuing the reporter’s job. Journalists are able to develop their own journalistic causes in the future through the editorial ladder as well as a specialist route (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001; LDH, film specialist interviewed 2001). Journalists have started to have a new perspective of their identity by having alternative career plans. Specialism empowers journalists to have a life long reporter’s career. Some junior reporters are now starting their careers with the purpose of being specialists rather than management executives (PKI, junior generalist interviewed 2001). One managing editor elaborated that:

With the diversifying of society, the fields to be dealt by journalists have been increased. It enables to expand the journalists’ territory to cover. In fact, journalists must be in very advantageous positions to develop a specific subject, because they can approach and use the relevant information (KYJ, interviewed 2001).
This desire to specialise in a specific area may not have been possible because of the practice of a desk-circulation in Korean journalism. To circulate desks or subjects is related to a belief that journalists should be able to understand every subject. Journalists had to get experience of as many fields as possible by circulating from desk to desk. During the foreign currency crisis, this has brought about a considerable problem. A senior generalist reporter (KYM, interviewed 2001) testified that journalists of the Economy desk were criticised since their lack of specialised knowledge of the economy caused, or at least worsened the crisis since it made a wrong interpretation and provided with wrong solutions on that situation. Circulation of fields was criticised as the major reason of failing to develop journalist specialisation. This more clearly shows the need for specialist journalism.

Besides this desire, the possibility of specialism as a new career path may be a consequence of the vulnerability of a journalist's job, since the economic crisis. This situation has led journalists to find an alternative way as journalists. A senior generalist observed that:

Journalists, particularly newspaper journalists, can no longer regard themselves as the most secure employees as have been senior colleagues before. The economic crisis has replaced life employment with annual employment contracts. Journalists can be sacked anytime and their juniors in promotion competition can overtake their positions. How can we imagine this change 5 years ago that company would not care for its journalists? However, we have to admit it and have another understanding of what we are. We have to prepare for the case of lay-offs from newspaper companies. For this, specialisation in a specific subject is inevitable in order to be a freelance after departing newspaper organisations (KOH, interviewed 2001).

The new perspective of journalist identity is related to a destruction of solidarity between journalists and news organisations. The majority of
journalists interviewed pointed out that they no longer believe in and rely on their company for employment. Their demands for an alternative to their future careers other than the management ladder is likely to be related to discontent with the news organisation’s way of managing journalists. This is one of the complaints of senior journalists and also a reason for leaving their journalist jobs. They consider that news organisations deal with them not as journalists but as a ‘means’ or ‘tool’ of producing reporting. They feel themselves as salary men who only seek high payment. The so called ‘venture exodus’ is also a consequence of this situation. A senior generalist said that:

There has been a driving force of expelling journalists from their job before the venture exodus. News organisations push journalists to write reports in favour of advertisers in an effort to win increased commercial competition. Sometimes, I am confused what I am: journalist or advertising salesman. In this situation, I can no longer trust a news organisation since I feel that it will discard me anytime it regards me as useless (JAK, 7th March 2000).

Journalists are experiencing a crisis of their identity as journalists due to the news organisations’ way of dealing with journalists. Along with job insecurity, the crisis of journalist identity is caused by management failure. This feature is identified more clearly in the JAK survey (JAK, 1st May 2000). This survey shows that newspaper journalists pointed out three major factors as leading to a deterioration of newspaper journalism: bureaucratic management (28.5%), despotism of ownership (26.0%), and treating journalists as salary-men (16.4%). Journalists regarded that these factors prohibit them from exerting their journalistic ideology. The first two factors seem to be related to attitude of news organisations in dealing with the economic crisis. Many journalists consider that management failed to deal with the business environment. News organisations would like to solve the problem by firing journalists without reforming management (N & B, May 1998). When seen as salary-men,
journalists have to write their reports for the sake of commercial profit without journalistic ideology. It indicates that the personnel management of news organisations caused a crisis of journalist identity by failing to provide journalists with a belief in news organisations’ management. This crisis impacts on the importance of newspapers as a social institution. In the same survey, nearly half of newspaper journalists in the JAK survey (48.8%) responded that the social status of newspaper in future would be affected adversely. This situation is also linked to journalists’ leaving. Almost three quarters (74.7%) of journalists reported that they would leave their newspaper job if they had the opportunity to do so.

News organisations should provide a reliable and stable career management that enables journalists to plan and shape the progression within an organisation in accordance with assessments of organisational needs and the performance, potential and preferences of individual members of the organisation (Armstrong, 1991: 471). Without proper assessments of senior journalist performances and potential, news organisations might fire them or produce job insecurity. Moreover, the survey above indicates that journalists are discouraged by the news organisations’ pursuit of short-sight commercial profit.

The most prominent change in journalists’ attitude towards their job may be that they would like to focus on possibilities outside news organisations. Instead of weakening loyalty for news organisations, journalists are focusing on freelancing. A film specialist indicated that:

The number of media has been dramatically increased in recent years. This phenomenon enlarges opportunities of freelancing. Besides various magazines, the Internet creates vast fields for journalists to make money. Journalists could not expect this at least several years ago. As a film specialist, I regularly write reports and columns in four Internet film sites. Three other film sites publish my reports in newspapers with payment, as well as writing
my own film columns on two magazines. These media admit my speciality in the film field so they ask for my writings. By this freelancing, I earn money as much as the salary provided by my company (LDH, interviewed 2001).

Russo’s study indicates that the identity of journalists refers to their profession rather than the news organisation or company. According to Russo (1998: 87-90), journalists identify more with their profession than with their newspaper. His study finds that journalists think of themselves as a journalist first and an employee of the company second. In Korean journalism, this attitude is more evident due to the distrust for the news organisations. According to this study’s interviews, most journalists prefer the specialist ladder to the bureaucratic ladder because of this distrust. They assume that the specialist refers to an individual journalist’s property, while the bureaucratic ladder is entirely dependent on the organisation.

2.2.2 Career Flexibility

This profession-oriented attitude towards journalist identity, rather than organisation-oriented, provides specialists with a flexibility and discretion within a news organisation. A film specialist (KDH, interviewed 2001) stated that “I ask my boss, the Editor, for a separate column space”. The specialist can use his/her own discretion regarding news production. He noted that such a journalist’s request for separate space could not have been imagined several years ago. Journalists had to obey the news executive’s decision of allocating space. Confidence in one’s speciality enables autonomous requests. Specialism helps to create a new relationship between journalists and a news organisation.

Levels of confidence about the future vary considerably between generalists and specialists. All generalists and news executives interviewed
worry that they cannot imagine how their situations will change in five years’ time. A news executive described that:

So far I would not say there is a problem of promotion compared with my colleagues. However, I am very concerned about my promotion. In two or three years, I have to advance towards an assistant managing editor. If I fail to promote to this status, I may be alienated from the mainstream of the newsroom. Once I am excluded from the decision making group, I am highly unlikely to come back to a bureaucratic hierarchy again. By shortening retirement age, junior colleagues will take these statuses, so I have no chance to be involved in the editor’s group. It is a terrible stress for me (JJS, interviewed 2001).

Unlike the generalists’ uncertainty about their future, specialists describe relatively clearly and confidently their five-year prospects. A medical specialist expected that in 5 years’ time:

There may not be unexpected changes. As I prepare these days, I will have two or three books that include my experiences as a medical specialist. And I will be a member of several institutions of medical fields. In the view of promotion, maybe I will fall behind my colleagues. However, it will not be a problem since the specialist system has its own promotion practices. My concern is not how high my status is in the newsroom, but how I can deliver my speciality or how I can strengthen my influence in my field (KCJ, interviewed 2001).

An arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) also presented his future in five years as “based on in-depth reporting, I am going to write a book that combines academic knowledge with general interests of the audience”. He added that he has no worries about his job security since he can lecture at university and freelance outside newspaper companies in case of redundancy.
These observations reveal the fact that whereas the bureaucratic ladder is closely related to and dependent upon a news organisation, the specialist ladder is relatively free from it. It can be argued that specialism is a way of diminishing a journalist's dependence on or subordination to a news organisation. Generalists seeking hierarchical posts want to obtain job security by the bondage with the news organisation. Whereas, specialist-seekers can find their own job security by fortifying their own individual speciality, enabling them to lessen their dependence on the news organisation. The specialist has a 'bridge' into some other field (Tunstall, 1971; Elliott, 1977). Tunstall states that:

Journalism is a 'bridging' occupation – it provides, through work experience, the conditions and opportunities for movement from one occupation to another. One attribute which makes journalism a bridging occupation is access to people in other occupations and to helpful knowledge (Tunstall, 1971: 65).

The specialist status creates a new option beyond news organisations. Tunstall exemplifies politics as one of the most visible and traditional forms of bridging. Regardless of the forms of bridging, a specialist can take advantage of his/her individual speciality. As examined above, all specialists suggest freelancing, authorship, or lecturership at university as career prospects beyond the newspaper. Such work is available by the very fact that they are specialists. They can extend such work by promoting their own personalities. Elliott also demonstrates that:

For some there are opportunities to develop a public persona, to become a 'personality' or a 'star', for others similar opportunities to build a personal reputation, though within the occupation rather than with the public at large (1977: 144).
Some studies argue that the specialist is like a ‘star’ journalist. Tunstall (1996: 155-161) understands specialism in terms of pages and people. Specialists are allowed to report their writings in regular sections. Specialists do not have to follow a deadline for breaking news or brief news. They are in a highly favourable situation compared with general reporters in terms of time and space. According to Negrine, they also have the personality which “adds something special to the news story beneath their names” (Negrine, 1996: 80). These benefits are likely to be the grounds for making their name known to the public. In this sense, Tunstall calls them ‘stars’. According to him, “there has been a huge growth in the phenomenon of the star columnist who is given a set space on perhaps two days a week” (Tunstall, 1996: 155). Specialism enables specialists to widen their flexibility to work depending on their own ‘personality’ or ‘star’ profile.

Interestingly, there seem to be some differences in understanding specialism between management and reporters. A deputy managing editor said that:

Aspirations to specialism are, first of all, because of job insecurity. During the economic crisis, journalists experienced unprecedented job redundancies. Furthermore, news organisations want to decrease managerial positions in a bid to lessen expenditure. Promotion competition must be more severe when it comes to higher positions. To be worse, it seems highly difficult for journalists, especially the senior journalists, to seek alternative jobs. In this sense, specialism is the only way for reporters to save and to protect their job. In a word, only specialism can secure the senior journalists’ job within a news organisation (KJB, interviewed 2001).

In the seniority practice of Korean journalism, the defeat of promotion competition is directly related to a journalist’s job insecurity. As stated by a deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001), promotion to the hierarchical
bureaucratic ladder has been regarded as the only route to enable a journalist’s career prospects to last. This indicates that one of the main objectives of personnel management is possibly how to deal with senior journalists in such a situation of limited positions for promotion.

Beyond it, news organisations have to utilise the resources of experienced journalists. Their experiences are assumed to preserve the know-how of newsgathering accumulated through covering news events. A deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) testified that journalistic experience cannot be obtained within a short time, so the resources of senior reporters should be utilised. The problem is a plan of action. Another deputy managing editor (KJB, interviewed 2001) pointed out that lack of diversity of personnel management hinders making use of the experienced journalists. Specialism is considered one way of diversifying personnel management.

Moreover, specialism enables news organisations to bond journalists to the news organisation. As maintained by Soloski (1989: 217), if news organisations provide opportunities for upward movement to specialist journalists, they are able to maintain senior journalists’ loyalty by resolving their job insecurity, and also to retain experienced labour resources. Becoming a specialist can solve a senior journalist’s promotion conflict and specialism can be a useful means of personnel management for a news organisation. As mentioned by Armstrong (1991: 471), specialism helps journalists to identify some ways and qualities needed for future jobs that news organisations require.

Management understands that reporters’ appetite for specialism is related to an intention of take advantage of their influence on the public and the credibility of the established news organisations. Another deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) explained this in terms of journalists’ power. According to him, journalists normally satisfy and identify their existence through their power towards audiences and sources. He argued that “their power can be achieved the most efficiently through the major media like...
newspapers, not the minor media such as magazines or the Internet” (JSH, interviewed 2001). Another deputy managing editor stated that:

Although many newspaper journalists can transfer to the Internet and other media, I do not think they are satisfied with it. The basic instinct of journalists is influence. Journalists always want to confirm their influential power. The Internet can never provide this power even if it could give them money. To write in the Internet or other media is a means of making money. For this, journalists should compromise with these media in the way of producing writings that these media want. This is not journalism but a commercial transaction. Therefore, I think that journalists have to seek their ways ‘within’ news organisations (KJB, interviewed 2001).

A managing editor stated that “only when reporters are members of a newspaper company, they do feel safe” (KYJ, interviewed 2001). This indicates that management regards specialism as an efficient means of dealing with journalist resources by binding them with the news organisation. Three quarters of executives interviewed put an emphasis on the aspect that specialism is as a way of personnel management by reducing journalist job insecurity. They saw the specialist status as a kind of safety valve. These management observations are a little different from reporters’ approach to specialism, which emphasises the possibility of freelance activities. Most reporters interviewed in this study indicated that becoming specialists could effect a more loosened relationship between journalists and a news organisation while the management considers specialism a means of binding journalists to a news organisation.

In spite of this discrepancy, both parts agree that specialism creates an alternative journalist identity. This identity also involves flexibility in a journalist’s career. Specialism enables journalists to develop alternative
prospects besides hierarchical promotion in the bureaucratic ladder. The journalists interviewed considered that specialism creates a rather loose relationship between a news organisation and journalists. However, reporters were more focused on an aspect of journalist independence from a news organisation whereas the management assumed that that independence is not beyond a news organisation but within a personnel management policy of news organisation.

Summary

According to the journalists interviewed, specialism is supposed to resolve the job insecurity of Korean journalists. The crisis of journalist job insecurity originates from a destruction of two fundamentals of Korean newspaper journalism. The impacts come from inside as well as outside news organisations. Externally, the economic viability of the newspaper industry has been significantly demolished by the foreign currency crisis in 1997. This crisis has directly affected the news organisations’ management of personnel policies as well as business policies. Newspapers had to implement survival strategies to save expenditure across all elements of the news organisation. The simplest way led to massive scale of journalist redundancies, especially senior journalists. Internally, the impact of the economic recession transformed the traditional practices of news organisations. It nearly terminated the seniority practices, which had dominated newsroom routines. The overthrow of the seniority practices also undermines the job security of senior journalists.

Today, Korean journalists are uncertain about their job security, and this has changed their attitude towards their journalist identity. Traditionally, Korean journalists focused their identity on their relationship with the news organisation. But news organisations destroyed their belief of life-time
employment. This has generated a rather individual identity. Not trusting their news organisations, journalists have started to depend on themselves to protect their jobs. Many journalists view freelance work as a way of being less dependent on their news organisations. Specialism is regarded as an alternative identity of journalists, and also as a protection of their future career. From these perspectives, it can be inferred that specialism is introduced as a possible solution for job insecurity and uncertain job prospects. Specialism is adopted as a strategic choice to confront a harsh situation.

Specialism also functions as a strategic choice in more practical terms: aspects of news consumption and news production. Newspapers in Korea see specialism as an efficient way of dealing with the news production process, which is affected by the Internet challenges in practice. This study will investigate how specialism relates to the efficiency of news production in the Internet environment.
Chapter 3
INTERNET CHALLENGES

3.1 Technological Impacts

According to journalists interviewed in this study, specialism is assumed to be an efficient means of dealing with the newly emerging circumstances of the news media, mostly technological impacts, such as the Internet challenges. The journalists interviewed suggested that the major effects of the Internet on newspaper news production can be assessed in three ways: an increase of speed in news production and news transactions; an expansion of accessibility to information; and a change of audience feedback.

Singer (1997: 4) divides journalists according to attitudes toward technological changes in their daily routines, perceptions of their own roles, skills and values such as: the revolutionary, the traditionalist, and the realist. The revolutionaries are the most enthusiastic about new technology, and evaluate it in terms of opportunities, since they believe it enables them to do their existing jobs better. Conversely, the traditionalists perceive greater drawbacks than benefits. As far as they are concerned, new technologies are an indication that journalism is not good any more. The realists consider that technological changes are not seen as having much to do with them at all. These various attitudes of journalists towards technology illustrate that there is a disagreement in acknowledging the influence of the Internet among journalists. In accordance with attitudinal orientation, a journalist's evaluation of specialism could also be different. If journalists do not feel the Internet's impacts, they might have a different opinion of the usefulness of specialism.

This study found that although such attitudinal variety as discovered by Singer's study is also true in Korean journalism, the discrepancy is not as serious. From the survey in this study (Table 2), it can be inferred that most
Korean newspaper journalists consent to the fact that the Internet impacts on newspaper journalism in various ways. Of 131 journalists including reporters and news executives from the two middle group newspapers, 69.5% (n=91) of respondents agreed with the impact of the Internet, while only 10.7% (n=14) said that the influence of the Internet had nothing to do with newspaper journalism. The degree of worry about Internet impact varied with their position within a news organisation.

<Table 2> Journalist Ranking by Internet Impact Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking in News Organisation</th>
<th>Internet Impacts on Newspapers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Reporter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Reporter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk News Executive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four groups, the group most sensitive to Internet impact was found to be the senior reporters, who have more than 10 years’ experience. 75.7% (n=28) of them showed an attitude of ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’. The second most sensitive group was the junior reporters who have less than 10 years of journalistic experience. Their consent rate reached 70.2% (n=40). By contrast with the reporters, desk news executives showed a lower approval for this issue, at around 60% (61.1%, n=22). This outcome suggests that as the rank of a news employee is higher, the degree of concern about Internet impacts becomes lower. In a focus group discussion, this finding was also identified. Discussants argued that the reporter group tended to accept the impact, whereas the executive group denied it (FJAK, focus group discussion 2001).
This finding appears to be related to the inclination to specialism. All generalists asserted the necessity of specialism for dealing with Internet challenges. On the contrary, 3 out of 6 managing editors showed negative responses to the efficiency of specialism. This indicates that concern about Internet influence lead journalists' attitudes to the need for specialism.

As shown by the discussants in the focus group, the main reason for this differing response to the Internet is possibly related to an ability or lack of it in using the Internet. The executive group was not accustomed to this environmental change. Discussants considered that they were normally too old to learn this new technology. However, the senior reporters felt the Internet impact most significantly since they considered themselves to be on the borderline between junior reporters and news executives. Most junior reporters are of the computer generation, whilst the senior reporters started using a computer in the middle of their journalist careers. Therefore, senior reporters were assumed to be less skillful than the juniors in using the Internet (FUMH, focus group discussion 2001). This relative lack of competence in using new technology seemed to make the senior reporters uncomfortable in competition with the junior reporters. This situation of the senior journalists is likely with a demand for specialism. Even if junior journalists also support an introduction of specialism as means of dealing with Internet challenges, the senior journalists' appetite for specialism is stronger. Through in-depth interviews, senior journalists represented a rather desperate aspiration for specialism, since they considered it a more desirable option for their career prospects.

3.1.1 Speed

One of the major worries of newspaper journalists appears to be the speed of Internet news. The impact of Internet speed can also identified in the survey
research (Table 3). A large proportion (40.5%, n=53) of respondents reported that lack of speed is the most critical problem of newspapers. In contrast, under a quarter (22.9%, n=30) expressed concern about the variety of channel on the Internet.

As regards news business, the Internet impacts on newspaper consumption with its speed of information production. Virilio (1996: 1-5) contends that the problem of the Internet is not the information in itself, but the speed of the transaction of information. Speed of communication in the Internet age is presented in expressions of ‘immediacy’, ‘instantaneousness’, or ‘simultaneity’. Information is transacted at ‘real time’ speed (Virilio, 1996: 1-5), forcing a ceaseless updating of news. Internet speed reaches a ‘timeless’ level, with no time lag between successive information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Problems of Newspapers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptibility to Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline in Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readership Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional News Framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

The feature of ‘timelessness’ of the Internet is linked to a term of ‘virtuality’. According to Castells (1996: 461), the culture of real virtuality on the Internet is associated with multimedia systems which can transform time in society in two different forms: ‘simultaneity’ and ‘timelessness’. Ceaseless updating of news
on the Internet generates a remarkably temporal 'immediacy' of social events and cultural expressions. When the information is presented in the form of hypertext with interactivity, there occurs a 'timelessness' of information. Here, time becomes synchronous in a flat horizon, with no beginning, no end, and even no sequence (Castells, 1996: 462). This 'timelessness' is related to a 'single-time-system'. Virilio (1996: 1-5) again asserts that virtuality in cyber space and globalisation by virtuality produce a 'one-time-system', or a 'single-global-time'. The principle characteristic of single-global-time is that it is 'live': there is instant feedback between reception and transaction. Because of this, the speed of information transaction in real time is different from 'the relative velocity' found in past communication. According to Virilio, communication has passed from the local and relative velocity to the global and absolute velocity of information transmissions.

The speed of the Internet transforms the 'newness' of news in terms of 'time'. The real time transaction of information as mentioned by Virilio (1996: 1-5) results in a 'timeless' and incessant news supply. There is no deadline on Internet news services. This capacity for updating news is thought to be unbeatable by newspaper journalism. In the past, newspapers had experienced such challenges as increasingly updating news from radio and television. In those cases, newspaper journalism successfully adapted to radio and television, but the Internet appears to be different story (KJB, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001).

Those journalists interviewed admitted the impacts of Internet speed on newspapers. One deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) expressed a fear about Internet speed due to its incessant supply of news. Internet speed ultimately influences an audience's news consumption. It could transform the audience's attitude towards media consumption in that "the incompatible speed of the Internet in turn effects audiences' impatient with the information of conventional media" (KYJ, managing editor interviewed 2001).
Internet speed especially appeals to the young generation. It seems clear that the Internet has decreased their newspaper reading. A KMNA survey shows that nearly three quarters (73.2%) of Internet users report a decline of reading printed newspaper since they use the Internet (KMNA, 2000: 39). This is likely to accelerate a declining trend of newspaper reading time. A research of the KPF (1998: 15-16) finds that newspaper reading time in 1998 was 40.8 minutes a day, against 42.8 minutes in 1993. The Internet advances this decreasing trend of newspaper reading time. This trend is much evident in the young generation. According to the KPF's research (2000: 204), the biggest group using news sites is the age group between 20-25 years old. It also reveals that the older the respondent, the lower the number of news sites which are used.

Journalists interviewed in this study argued that the young generation read newspapers less not because of the 'container' but because of the 'content'. A managing editor (CHU, interviewed 2001) interpreted that young people's dissatisfaction with newspapers is based on their news consumption behaviour, which tends to depend on speed. Young people consume news 'quickly' rather than 'deliberately'. The mode of newspaper information seems badly-matched with this inclination for speed of young generation. Some journalists proposed a need for change in the rhetorical style of news reporting. The survey of this study shows that nearly half of journalists (48.1%, n=63) insisted on a change in rhetorical style. A terse, simple, easy, and colloquial style of presentation was most frequently required.

This observation indicates that Internet speed clearly impacts on newspapers especially in terms of news consumption. Accordingly, newspapers have to prepare a differentiated approach of news production from that of the Internet. Those journalists interviewed mostly consented with the statement that the traditional way of newspaper news production should be transformed for this purpose. A medical specialist (KYH, interviewed 2001)
insisted that specialists can cope with this environment more efficiently than
generalists since they have specialised knowledge to quickly discern news
events and then they can develop an easier way of delivering news stories. He
stated:

Specialists work efficiently for a quick delivery of news. A daily deadline does
not allow sufficient enough time to deal with news events. For the purpose of
treating news events within such limited time, journalists have to grasp the core
significance of events at a glance. In the case of medical news, most issues are
a far cry from the simple things for generalist journalists. To transfer facts is
not enough to tell whether or not the issue goes in the right direction.
Specialists can afford such a capacity (KYH, interviewed 2001).

A senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001) supported specialism in that it is
capable of discovering the quintessence of an issue out of the chaotic speed and
information flood. Specialism is needed since it can deal with a changed news
production environment, and can make news production more efficient.
Negrine also states that "[specialist] reporters could become knowledgeable
about specific areas of work and generate and process news more quickly and
more regularly" (1996: 80).

However, this assertion suggests only a relative superiority of specialists
to generalists. Most journalists interviewed doubted that specialism is directly
connected to an efficient way of dealing with this situation. The most serious
problem indicated by journalists in this study was the time-bound aspect of
newspapers' deadlines. A news executive (HHP, interviewed 2001) observed
that "even if specialists are relatively competitive for dealing with increased
speed of information transaction compared with generalists, they are also
incompetent to cope with the Internet because of two or three deadlines of
newspapers". Due to the intrinsic barrier of deadlines, newspaper specialism
is seen as unlikely to be sufficient to confront Internet speed.
3.1.2 Accessibility

Nevertheless, many journalists interviewed saw other advantages of specialism in coping with Internet challenges. Besides speed, another feature of the Internet's impact on newspapers seems to be the 'accessibility' of the Internet. While Internet speed influences a newspaper's business side partly by transforming the audience's news consumption attitudes, its accessibility can be particularly related to news production.

Many studies on digital communication technologies tend to focus on how to incorporate new technologies into journalists' work practices (Singer, 1997; Garrison: 1997a, 2000a; Williams, 1998; Schultz, 2000). These studies generally assume that the Internet enables journalists to extend the range of information gathering and analysis. Garrison's (1997b: 9) research on CAR (Computer-Aided-Reporting or Computer-Assisted-Reporting) from 1995 to 1996 also suggests benefits from the Internet such as backgrounding, checking in-house clips, checking competing publications, finding experts, locating sources and people, and identifying potential story sources. All these potentials take advantage of the thoroughness, speed, and systematic approach of both online and offline database search engines now available to newsrooms. It also enables journalists to retrieve data, work with other journalists at distant locations, conduct interviews, and identify ideas for stories and projects.

A junior generalist (KCH, interviewed 2001) of the International desk argued that Internet investigation is indispensable for the International desk since the international news largely depends on updated news. Such need can also apply to the Sports desk that has to provide updated news regarding, for instance, Korean baseball players of the Major League Baseball in the U.S. A. or Korean golfers (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). In the case of the Home news desk, the Internet can allow reading up about the development of a situation including a change of public opinion using Internet polls (KYM, senior
generalist interviewed 2001). The Internet also enables to cover issues taking place in remote areas. By e-mail, journalists can interview someone in a remote area or who is difficult to approach in face-to-face situation. With an increased dependence on the Internet, one of the middle range newspapers has introduced the Internet desk in an effort to investigate the Internet more specifically (PMH, managing editor interviewed 2001).

These examinations indicate that the Internet is used to improve the efficiency in newsgathering activities. These features are revealed in the survey in this study (Table 4). Of various benefits from the Internet, the most preferential to journalists is that of obtaining data (27.0%, n=109). The second most favourable aspect is to gather news items (23.8%, n=96). Identifying public opinion and selecting news sources are also pointed out as major benefits from the Internet. However, journalists hardly use the e-mail interview (1.5%, n=6) even if it can provide a broader capacity of covering various sources.

<Table 4> Internet Impacts on Newsgathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering News Items</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Public Opinion</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting News Sources</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Data</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Response</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
- Multiple responses.
Through the in-depth interviews, the majority of journalists viewed the accessibility of the Internet as one of the manifest impacts of the Internet on newsgathering activities. Accessibility first of all permits journalists to access information sources, different from the traditional ones as examined above (KYM, senior reporter interviewed 2001). This aspect is certainly a positive side of newsgathering activities. However, there is also a negative side for journalists.

Most organisational news sources in Korea, including government official sources, open their press releases to the public through the Internet. Several generalists consented that the accessibility of the Internet permits audiences access not only to the media, but also to their information sources. By sharing information or information sources with audiences, journalists are faced with the end of an information monopoly (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). They confessed that this is a critical loss to them.

Before the Internet, most journalists were allowed exclusive access to these organisational sources. They enjoyed various benefits from press releases to face-to-face meetings with individual officials of organisations. For this monopoly, Korean journalists formed 'Kijadan', an exclusive cartel system normally composed of beat reporters. It provided them the privilege of enjoying exclusive beat information. Governmental organisations have been typical official sources that allowed the privilege of 'Kijadan'.

Newspaper journalism has dominated official sources even more than broadcasting journalism. In competition with broadcasting journalists, newspaper journalists have enjoyed much more important and more serious information than broadcasting journalists. The Internet, however, ends this benefit. Anyone can access to that information (LY, arts specialist interviewed 2001).

The openness to sources leads the public to a flexible access to professional
information. A few generalists pointed out that access to professional information has been regarded as a newspaper journalist’s right (JJH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). Now that this information can be shared with Internet users, journalists have to develop other sources.

From these examinations, it can be inferred that generalists worry more about the loss of sources due to accessibility than specialists. Most specialists were highly enthusiastic about the Internet’s accessibility. They seemed to use the Internet more frequently than generalists. All the medical specialists interviewed agreed with a significant dependence on the Internet. One medical specialist elaborated his newsgathering method:

After deciding on a news item, I examine related sites on the Internet to appreciate the general trend or development of the issue. 30% of basic information or raw data for reporting is composed of Internet information, 30% of it is acquired from news sources, and the rest comes from my own knowledge (KCJ, interviewed 2001).

Medical specialists can obtain the latest news from the Internet. Internet investigation is inevitable for them. According to another medical specialist:

The latest news is the major type of medical news. However, it is difficult to find ‘something the first’ from the domestic medical field. By investigating foreign news or the foreign medical journal Internet sites, I set out to cover the story in the domestic field relating to this issue. This has been the pattern in this area (KYH, interviewed 2001).

Medical specialists tended to start newsgathering by investigating the Internet to select news items. They considered that the step of gathering raw data or basic information should be conducted through the Internet. Another medical specialist stated:
Regardless of whether the related information comes from the domestic field or the foreign field, an investigation of information begins from the Internet. The medical field is related to a considerable number of subjects. The Internet enables me to search these subjects in a surprisingly convenient way. I cannot do without the Internet (HHK, interviewed 2001).

This indicates that Internet newsgathering is indispensable for investigating global issues. A senior environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001) explained that environmental issues have become global issues, since no region in the world can be free from the effects of problems in other regions. The majority of specialists interviewed admitted that the Internet is a prerequisite for newsgathering. From this examination, it seems that the openness to sources on the Internet provides a means of newsgathering for particularly specialists. It allows investigation of basic information such as databases of previous reporting, addresses, phone numbers, maps, general information, the history and background of issues and other relevant information. Internet exploration is assumed to be an essential step for early-stage reporting material. 6 out of 8 specialists in this study responded that they depend considerably on the Internet, except for one arts specialist and a film specialist.

Of course, Internet dependence also holds true for some generalists, but not to the extent of specialists. Specialists are what Singer called revolutionaries compared with generalists. As said by a senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001), although the Internet is becoming important in newsgathering, most generalists interviewed held that they are still more heavily dependent on human sources than the Internet. It seems that specialists are in more favourable situation of taking advantage of Internet circumstances than generalists.
3.1.3 Feedback

Internet interactivity can be identified in a change of audience feedback. Interactivity opens a direct feedback of where the audiences can actively contact journalists. It first of all increases audience activity leading to changing the way of constructing news content.

Rafaeli defines interactivity in terms of an expression of the extent that “any subsequent transmission is related to the degree to which previous exchanges refer to earlier exchanges” (1988: 111). In line with this definition, Rafaeli (1988: 118-119) categorises three levels of interactivity in communication as follows: (1) two-way (non-interactive) communication, (2) reactive (quasi-interactive) communication, and (3) fully interactive communication. Dijk’s approach (1999: 11) demonstrates a similar way to Rafaeli’s. He also divides interactivity into three levels. The first level is reactivity, which is the possibility of establishing multi-lateral communication. The second level is the degree of synchronicity. The third one is the extent of control exercised by the interactors.

From this observation, it can be inferred that the criterion of these categorisations lies on the extent of role exchange between the media and the audience. The stronger the activeness of the audience role, the higher the level of interactivity. Rafaeli (1988: 118-119) explains that the last two levels differ from the first in that role exchange is central to each subsequent message. Even if senders and receivers can mutually change information, it cannot be fully interactive without role exchange. In terms of role exchange, Steuer’s definition (1992: 84) more clearly shows the active aspect of full interactivity. According to Steuer, interactivity is the extent to which users can participate in modifying the form and content of a mediated environment in real time. Interactivity is the extent to which later messages recount the relatedness of earlier messages. At the phase of fully extracted interactivity, the audience can
reach their activeness to the degree of role exchange throughout the information.

According to interviews of newspaper journalists, audience activity is presented as instantaneous response. A senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001) stated that feedback from the audience on news reporting comes out immediately through the Internet. A music specialist (LJJ, interviewed 2001) described this immediateness as a 'real time' response. He accounted that the introduction of an e-mail address with by-line accelerates this immediate response. Besides immediateness, interactivity presents a much stronger response than a one way response in the off-line. A managing editor acknowledged:

Audience feedback through the Internet shows a clear stance of pros and cons. Along with distinctiveness of standpoint, audiences present their private views without hesitation. These phenomena could not have been expected in the offline newspaper. In a word, the audience response has been changed in terms of quantity and quality (PMH, interviewed 2001).

The survey result in this study also shows this aspect of instantaneous feedback (Table 5). 80.9% (n=106) of respondents reported that the increase of feedback speed is the most manifest change regarding the audience feedback due to the Internet. The second most important change was the increase of feedback volume (10.7%, n=14).

Due to the Internet, one senior arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) experienced a previously unavailable audience response, when he was involved in an intensive dispute with an audience who disagreed with his reporting. He also exchanges information with the audience. With the Internet, audiences require additional or more detailed information concerning reporting (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). Both generalists and specialists consented that these changes of audience attitude require a specialisation from
journalists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Feedback</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of Feedback</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on News</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

The necessity of specialism seems to be more various. Because of audience activeness, the relationship between journalists and audiences has changed. Most journalists alter their attitudes towards the audience in how they reply to audience responses. This aspect is also a newly emerged phenomenon. Some journalists considered they could identify precisely an audience’s thoughts on news reporting.

I reply to audience response by sitting up all night. This approach, on the other hand, brings me into a kind of catharsis by confessing my hard work to the audience. This interactivity gives me a joy of directly contacting with my audience who present their answers to my reporting. It must be more than workload (KOH, senior generalist interviewed 2001).

More importantly, this change implies a significant alteration of an arrogant attitude of journalists towards the audience. A senior generalist elaborated that:

Journalists have considered themselves prestigious people. We take a high-
handed attitude towards the audience. We were not concerned with the
interests of the audience in news reporting. Because of it, the interactive
response would be considered a daringly defiant action against journalists.
Interactivity demolishes this oppressive behaviour (JJH, interviewed 2001).

Audience activeness can create some tension between journalists and audiences.
Journalists are sometimes influenced by this audience activity in news
production. The audiences insist their demands for news. These demands
lead newspaper to recognise the possibility of specified new areas of news
(KYM, senior generalist interviewed 2001). With regard to developing new
areas of news, most executives suggested that journalists have to change their
standpoints from providers to spokes persons for the audience. They argued
that newspapers should perceive audiences’ interests (HHP, news executive
interviewed 2001; CHU, junior generalist interviewed 2001).

This active response from the audience sometimes seems to result in a
problem of critical journalism. Journalists become aware of audience
responses. A senior music specialist indicated that:

Let’s think about active audiences who are ready to dispute my reporting.
Even they have already known about the subject of the reporting. In this
circumstance, I have to provide another side of the subject that the audience
does not have. Unfortunately, this situation sometimes leads me to decorating
the appearance of the reports with rhetoric rather than developing quality of
news. I acknowledge it is a kind of cheating. But it is occasionally inevitable
due to lack of time, my capacity, or other reasons. This is certain to deteriorate
the critical approach of news (KIM, interviewed 2001).

This situation is sometimes linked with another problem: a compromise with
audience interests. Some journalists admitted that this is a flattering attitude
for commercial purposes (LDH, film specialist interviewed 2001). The worst
case of audience activity may be a hostile reaction against journalists, such as an e-mail bombing, and a considerable threat to critical journalism. They admitted that, in this case, they tone down a critical approach to news events (PKI, junior generalist interviewed 2001). These observations imply that specialism is essential for the purpose of a consistent critical approach.

However, other journalists disagreed with the impact of active audience response on newspaper journalism. They concluded that all the audience responses through the Internet do not always imply important information, so they ignore these responses (KYH, medical specialist interviewed 2001; KJB, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001). A managing editor (KYJ, interviewed 2001) argued that the increase of audience responses on the Internet is limited to a quantitative expansion. Since the audience is anonymous he does not take their responses seriously.

It might conclude that the change of audience feedback with journalists or news organisations does not always impact on journalists, but it cannot be ignored. Sometimes, hostile audience responses force journalists to de-emphasise a critical approach. However, audience activeness, especially of specialised audiences requires a specialist approach to news events. Most journalists interviewed argued that specialism is an essential newspaper response regarding the change of audience feedback.

To sum up, the technological impact of the Internet has influenced newspapers to a certain degree both in terms of business and news production. Journalists interviewed in this study viewed specialism as one possibility to deal with these Internet impacts. Even if specialism has a limitation to fully cope with Internet speed due to newspapers’ deadlines, it enables newspapers to take advantage of the Internet in newsgathering activities. Specialism is assumed to be efficient when dealing with changes in accessibility and audience feedback. However, it can be asserted that these aspects of specialism are
related to how specialism copes with the Internet. In this regard, journalists in this study paid attention to journalist-based newspaper competence.

3.2 Journalist-based Newspaper Competence

3.2.1 News Quality

The majority of journalists interviewed in this study saw that specialism is better for improving newspaper's existing competence than competing directly with the Internet's advantages. They believed that newspaper competence can develop strategic advantages of newspapers that the Internet avoids. Specialism is assumed as a weapon to attack the weakness of the Internet by improving the merits of the newspapers.

They admitted that the most manifest core competence of newspapers is the journalists. A news executive of the Issue desk described this aspect as follows: "the newspaper business is that of human resources, the journalists" (HHP, interviewed 2001). The implication of journalist resources is appreciated in terms of both of quantity and quality. One deputy managing editor stated that:

A comparative strength of my company? I would like to say there is one thing: journalists. We firstly have many more journalists compared with the other competitors. May be more than 15%. Secondly, I bet that our journalists are better than those of our competitors in terms of quality (JSH, interviewed 2001).

A news executive discussed an analysis conducted by his company that his company's competitive strategy should be based on 'more journalists' than competitors (HHP, interviewed 2001). This executive saw that the quality of
news reporting depends on the quality of journalists. Most executives maintained that the quality of journalists might, to some degree, be based on the quantity of journalists. According to them, the quality of individual journalists of most newspaper companies is nearly even since new entrants of national newspapers have nearly the same educational background, for instance graduating from several top class universities in Korea. A junior generalist also identified this competence as follows:

We have 50-60 more journalists than the other major competitors. This superiority in the number enables journalists to provide sufficient time to cover news events. This is the basic condition to produce quality news information (KCH, interviewed 2001).

He added that the abundant number of journalists enables the newspaper to provide journalists with re-training education without a shortage of reporters in news production. Such education improves journalist competitiveness in news production by specialising in their fields. A large number of journalists provides the chance to focus more intensively on certain events, and enables the development of a variety of information. A senior generalist also understood that the superiority in the number of journalists can be grounds for a competitive strategy: “more journalists can collect more news items that bring much wider diversity” (KOH, interviewed 2001). In this sense, a deputy managing editor of a major newspaper, explained why it is hard for the minor newspaper to take over the majors:

The most precious resource is journalists. The difference between the majors and the minors is how many journalists they can retain, and how to develop them. Simply, the minors cannot afford more journalists to produce quality information, which is the basic condition to compete with the majors (JSH, interviewed 2001).
As stated by a news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001), specialism is impossible without confidence in the quality of the journalist as well as the quantity of the journalists. So, newspaper competence is a journalist-based one. The majority of journalists interviewed pointed out that this journalist-based competence focuses on the quality of the news.

News quality generally indicates the level of overall excellence of a news story. It widely includes news reporting from the content to the rhetorical style. The properties of news quality are, in this sense, represented by such adjectives as 'good', 'interesting', 'enjoyable', 'important', 'coherent', 'clear', 'concise', and 'well-written' (Gibson and Zillman, 1993: 793-800; Sunder, 1999: 381). The features of 'important', 'interesting', and 'enjoyable' refer to the worth of news as information, that is, the 'utility' of news. On the other hand, the aspects of 'coherent', 'clear', and 'concise' are related to bringing together pertinent aspects of news. News provides the relevance in order to be 'coherent', 'clear', and 'concise'. News should also possess an 'integrity'. To sum up, news quality is summarised in the 'information utility' and 'integrity' of news. Most journalists interviewed assumed that specialism can develop these features.

Information utility is possibly related to changes in society, which links to changes in audience demand for news. Some journalists argued that change in social diversity and specialised audiences are the grounds for quality news demands. Social diversity in Korea has several specific features, which are related with the democratisation of Korean society brought by the transition of political power from the military regime to the civil government in the late 1980s. One managing editor observed that:

Under the authoritative military regime, people used to focus on news of the political democratisation. At the same time, the economic predicament led people to depend on economic news. However, these elements have been replaced with diverse demands, especially demands for culture, everyday life,
and sport, after the introduction of the democratic civil government (KYJ, interviewed 2001).

A senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) indicated an increase in the number of jobs, generally in Korean expanding from 10,000 to 30,000 – 40,000 over about 2 decades. This variety in society creates ‘specialised audiences’ who ask for more focused information. Many journalists identified this phenomenon as a more compelling reason for upgrading news quality. An IT specialist (KTH, interviewed 2001) testified that specialised audiences can obtain much more specialised information than journalists. This situation leads to a possibility that news reporting may provide lower level quality of news than audiences expect.

It can be argued that information utility requires a strict accuracy of news information. A concern of specialised audiences on accuracy is also related to the new complexity of society, which sometimes brings journalists to cover unprecedented news events where accuracy cannot always be guaranteed (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). One arts specialist expressed concern:

Art reporting is susceptible to present incorrect information if journalists did not have specialised knowledge of art. Confusion of the genre, misjudging an Oriental painting for Western art, or miscalculating a year of production is an example. Since audiences of art news are mostly specialised, they can easily find out these inaccuracies in reporting (LY, interviewed 2001).

He insisted that accuracy is one of the most important reasons for needing specialism, particularly from a specialised audience. This concern of accuracy in news reporting is also identified in the survey of this study (Table 6). The respondents pointed out the medical field (14.8%, n=39) as the most needed area for specialism. The environment (8.3%, n=22) and science areas (6.1%,
n=16) were also considered to need specialism. The journalists interviewed proposed that specialists of these subjects should be recruited from experts outside of news organisations. In the survey of this study (Table 7), the medical field was also found as the most required subject needing expert (20.8%, n=55).

<Table 6> Fields of Specialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence and Military Affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop Culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Missing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
- Multiple responses.
In the focus group discussion (FJAK, focus group discussion 2001), discussants considered that scientific subjects are difficult for general reporters to establish accuracy, thereby showing the need for specialism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;Table 7&gt; Specialism Fields of Expert Recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence and Military Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
- Multiple responses.

Most journalists in Korea have studied social science rather than science subjects (Table 8). More than half of the respondents (57.3%, n=75) studied a social science as their first degree at university, second was humanities (22.9%, n=30), and third was languages (16.0%, n=21). A significantly small number of journalists (3.8%, n=5) studied science. It is true that journalists do not cover news events in accordance with their degree subjects. However, science-related subject coverage seems to be a different matter. The majority of the journalists interviewed held that journalists without a specific knowledge of science are not considered competent enough to deal with science-related
subjects, unlike with other subjects.

<Table 8> Journalists' First Degree at University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

Specialised audience demands may involve more than the accuracy of the specialised information. They also want more comprehensive or integrated news analysis. According to a senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001), audiences are asking for more detailed information. For this, journalists should evaluate news with a grasp of background story, historical development, or relevance to similar issues.

A senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) argued that even if audiences want more specialised news for the sake of their fragmented interests, they simultaneously have difficulty in understanding the whole context of news. Audiences are also eager to seek a new and different perspective concerning the issue. According to an arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001), some audiences suggest having a discussion on news stories. He held that, for this occasion, journalists should be able to insist on their own perspectives to satisfy specialised audiences. Journalists should be able to integrate relevant problems surrounding his/her news reporting along with specialised knowledge. An environmental specialist said that:

Specialists have to correlate all the relevant elements with each other. Based
on this permeation through the issue, they can show an entire map of news events. For instance, scientists cannot tell the whole significance of human cloning in line with society. Journalists should do this (JHS, interviewed 2001).

The other issue of quality news is the integrity of news. Interestingly, most journalists interviewed in this study were highly confident of this aspect. They proposed 'value judgement', 'agenda-setting', and 'wholeness' as merits of newspaper news against the other media. They exemplified several types of news reporting in these categories such as in-depth reporting, analysis, or commentary. The majority of journalists interviewed maintained that that the Internet generally lacks these qualities in its information. As observed above, this observation is related to the low credibility of Internet information (Garrison, 2000b; Middleberg and Ross, 2000). Many journalists acknowledged that, for newspapers, the quality of news in terms of integrity can be the most important strength to compete with the Internet.

To sum up, for the purpose of news quality, newspapers should provide two virtues of news: information utility and integrity. Of the two, journalists assume that information utility seems to be acquired by the accuracy of specialists with specialised knowledge. The integrity of news quality can be obtained by developing the existing characteristics of newspaper journalism, that is the journalist-oriented competence or serious minded professional. Those journalists interviewed indicated that specialism can develop journalist-based newspaper competence as a solution of the problems. According to them, specialism can, on the one hand, develop information utility of news, and on the other hand, fortify integrity by improving a newspaper's inherent competence such as 'value judgement', 'agenda-setting', and 'wholeness' as the elements of merit of newspaper news. Next, this study examines more concretely how specialism plays an important role of creating quality in news.
3.2.2 Critical Approach

The journalists interviewed argued that the journalist-based competence of newspapers regarding news quality is a basis of a critical approach. This competence is evident when compared with the deficits of the Internet in this light. Some journalists interviewed accounted that the characteristics of information utility and integrity of news are closely related to the characteristics of a critical approach of a newspaper. A managing editor maintained that a critical approach is a starting point of quality news, composed by serious minded journalists' value judgement (CHU, interviewed 2001).

Firstly, the critical approach should start from information utility of news. The value judgement of the newspaper is identified as an advantage of a newspaper when journalists deal with an explosion of information in the Internet.

Newspapers prefer judging a value on information to simply displaying it as it is found. To exercise value judgement aims at selecting news. The Internet has a limitation on issuing a certain event as news, impacting on policy making, and leading opinion. Those who participate in the Internet are irresponsible due to anonymity. What they do is to deliver all of the information as it occurs (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001).

A film specialist (LDH, interviewed 2001) described value judgement as filtering information to separate essential news from miscellaneous information. In the same sense, some journalists posit that value judgement relates to utilising information. Information itself is certainly not news. Newsworthiness should be added in order for it to become news. Judging the value of news from information provides useful knowledge for the public by categorising its importance. Before weighing its importance, information can even be harmful to the public. A medical specialist observed that:
The Internet produces a great deal of medical information. [...] However, it is very difficult for ordinary people to classify the importance of medical information. Most medical information on the Internet is created by private doctors who have an intention to develop the Internet as a means of their advertising. Newspapers, in this sense, can exert credibility and responsibility by classifying the importance of the information (KC, interviewed 2001).

Therefore, newspapers can play the role of information guide, adapting information to news. Newspapers can be regarded as quality controllers in the Internet environment.

Secondly, the critical approach based on the value judgements of journalist is also related to the integrity of news. To exercise a value judgement is a step towards providing newsworthiness for raw information. Value judgement, thus, enables the audience to focus on a certain issue (JHS, environmental specialist interviewed 2001). By contrast, the information abundance of the Internet induces chaos in the value of news events. This seems to have an important meaning particularly in the Internet environment. Bardoel (1996: 284) maintains that the reporter has been reduced to a mere purveyor of facts as new media enters the media market. According to him, "more recently, the advent of new, interactive communication services, such as Internet, 'free nets' and 'digital cities' has given rise to expectations that in the future journalistic intervention in political communication will no longer be necessary" (1996: 284). Katz (1992: 13), also, contends that the combination of information management, instant news, and empty analysis threaten the future of critical journalism.

However, there is also a possibility that sometimes the value judgements of journalists can mislead the audience, if they have intentions other than serving audience interests. Critical journalism led by value judgement should be based on a serious-minded interpretation on the world. Normally critical
journalism is considered to be carried out by 'serious journalism', 'professionally valued hard news', 'investigative journalism', 'public debate', 'orientating journalism', 'problem frame', and be 'rational and considered' (Bardoel, 1996; Altheide, 1997; Aldridge, 1998; Bird, 1998; Newton, 1999; Liebes, 2000). On the other hand, the opposite of critical journalism is described as 'sensational journalism', 'individualisation', 'segmentation', 'instrumental journalism', 'softening of hard news', 'disconnected', 'personal narratives' (Donohue et al., 1995; Connell, 1998). For instance, a serious and in-depth treatment of the news can inform and mobilise, whereas a superficial and sensational treatment may induce alienation of the public from the world (Newton, 1999: 581). Anti-critical journalism is to some degree inclined to commercial profits. Or it tends to stand by a specific interest. This is why critical journalism should be the basis of serious minded journalists.

Several generalists considered that serious minded journalists are rather critics who usually produce highly value judgement-laden news reporting, for instance, analysis or commentary (Katz, 1992: 13). In the chaos of information flood, people look for a clear direction, which can lead them to understanding their surrounding reality. That is why bewildered people rely on newspapers rather than the Internet (PKI, junior generalist interviewed 2001).

Some journalists suggested that the site of 'Ohmynews.com' in Korea is one of the most prominent examples of the Internet news problems. This Internet news site retains more than 10,000 amateur, mostly freelance reporters nation-wide. With this amount of reporters, this news site produces an incessant and unprecedented volume and variety of information, with contents very different from the conventional media in terms of types and details (LDH, film specialist interviewed 2001). A senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001), however, rebuked that the news of this site cannot be serious because of an absence of serious minded value judgements. He argued that this news site does not seem to have an editorial function. Even if there are one or two
permanent editors, their role seems to be limited to correcting grammatical errors in sentences.

Along with a massive volume of information, the speed of Internet information also has weaknesses. A deputy managing editor observed that:

The Internet desperately resorts to speed. [...] By depending on speed, the Internet fails to delve patiently into an issue. Principles of the world cannot be found in the speed of information delivery. Speed prohibits evaluating the penetrative worth of reality because of lack of time (JSH, interviewed 2001).

That is, the integrity of news is related to newsworthiness. Discussants in the focus group discussion deliberated about the possibility of Internet news integrity (FJAK, focus group discussion 2001). Some of them argued that editorial control can transform several predicaments of Internet news, while others saw it highly impossible since Internet news is simply destined to focus on volume and speed. To sum up, the Internet fails to answer the question of 'where is the information that I want?' and 'how I can trust in its authenticity?' In this sense, they concluded that the serious minded value judgements of journalists are certainly a potential competence of newspapers to cope with the Internet challenges.

3.2.3 Credibility

With regard to news quality, the other merit of journalist-based newspaper competence seems to be the credibility of news. Without credibility of newspaper news, the critical approach cannot be accepted as worthy by the audience. One of the most peculiar aspects of newspaper credibility may be an agenda-setting function. A news executive argued that:

The strongest weapon of newspapers is to declare what is news and what is not
news. Newspapers publish news at most two or three times a day, while the Internet produces news incessantly. However, the two or three deadlines to deliver a verdict of news enable newspapers to clear a jumble of news explosion. The pattern of the audience’s news consumption is accustomed to the regularity of this update period a day. Given that news is not normally to be updated more than three times a day by newspaper deadline practices, the ceaseless updating of the Internet might be effortless (HHP, interviewed 2001).

This implies that, with an established credibility, newspapers still dominate an agenda-setting role. A senior generalist also insisted on the newspaper superiority in agenda setting:

Shaping public opinion by setting agendas has been a traditional role of newspapers throughout the media history of Korea. Audiences still assume that this function is done by newspapers. Newspapers retain an authority such as a decisive power, which the other media cannot challenge. This authority can explain why the majority of applicants to journalism want to be newspaper journalists rather than journalists in the other media (KYM, senior generalist 2000).

The credibility of newspapers has been built up over a long period. A senior generalist observed that “although television has taken a bigger portion of media consumption than newspapers, its share of the journalism field is certain to be smaller than that of newspapers” (KDH, 111: 10409). According to him, newspapers are synonymous with journalism.

The credibility of news may be influenced by various factors. Schweiger (2000: 39-41) suggests different levels of reference objects for credibility attributions such as: presenter (presenter, anchor, commentator, etc.); source/actor (politician, etc.); editorial units (programme, articles, etc.); media product (NBC, Wall Street Journal, Time, etc.); subsystem of media type (public
TV system, tabloids, etc.); and media type (TV, newspaper, web, etc.). This indicates that news credibility is a synthesis of all the elements related to news production. News credibility is a product of complex interactions among all systems surrounding the media, and an integrity that is synthesised by all related aspects of the media. Many journalists interviewed assume that newspapers have accumulated this integrity throughout its history whereas the Internet is too young to establish its credibility.

The issue of credibility is critical for news media in terms of both journalism and news business. Gaziano elaborates that decreased public trust for news can lead to diminished freedom of the press and consequently can threaten the economic health of the media (1988: 267). Flanagin and Metzger find that audiences consider Internet information is not as credible as newspaper information (2000: 515-540). According to them, the most prevalent dimensions of media credibility are believability, accuracy, trustworthiness, non-bias, and completeness of information (2000: 521). Without these qualities, information cannot argue its usefulness as information. Based on their research, they find that newspapers are recognised to be more credible than all other media including the Internet across the types of information considered.

The authoritative credibility of newspapers is probably linked with responsibilities of newspapers. A newspaper's gate-keeping role is one of the most salient aspects of its responsibilities compared with the Internet. A senior generalist saw these responsibilities as originating from the professional journalists as follows:

A newspaper is made up of a group of qualified professional journalists whereas Internet news can be produced by the mass. They are literally a mass who do not normally feel a responsibility for their information. The mass are not likely to feel responsibility of what information is, and how to deal with information. This situation restricts the Internet to a conduit of raw information. It does not develop the Internet towards a news media (KOH,
Some journalists proposed that the most manifest example of the gate-keeping role of newspapers may be the editorial function. The credibility gap between newspapers and the Internet is due to the latter's inability to verify the value of information. Flanagin and Metzger also confirm that "whereas newspapers, books, magazines, and television all undergo certain levels of factual verification, analysis of content, and editorial review, by and large Internet information is subject to no such scrutiny" (2000: 516). This indicates that the absence of editorial function may be an intrinsic defect of the Internet. According to them, the Internet firstly depends on information freedom, which seems to introduce an increased potential for error or exploitation. This freedom, based on the free access to the Internet, results in shifting the responsibility of editorial function to the audience. Secondly, speed is also pointed out to compound the problem because information changes too quickly. Ironically, access and speed are assumed as the most salient elements of the Internet as investigated earlier. The irresponsibility of the Internet caused by the deficiency of editorial function is, in this way, linked with the weakening of credible journalism as found by the journalist interviews in this study. This irresponsibility might limit an investigation of problematic issues on the Internet.

The Internet seems to reveal all the information without verifying the authenticity of information. The credibility of the Internet is deteriorated because of it. Consequently the quality of Internet information cannot be assured. As far as I am concerned, the Internet is far from verifying information and setting some agenda. These roles can be done only by newspapers (JHS, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001).

As Katz (1992: 13) mentioned above, an 'empty analysis' is one of the most
crucial issues of critical journalism. The responsible approach of newspaper journalism focuses on 'analysis'. The majority of journalists interviewed argued that a newspaper's responsible approach is identified in its discernible types of news reporting such as 'commentary' or 'in-depth reporting'. The commentary is also made on the value judgements of serious-minded professional journalists (JSH, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001). Based on value judgements, commentary firstly pertains to interpretation and analysis of news events. Secondly it develops this interpretation into its own way of understanding news events. This understanding sometimes advances towards an advocacy for a specific party or a declaration concerning news events. However, as held by a music specialist (KIM, interviewed 2001), commentary is essentially related to an audience's credibility of news. He emphasised that when a newspaper provides a commentary that leads the audience to consenting with it, the newspaper can easily acquire credibility from the audience. Consent on commentary cannot be established without audience credibility.

Along with commentary, in-depth reporting can also provide credibility of newspaper news. Some journalists argued that the process of sifting news from raw information enables newspapers to develop in-depth reporting. One managing editor explained that “screening the confusion of information flood provides a chance to focus on particular issues that are assumed to contain importance” (PMH, interviewed 2001). He again argued that sorting out importance refers to focalising or emphasising on points of news rather than simply selecting facts of news. A deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) also identified sorting out importance as excavating an issue with enough time to reveal the truth. These observations indicate that the credibility of news relates to paying specific attention to a certain issue with in-depth reporting which is different from the usual approach.
In-depth reporting is certainly related to news quality in that it creates the integrity of news. With in-depth reporting, newspapers can unravel the complication of social realities. An environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001) contended that in-depth reporting means exploring how intermingled situations are related to certain news subjects. This may be another merit of newspapers. As mentioned by him, to unravel complicated aspects of the world leads the audience to understanding the whole relationship in which the issue involves the world. This wholeness of news implies the integrity of news, in other words, seeing the social realities through a comprehensive perspective. A music specialist pointed out:

The Internet reveals information in a horizontal structure that displays it in a row. It is a list of information. On the contrary, the way of newspaper news presenting depends on a vertical structure, telling the mountain, river, valley, islands, and the other positions of news (KIM, interviewed 2001).

By categorising news and investigating all aspects of reality, newspaper journalism can discover a clear and concrete figure of news events. Most journalists presupposed that in-depth reporting may be the manifest strength of newspapers. Depending on the in-depth reporting of newspapers, one deputy managing editor (CSH, interviewed 2001) showed confidence in competing with the information flood.

Other journalists described that the main news area of newspapers is also related to a responsible newspaper approach. Normally newspapers emphasise hard news rather than soft news. The Internet largely depends on soft news such as entertainment information (KOH, interviewed 2001). Those journalists related the Internet's dependence on entertainment information to its sensational attitude. A managing editor pointed out that "the Internet emphasises non-essentials deviated from the main issues of society by dealing
with a sensational news events or treating them in a sensational manner" (KYJ, interviewed 2001). On the other hand, with commentary or in-depth reporting on the issue of hard news, newspapers exercise a responsibility to record a history of the day. Most newspaper journalists indicated that the print on the paper enables newspaper to record history and leave physical evidences. The characteristics of recording history is another aspect of newspaper responsibility (KJB, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001; KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001). However, Internet information is easily discarded by irresponsible webmasters so that there is no room to verify that information.

Newspapers deliver message with printed writings, while broadcasting depends on moving images. The Internet also focuses on its hypertext function, which leads the audience to dispersing concentration on information. In a word, the technological characteristics of newspapers essentially draw audiences' concentration on information (LY, arts specialist interviewed 2001).

This ease of concentrating on newspaper news also requires newspapers to take a responsible attitude towards news production. Some journalists argued that because of this concentration, audiences can easily find out the defects of newspaper reporting. By contrast, a producer's anonymity on the Internet can cause irresponsible information.

Credibility is the core competence of newspapers when coping with the Internet. As found by Schweiger (2000), newspapers have superiority of credibility compared with the Internet. According to his study, newspapers were rated ahead of the web or television on nine out of 11 categories such as: clear, serious, thoroughly researched, detailed, critical, credible, balanced, competent, professional. This finding also supports the assumption in this study that newspaper competence is based on newspapers' characteristics related to credibility.
These approaches to newspaper competence can be identified in the survey research regarding newspapers' core competence (Table 9). Journalists selected four aspects as core competence of newspapers: responsibility (20.1%, n=79), in-depth reporting (19.6%, n=77), agenda-setting role (18.0%, n=71), and commentary (17.3%, n=68). By contrast, they hardly chose information variety, speed, and new areas as newspaper competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspapers' Core Competence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Variety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda-setting</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth Reporting</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recordability</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Journalism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Arrangement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
- Multiple responses.

The analysis on the core competence of newspapers indicates that newspapers can develop a competitive strategy based on serious minded professional journalist resources. Most journalists interviewed held that the advantages of newspaper journalism of credibility, responsibility, or critical journalism are possibly achieved by this serious minded journalist-based resource. The majority of journalists in the focus group discussion (FUMH, focus group discussion 2001), however, demonstrated that the present generalist-oriented
practices of news production cannot successfully achieve these qualities, since generalist practices cannot provide suitable environments for developing the newspaper’s intrinsic worth. They concluded that specialism could be an alternative to develop newspaper competence.

A senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001) grasped that generalists who are destined to circle various desks cannot cope with this situation, since they cannot easily accumulate knowledge about a specific subject. Besides the Internet impacts, sources of news items or issues have been gradually expanding from official organisations to everyday life due to a trend of social diversity. Journalists have to adapt to such new information. A managing editor (PMH, interviewed 2001) described that journalists are no longer a ‘walking encyclopaedia’: “the days of the versatile journalist have been ended due to the Internet”. Consequently they cannot understand some arguments of newly emerged areas if they do not have specialised knowledge about the issue. Those journalists interviewed maintained the need to specialise in certain subjects and separate from the generalist approach. They saw specialism as a way of separating responsibility in order to cover news events more efficiently, as pointed out by Negrine (1996: 79-80).

Summary

The specialist journalism in Korean journalism is regarded as a way of solving problems of the production environment changes caused by the Internet. Newspapers intend to focus on the quality of news rather than the quantity of information to compete with the Internet. Internet information is characterised of the speed by information production and transaction, accessibility, and audience feedback. These features impact on the news content of newspapers as well as newsgathering practices. On the one hand, the speed and volume of information transaction on the Internet influence
audiences' news consumption attitudes. On the other hand, Internet accessibility has affected the traditional newsgathering methods. It has made journalists develop new ways of approaching news along with an increasing dependence on the Internet. Furthermore, audience activity based on the interactivity of the Internet has led newspaper journalists to be more concerned than ever about audience demands for news contents.

The newspaper journalists interviewed, however, concluded that newspapers can cope with these challenges by focusing on the journalist-based core competence of newspapers. Specialism was proposed as the most efficient way of improving this competence. As regards news quality, they assumed that specialism can provide both information utility and integrity of news. More importantly, they argued that the quality of newspaper news relates to a critical approach and credibility. Specialism based on specialised knowledge provides advantages in these issues.
Summary & Conclusion

SPECIALISM as STRATEGY

These observations of Chapter 2 and 3 indicate that Korean specialism is a strategic choice to solve the problems news organisations face. These problems come from both inside and outside the news organisations. The needs for personnel management to resolve job insecurity and environmental challenges especially from the Internet have led news organisations to introduce specialism. The survey in this study summarised the need for specialism in Korean journalism as can be seen in Table 10. The most frequently responded need related to news quality improvement (22.5%, n=59). The second was to meet the specialised demands of audiences (21.8%, n=57), the third to use experienced journalists (16.8%, n=44), the fourth to develop new readers (14.9%, n=39), then, personnel management (12.2%, n=32), and finally career prospects (31%, n=11.8%). Specialism can serve many varied needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs for Specialism</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing New Readers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Specialised Demands</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Experienced Journalists</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Prospects</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
- Multiple responses.

An important point is, however, that the main reasons for specialism in
Korean newspapers are related to resolving present problems: news contents, audiences, senior reporters, new markets, and personnel management. The introduction of specialism is certain to relate to the strategic choice of news organisations as a means of problem-solving.

From these examinations, this study seems to verify the first research hypothesis that 'Specialism is adopted for personnel management and newsgathering efficiency'. On the one hand, this study clearly supports the presupposition of specialism as a way of 'personnel management'. This study found another demand for specialism as an alternative to the generalist-oriented career path. On the other hand, it is also likely to confirm the other point of the hypothesis of 'newsgathering efficiency'. The journalists interviewed concluded that specialism is a way of developing newspaper competence. Specialism was seen as a competitive means of coping with Internet challenges. It increases the efficiency of newsgathering activities based on specialised knowledge.

Another important finding of this study may be the fact that this need for specialism relates to problem-solving. This feature appears to be different compared with British specialism. Generally speaking, a specialist in British journalism covers his/her specialised subject. However, Tunstall (1971: 74) says that it is certainly difficult to exactly define specialism whereas Korean specialism is understood more clearly. According to him, British specialism dates back to an earlier period of the British press. 18th century English newspapers carried material from 'foreign correspondents'—people who wrote letters to the publication in question. By contrast, the Korean specialism is more recent and is being constructed artificially in an effort to resolve several urgent contemporary problems.

Although the Korean specialism is aiming at reducing problems of personnel management, there is a common purpose of both Korean and British specialism such as an efficiency of news production. British specialism focuses
upon this through ensuring "a regular supply of material" of specific areas (Negrine 1994: 125). Korean specialism intends to develop news quality in an effort to compete with the Internet based on newspaper competence. That is, both Korean and British specialism focus on the news contents.

To sum up, British specialism mainly aims to develop the contents of news reporting, while Korean specialism focuses on points besides it. Firstly, it is introduced in an effort of resolving journalist's job insecurity. Secondly, it pays attention to how to deal with change of production environments by the Internet. Unlike British specialism that has developed and evolved over a relatively long-term period, Korean specialism is about to set out with the manifest purposes of problem-solving. Specialism in Korean newspapers is a strategic choice for problem-solving.

For this, it seems to require suitable action plans and systems, for instance an authorised, objective, and institutionalised system for managing specialism. Journalists' distrust of news organisations leads them to ask for objective regulatory institutions for specialism in particular. This aspect of Korean specialism seems to be linked to the formality of management of specialists. More importantly, specialism, to a certain degree, involves heterogeneous aspects that can be in discord with the existing practices of news organisations. This heterogeneity could sometimes generate confrontation between specialism and established practices. This feature of Korean specialism will be explored in the next part.
Part III. NEWS ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

In the last part, this study found that Korean newspapers are adopting specialism as a means of resolving problems of journalists’ job security. It also discovered journalists’ belief that the journalist-oriented core competence of newspapers could be an advantage in competing with the Internet. So, specialism is a problem-solving measure in Korean journalism. Following on from this conclusion, this part will examine how news organisations develop the specialist system or how it is adapted to the existing news organisational culture.

Chapter 4 aims to observe the specialist’s status within a news organisation from the view of personnel management. Chapter 5 will examine the routines of news organisational culture in relation to specialism, focusing on aspects of news organisational culture in terms of the news production process such as newsgathering routines. From these perspectives, this study raises the second research question “What does specialism have to do with the news organisational culture?” Based on this question, it also posits the second hypothesis that “Specialism is restricted by news organisation routines”.
Chapter 4
JOURNALISTS' STATUS

Specialists normally have a different status within the newsroom compared with their generalist colleagues, since news organisations expect them to achieve different goals from those of generalists. The goals themselves may be influenced by status as mentioned by Tunstall (1971). A specialist's status refers to what conditions he/she works under as a specialist. Tunstall (1971: 139) suggests six indicators of a specialist's status: salary, volume and prominence of coverage, by-lines, titles, travel and expenses, and timing of deadlines. These indicators relate to how news organisations treat and organise specialists in the light of personnel management policies and the approach to newsgathering activities. This Chapter focuses on three aspects of personnel policies to define a specialist's status as designation path, reward management, and movement. The other indicators of a specialist's status concerning news production process will be examined in the later Chapter, in relation to journalist routines and news selection.

4.1 Designation

4.1.1 Internal Recruitment

Designation is the process of selecting a specialist for a particular field. A specialist can be designated through various paths, and conditions of designation might differ accordingly. Broadly speaking, there are two types of designation routes: either informal, or institutional. An example of an informal way of designation can be found in British journalism. Tunstall (1971: 76) and Negrine (1996: 84) observe that the designation of specialist journalists is dominated by the management's sole decision rather than a
systematic designation procedure. Tunstall states that:

The specialist is given his specialist platform by a stroke of the Editor's pen. And what the Editor can thus give, he can also take away. The Editor can also take it away. The specialist, then, lacks the kind of recognised or 'rational basis for his specialisation which is possessed by the professional who studies for an examination qualification and is backed by the supports of an established profession such as law or medicine (1971:116).

This indicates that specialist designation is heavily dependent on the Editor's individual decision. Tunstall holds that, by designating a specialist journalist, journalists become at least instant specialists. That is, executives, especially the Editor, impact on the designation of specialists in an arbitrary way. However, it seems that there are no clear criteria for the Editor's decision. Negrine acknowledges that “it is unclear, for example, why the fortunes of areas of interest change, how the responsibility for covering any particular event is distributed to different specialists either within a single newspaper or across newspapers” (1996: 84). According to him, all the relevant decisions on specialism are in the main made by executives. Specialists' career futures and their remaining in their specialist areas also depend on news executives' consent. It suggests that, in British specialism, there are no concrete structures, official guidance, or recognised regulations in designating specialist areas and in allocating specialists. By contrast, Korean specialism depends highly on a formalised designation.

In relation to this, the important point is the recruitment route. Specialists in Korean journalism can be recruited from two different sources: experienced journalists within news organisations and experts from outside news organisations. Designation also differs according to these routes. Firstly, when specialists are recruited from inside a news organisation, then a problem is how to select them from generalist candidates. Secondly, in the
case of expert-rooted specialists, recruiting criteria are relevant. News organisations, in this case, have to prepare a policy to fix and secure their status within news organisations, since they can be recruited under different conditions from the generalists.

Of the two routes, most generalists and executives interviewed in this study supported the way in which news organisations designate experienced senior journalists as specialists from inside a news organisation. When news organisations designate specialists out of generalists, a critical issue is designation should be based on trust between members of news organisations (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). Impartiality is, therefore, the central problem in designation.

Impartiality appears to be based on preparing an objective institution of designation. The Hangyurae Daily is focusing upon contriving a new designating system. This newspaper has spent two years studying how to manage the selection committee. This newspaper composed a special task force committee. According to the managing editor of this newspaper, the outcome is as follows:

A committee for selecting specialists is in charge of the whole process of designating specialists with full powers. This committee is composed of the editor, deputy managing editor, and sub-managing editors. A journalist with more than 10 year experience can apply as a specialist, while one with less than 8 years’ experience journalist has to spend 3 years as a pre-specialist (KYJ, 312: 30404).

The Joongang Ilbo, which was the first newspaper to introduce a specialist system in Korean journalism, sets criteria and regulations for designating specialists. According to an executive director of this paper (Kum, 1994), firstly the news organisation publicises a notice of schedule, qualifications, and other guidelines for designating specialists for members of the newsroom. For
instance, this news organisation states a guideline of more than 10-year experience as a journalist. It also proposes several conditions such as long-term experience of hard news coverage, specialised knowledge on a specific subject, writing skills, a journalistic mind, balanced viewpoint, and robust ideology. When journalists consider themselves suitable, they can apply as specialists with the recommendation of their desk news executive and the editor. After thorough scrutiny of application materials and interviews, a special designation committee, comprising of company executives, finally decides whether they are designated as specialists.

Most newspapers in Korea have their own guidelines, and these are mostly similar to that of the Joongang Ilbo (Mediaonul, 24th August 2000). Despite differences of details, all of them have introduced a special committee for designating specialists. By organising a special committee, news organisations establish a legitimacy of designating specialists (Hankyurae Daily, internal document 2001). They can apply objective criteria for designation. One of the most critical criteria is the length of experience. Many journalists interviewed needed at least 10 years’ experience to be designated as a specialist. It is also assumed that applicants should have spent more than 3 years on a particular subject. One newspaper insisted that a specialist job requires more than 5 years’ experience in a specific subject (Kyunghyang Daily, internal document 2001). Such experience is one of the prominent conditions for specialists when they are to be recruited from senior journalists. A deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) pointed out that the length of experience may be more important than other conditions, for instance speciality. He explained that “speciality is essentially related to a journalist’s experience”. Accordingly, specialists recruited from generalists are mostly senior reporters. Younger reporters are relatively disadvantaged even if they are specialists in certain subjects. In the end, there is a high possibility of conflict between reporters when news organisations recruit specialists from generalists. This is
why Korean journalists demand an objective and institutional system of designation.

The fact that the Korean specialism is based on such an institutionalised designation system is also linked to lack of confidence in news organisations. Through the history of Korean Journalism (JAK, 25th September 2000), journalists have had little or no confidence in the continuity of a news organisation's policy. As examined in Chapter 2, Korean journalists' demand for an alternative to their future careers other than the management ladder seems to be connected discontent with the news organisation's way of managing journalists. This feature affects the specialist system, even if the system is regarded as a solution to this problem. Without trust in a news organisation's management, specialism cannot properly work. A senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001) was highly pessimistic regarding specialism in practice. He stated that "I am not confident in company's real intention to introduce specialism". His doubt originated from past experience. One time, his company encouraged reporters to take university courses to get specialised knowledge. For this purpose, his company promised a partial exemption of routine duty such as night desk work to allow for studying. However, this exemption was exploited as a ground for promotion disadvantage. Even worse, some journalists who studied abroad with a one-year temporary suspension of service were listed as the first redundancy group in the economic recession in the late 1990s. Specialism is unlikely to be advantageous, while journalists are discontented with a news organisation's management policies.

Discussants of the focus group pointed out:

Most reporters understand the necessity and urgency of specialism at least in theory. However, it is a different story in practice. A company's policy should be supported with specific action scenarios. For instance, a news organisation has to propose a deliberate and specified relationship between specialists and generalists for the sake of the interests of both of them (FUMH,
Specialists need a system appropriate to them, and a news organisation has to provide confidence in its system. However, such confidence in organisational policy cannot be acquired in a short time. An arts specialist pointed out that “there is no common understanding of what specialism is” (LY, interviewed 2001). Even if specialism is regarded as an alternative to generalist system, most journalists interviewed in this study had no idea about what a news organisation expects exactly from specialists, and how a news organisation should deal with specialism. Rather, it needs a culture of specialism as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions” between members of news organisations (Schein, 1992: 12). Specialism in Korean journalism requires a routinisation of the specialist system. Without routinisation or at least concrete plans, it is unlikely to be established in practice, or it could be established but not work well.

The distrust for news organisations leads journalists in Korea to ask for a regulation of specialism not by the editors but by means of an institutionalised system. To sum up, a specialist designation needs to be approached in terms of resolving distrust for news organisations.

The lack of confidence in news organisation policy is initially related to the lack of organisational culture of specialism. The absence of a specialist culture is likely to be a result of the lack a confidence-inspiring system. A junior generalist described how deeply pessimistic journalists are about news organisation policies.

Even if the majority of journalists want to be specialists in the survey, the number of applicants is too small in reality. It is because journalists cannot have faith in a news organisation’s plan for introducing specialism when taking into account the past. If a news organisation changes or abolishes the system after designating specialists, it significantly harms specialists. Journalists
think that news organisations would never make up for this loss as usual. In this situation, the president, the owner of the company, designates his best friend as specialist to reconfirm his pledge to specialism (CUS, interviewed 2001).

If the organisational promise of specialism is broken, journalists believe this could seriously harm journalists. They considered that it could be directly linked to job insecurity (JJH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). If generalists fail to adapt into specialism system for whatever reason, they in fact have no way of returning to a generalist status, since their junior colleagues might already have taken their positions as executives.

One of the most important reasons of this distrust may be a lack of system for specialism. A manifest instance is the Munhwa Daily. The former music specialist for this paper stated that:

The Munhwa Daily was established in 1991 claiming to differentiate itself from the others by specialising in cultural pages in particular. It hired several specialists from music, literature, art, media, and other cultural subjects under the conditions that it provided a necessary system and benefits for specialists. However, this paper has not prepared any relevant institutions for them for nearly 10 years. It applied to specialists the same practices of generalists such as personnel policies, beat system, and involvement of news events. Most specialists left since they could not believe in its promises (KIM, interviewed 2001).

The case of the Munhwa Daily presents a significant worry for journalists of the other papers (N &B, July 1999). Most journalists interviewed in this study learned from this case that specialism cannot succeed without a system of supporting. Although some executives consider it important to provide journalists with the chance of becoming specialists, journalists are unlikely to
apply to be specialists unless proper systems for specialism exist. More importantly, there is another reason for journalists' doubt about specialism: distrust in news organisations' pledge of a specialism policy. A junior generalist pointed out that:

If a news organisation promises to establish a specialist system with clear statements and institutions, I will go for it in principle. However, I cannot trust 100% a news organisation's pledge. From the history, no one believes in the consistency of this system. If a news organisation changes its mind after designating specialists, they have to suffer disadvantages compared with their colleagues (KCH, interviewed 2001).

This interviewee is a reporter of the Joongang Ilbo, which is the first paper to introduce the specialist system. He was not confident about his news organisation's promises, adding that a news organisation can change anything at any time. Distrust for news organisations is related to an inconsistency of policy.

This aspect can be identified in an evaluation of journalist performances in particular (JAK, 6th June 2002). The first problem is the method of evaluation. Korean journalists tend to regard an evaluation of journalist performances as impossible, based on an assumption that a journalist's work cannot be statistically measured. Normally news organisations evaluate news on the front page or the home news pages as more valuable than that on the other pages. This approach refers to the hard news-centred practice of Korean journalism (LDH, film specialist interviewed 2001). However, those journalists in this study argued that news reports of culture, sports, style, and other news have much less chance of getting to the front or home news pages than news about politics, economics, or home news. Because of this, one reporter on the Cultural desk insisted that "if the evaluation of a reporter's performance is conducted by how many stories he has on the front page or
home news page, reporters of the Cultural desk are in an unfavourable position” (JAK, 3rd July 2000). Even if this is normal, since news has its own hierarchy of values emphasising hard news, many journalists in this study argued that such a value hierarchy should not be applied to an evaluation of journalist performance.

The second aspect concerns the issue of evaluator impartiality. On the one hand, journalists worry about the possibility of subjective evaluation. Given that there is a difficulty in establishing objective criteria for evaluating a journalist’s work, the subjective judgement of an evaluator seems to be inescapable. Journalists, on the other hand, believe that an uncomfortable relationship with news executives could negatively influence evaluation. Fair evaluation is a basic condition for specialist applicants. A lack of trust in a news organisation’s evaluation, therefore, suggests a critical problem in the process of designating specialists. Due to this mistrust, one journalist stated that “even if specialism is regarded as the most efficient breakthrough for newspapers to resolve several problems at once, nobody knows how long the management or news executives would continue this system” (JAK, 25th September 2000). This indicates that distrust of news organisational policy implies a significant breach between journalists and news organisations. So, there seem to be multiple problems in introducing specialism in Korean. First of all it requires an authoritative and institutionalised system to regulate specialism. However, the system itself is unlikely to be enough until trust in news organisation policy is established.

A managing editor (PMH, interviewed 2001) pointed out that the task of establishing specialism is how to successfully verify speciality. Even in a highly specified area such as medicine, mistakes in estimating speciality can be made, according to him. He worried that “if a news organisation fails to verify correctly whether specialists’ speciality is suitable for specialist work, it could result in mistrust in the designation system itself”. Mistrust for the
designation system can be found in the results of the survey question: "Why do you not prefer specialist work to generalist work?" (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Management to Reporting Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust in News Organisation’s Policies</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias against Specialist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

According to the survey, the main reason that journalists preferred to remain as generalists rather than specialists was a distrust in their news organisation policies (55.7%, \(n=73\)). This indicates that news organisations’ policies have not been consistent or coherent. The second worry of the survey respondents is related to job insecurity (31.3%, \(n=41\)). Although in the in-depth interviews specialist status was assumed to protect journalists’ job security, this survey result implies that ironically a significant number of journalists worry that specialist status can cause job insecurity. This suggests that, as examined above, journalists are highly aware of the aftermath of failing to adapt to specialism. This worry is also aggravated by several factors such as an inability to return to management positions and the lack of trust in a news organisation.

This observation indicates that both consistency and continuity of news organisation policy are urgent issues in order to establish specialism. The majority of journalists in this study demanded a strict and established
designation system so as to resolve journalists' mistrust of news organisational policy and lead to a fairer selection process.

The institutionalised system for designating specialists seems to refer to an intention to protect a specialist's status. Fincham and Rhodes (1992: 282-283) contend that specialists want to keep their monopoly of specialist status by highly evaluated qualification. For this purpose, specialists intend to mystify and monopolise their knowledge. The specified criteria for designating specialists based on the institutionalised system help to identify the qualifications of specialists. A senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) maintained that the designation system could protect specialists from generalists' intervention in their world.

An objective designation system could help to establish the news organisational culture of specialism. According to a managing editor (KYJ, interviewed 2001), an institutionalised system of specialism is more efficient to establish specialism. From these findings, it can be inferred that for the purpose of the cognitive congruence of the members of a news organisation, an institutionalised system of designation is essential. However, the designation system for selecting experienced senior journalists as specialists has not yet been regularised in Korean journalism. Instead, several specialists are designated informally on a verbal recommendation of the Editor in an informal way. Most of them have been working on a particular area for considerable length of period. One managing editor explained this case that:

B has worked as film correspondent for more than 10 years. Even if we have no institution of specialist system, I allowed him to use the title of 'film specialist'. Also I excluded him from rotating of fields. Arts specialist L also was entitled as specialist on my order. He has been an art reporter more than 14 years. I will designate them by system in future (PMH, interviewed 2001).

This way of specialist designation seems to be efficient since it does not have to
take into account a complicated process. Designation by the editor, however, inevitably effects uneasiness in journalists. A junior journalist of the IT desk was scouted by one major newspaper. This newspaper gave him the responsibility of specialising in the IT area on the word of the managing editor. However, he received no promise guaranteeing his specialist status from the company, only from the editor. He (KTH, interviewed 2001) stated that even though the editor had proposed the role of specialist, he did not trust the situation since there was no institutionalised system for specialists.

4.1.2 Expert Recruitment

Along with designating experienced reporters as specialist, news organisations can recruit mature entrants as specialists because of their considerable knowledge and their settled career in specific areas. They are normally experts with a doctorate degree. Sometimes news organisations hire reporters under the terms of designating a certain status. This way of designating specialists was introduced in the early stages of the specialist system in Korean journalism.

However, the generalists interviewed nearly all disagreed with this system. Their disapproval of expert-originated specialists relates to the low level skill of newsgathering. A senior general journalist illustrated that:

To train general journalists is more efficient in developing specialist journalism than to import specialists directly from experts. Expertise does not seem to be sufficient enough to be a journalist because of lack of newsgathering skills. I saw some examples that doctorate experts cannot cope efficiently with the newsgathering job. A major problem is that they do not know how to write reports with speed. Reporters firstly have to compose their reporting as quickly as possible as they get information. The first qualification of a specialist is not knowledge but this basic skill. This skill cannot be acquired within a short period (KDH, interviewed 2001).
Newsgathering ability is considered to be the fundamental and indispensable condition for specialists, besides specialised knowledge. A news executive pointed out that ‘imported’ specialists have problems in almost all aspects of journalism such as the skill of writing articles, journalistic viewpoint, attitude to events, and the variety of news sources (HHP, interviewed 2001). A deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) especially demonstrated one of the salient examples of low level skills is writing skill. He criticised ‘imported’ specialists who they do not write a proper news report but an academic article. They cannot summarise a story and are unable to quickly grasp the meaning or subject of an event.

This emphasis on newsgathering skill relates to generalists’ and executives’ understanding of what specialism is. Before specialised knowledge, the basic technology for newsgathering and producing news was preferred. Most generalists interviewed focused on generalist groundwork before becoming experts on specific subjects. Elliott (1977) clarifies the difference between generalist and specialist. According to him, the generalists are rather “straight reporters who are content to collect the facts through recognised channels and to leave to the reader the task of interpreting and evaluating them” (1977: 149). He elaborates generalist virtues as follows:

Straight reporters positively value the craft skills associated with their style of news production. Claims to professionalism in journalism are based on such routine competences as factual accuracy, speed at meeting deadlines, style in presentation and a shared sense of news values. Such claims are echoed in other media occupations where professionalism again means skill and competence in the performance of routine work tasks (1977: 149).

Elliott’s observation appears to be exactly the same as the generalists’ arguments on expert-rooted specialists’ ill-prepared basic skills of newsgathering activities and writing news reports.
Furthermore, many generalists maintained that generalists normally retain a potential of developing specialised knowledge. The medical area is admitted as one of the fields that have to import expert specialists due to its highly specified characteristics. Yet a senior generalist (KYM, interviewed 2001), once a medical reporter, expressed confidence that general reporters can build a fundamental knowledge of medicine if they have covered this area for more than 5 years. Generalists tend to disagree with recruiting specialists from experts because of their poor news production skills.

This attitude also emphasises the role of journalistic value judgement. Some discussants in a focus group discussion (FJAK, focus group discussion 2001) indicated that news is not only more than information, but also a product based on professional value judgements, and professional serious-minded journalists need this skill as well as expertise and newsgathering skills.

Elliott understands that specialists are “committed journalists who believe more attention should be paid to newsgathering, investigation, to providing background and analysis, even to making judgements on behalf of the reader about the relative worth of different accounts or the implication” (1977: 149). Most generalists and executives interviewed contended that ‘imported’ specialists lack the journalistic judgements which comes from having had previous generalist experience.

Generalists doubt an expert specialist’s comprehensive or integral understanding about social reality. The Joongang Ilbo was the first newspaper to introduce specialist system by importing doctorate experts in 1994. However, the deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) of this newspaper claimed that expert specialists are normally devoid of an insight to discern the whole feature of news events or the interrelationship between news events. He argued that he prefers experienced journalists to experts as specialists. This examination also indicates that news organisations should identify expert specialist’s newsgathering skills before designating them as
The majority of generalists including executives insisted on the necessity of expert specialist training in basic newsgathering skills. A film specialist, a former senior generalist, suggested an apprenticeship period for about 5 years for expert specialists (LDH, interviewed 2001), to confirm their capacity of specialist. This indicates that it is a prerequisite that specialists recruited from experts should be assimilated into the existing news production practices. This feature related to news production practices will be more closely examined in the later Chapter.

In conclusion, specialists are normally recruited from two different paths: experts from outside news organisations, and experienced generalists inside news organisations. Designating experts as specialists from outside presents problems of poor newsgathering skills and lack of journalistic value judgements. Experienced journalists from inside demand a legitimate designation system.

The first path refers to the issue of news production practices. There seems a different paradigm of newsgathering approach between specialists and generalists. The second path is related to establishing visible and objective institutions sharable with all members of news organisations. A reliable and trustworthy designation system is one of the central matters of managing a specialist system.

4.2 Reward Management

4.2.1 Preferential Payments

Another issue of managing specialism is a reward management of specialists. According to Armstrong, "reward management is the process of developing and implementing strategies, policies and systems which help the organisation to achieve its objectives by obtaining and keeping the people it needs and by
increasing their motivation and commitment" (1991: 495). It indicates rewarding employees according to their value to the organisation. An employee's value is measured by their actual and potential contribution. Typical reward policies are pay and promotion.

The journalists interviewed, whether specialists or generalists, generally stated that preferential payment for specialists is necessary. The wage payment method in the Korean newspaper business has been based on a single tier system in relation to the seniority practice. All employees in the news organisation receive the same amount of pay if they start their job at the same time, regardless of their performance. Increased rates of pay are also identically applied to them. The seniority practice is typically applied to the wage system. In this situation, it is difficult to identify what preferential payments are. It could simply indicate being paid an additional amount of money to a standard wage level, or it could be a different system of payment. Either way, preferential payment was suggested as a method of compensation for sacrificing promotion.

Both specialists and generalists were of the opinion that, even though specialism can protect their job security, it also has a disadvantage. For general reporters, to be specialists implies that they discard the chance of promotion in the management hierarchy since this is established as the generalists' career path, and not that of specialists (JJS, news executive interviewed 2001). Under the Korean newspapers' payment practice, a rank in the hierarchical ladder usually indicates the level of payment, generally given in proportion to the status in the hierarchy. Specialism, which does not have such a hierarchical position due to promotion limitations, is seen as requiring a preferential pay system different from that for generalists (JJH, senior generalist interviewed 2001).

A high rank also indicates a power to engage in managerial discussion on news organisation affairs. A medical specialist (KYS, interviewed 2001) held
that specialists are likely to be excluded from the decision making process regarding news organisation affairs. A music specialist complained:

Generalists can be promoted to a position of desk news executive that enables them to exert power to control reporters. They have their own staff to organise for newsgathering activities, and also have the power to control them. Specialists sometimes feel a kind of deprivation in this sense (KIM, interviewed 2001).

Exclusion from promotion to news executive status is considered a disadvantage for specialists. Some specialists in this study, therefore, argued that an incentive payment can be the only way to compensate for this loss of promotion when they become specialists.

Secondly, preferential payment is regarded as a reward for speciality. For instance, most journalists interviewed admitted that, for example, a medical specialist with a medical doctorate, a former doctor, deserves a preferential payment. A senior generalist stated that “expert specialists with doctorates should be treated to a higher salary than generalists because they sacrifice their opportunities to earn more money with that expertise otherwise” (KDH, interviewed 2001). Preferential pay is seen as compensation for sacrificing opportunities elsewhere. Preferential payment for specialist is a skills-based scheme (Armstrong, 1991: 615). Armstrong explains that:

Skills-based pay schemes, also called knowledge-based schemes, link pay to the acquisition of additional skills or knowledge. Employees are rewarded through direct payments for the ability to perform an operationally related range of tasks or skills rather than for the actual work performed at any time (Armstrong, 1991: 615).

Skills-based pay schemes aim to respond to the need of competitive advantage,
which is supposed to be achieved by having a skilled, flexible and committed labour force (Armstrong, 1991: 616). The preferential pay for specialists, therefore, supports the competitive advantage of their expertise.

However, some generalists objected to preferential payment or skills-based schemes for specialists recruited within a news organisation. A junior generalist (PKI, interviewed 2001) viewed that being a specialist is not related to a 'status', but to an 'assignment' or 'responsibility'. According to him, the workload of specialists is not different from that of generalists, so their payment should not be favoured. His statement rests on the presumption that specialists can return to generalists because the assignment of journalists can always be swapped with other members of the news organisation simply by personnel policy. This is contrary to the assumption of specialists who believe they cannot return to the bureaucratic ladder.

Contrary to some journalists' assertions, most specialists except for several medical specialists do not have preferential payment. An arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) and an environmental specialist who are recruited from inside a news organisation are paid equally with their generalist colleagues. Consequently, preferential pay for such specialists could sometimes bring about conflicts with generalists (JSH, a deputy managing editor, interviewed 2001). Most generalists would not consider the speciality of the generalist-rooted specialists as cause for preferential payment. As identified above, the specialist responsibilities are thought of in terms of 'assignment'. Their designation is largely dependent upon the length of experience, which is already included in their seniority payment. Significantly, generalists tended to appreciate the expertise of externally recruited specialists and felt they deserved preferential payment. Yet generalist-rooted specialists recruited from inside were seen as having other compensations. A senior generalist stated:
The privilege of a specialist is the fact that he/she is a specialist. The most important thing for a journalist is to work as a reporter till his/her career retirement. Specialist status is a means to guarantee it. Furthermore, specialists can specialise in their own subject on the contrary to generalist. In a word, specialist status protects everything relevant to the journalist occupation. I do not think specialists should be favoured in pay (KHJ, interviewed 2001).

The journalists in this study had an inclination to assess the 'expertise' or 'speciality' as with externally recruited specialists, as more important than the journalistic 'experience' of generalist-rooted specialists, thereby favouring a preferential payment system for specialist expertise, but not for journalistic experience. This finding contrasts with generalists' disapproving of externally-recruited specialists since they lack journalistic experience.

It indicates that journalists have a rather mixed understanding of the main constituents of specialism. Some generalists contended that even if pay discrimination is necessary for specialists, it should be assessed in terms of a merit system, regardless of the reporter's status (KOH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). This is probably caused by the change of employment pattern from lifetime employment to an annual contract. While the payment for lifetime employment depends on seniority, under annual contract employment, it is based on the result of journalists' performance in news organisations (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001).

This implies that a change of employment practice could effect a different approach to reward management for specialists. A news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001) who took charge of preparing the system of specialist management testified that his company would introduce a merit system for specialists based on annual contracts while generalists will stay with the existing seniority payment system. Specialists should be evaluated by their performance, not by status and seniority. A deputy managing editor (CSH, interviewed 2001) whose company introduced a full-scale merit system for all
members of his organisation noted that regardless of status, payments of all journalists are evaluated by their performance at the end of an annual contract.

Although, in principle, specialists should be treated better in terms of payment, this policy is unlikely to be implemented. This is because there is a discrepancy as to which element of specialism is more important: journalistic experience or expertise.

4.2.2 Promotion Limits

There is another issue in a reward system for specialists: promotion. As examined above, promotion refers to job security under the seniority practice of Korean journalism. It is one of the major concerns in personnel management. Many journalists interviewed in this study, both specialists and generalists, presupposed that to choose a specialist course is to stop expecting promotion in the news organisation hierarchy. A senior generalist observed that the specialist ladder suggests an abandonment of the managerial ladder (KDH, interviewed 2001). However, some generalists and specialists would not entirely discard the desire for promotion, even if they achieve specialist status. A junior generalist contended that, without a position on the hierarchical ladder, even if they are specialists, journalists worry about their status (KCH, interviewed 2001).

This demand seems to be linked to the hierarchy system of the Korean newspaper industry, which has established two different bureaucratic ladders of executives. One is an assignment executive who takes charge of a desk and controls staff reporters. The other is a non-assignment executive without the responsibility of managing a desk but who is normally a member of the editing board. Some journalists interviewed, especially generalists, favoured the non-assignment executive position when they choose the specialist ladder. They demanded rank rather than assignment or desk power. Under seniority
practices, a lower rank than their junior colleagues is regarded as a threat of depriving of their positions in news organisations, even if they are specialists (KYM, senior generalist interviewed 2001). This demand for rank seems to be more prominent in the case of specialists recruited from inside a news organisation than from experts. A junior generalist explained the reason as:

Expert specialists like medical specialists, the former doctor, may leave a specialist job without significant worry, since they can find alternative jobs outside news organisations by virtue of their expertise. First of all, they have expertise. This expertise has been already acknowledged in its field through specialist activity. However, it is a different story for a specialist recruited from inside news organisations based on long-term experience. Although they can freelance without depending on news organisations, I am not sure about it. On the contrary for expert specialists, it must be highly impossible for them to work as experts. They are at most journalists. Even if this type of specialists can work as freelance outside news organisations, their status as journalist must be weakened without bondage with the news organisation. Therefore, to leave a specialist job could be a crisis of job security. This type of specialist has no choice but to depend on news organisations (PKI, junior generalist interviewed 2001).

Specialists, former senior generalists, are not free from their news organisations. As examined before, it is widely accepted that once journalists fall behind their junior colleagues in the promotion race, it is difficult to recover from the defeat of promotion. This indicates that an obsession with promotion is related to job insecurity. In spite of introducing specialism to relieve job insecurity, the news organisational culture disturbs this objective. Korean specialism is highly dependent upon a hierarchy-driven organisational culture.

Despite the fact that promotion to non-assignment rank is proposed as resolving the limitations of promotion positions for specialists, even this
separate promotion system does not seem to entirely eliminate stress. As indicated by several generalists and executives, the separate promotion system itself is evidence of discriminating against specialists (CUS, junior generalist interviewed 2001; CHU, managing editor interviewed 2001). They considered that a different promotion system could result in a specialist's immobility to the generalist status and management ladder in the end. This worry is shown in the survey of this study. As shown in Table 12, only one third of those surveyed supported a separate promotion system for specialists (33.6%, n=44), whereas the dissidents predominated (62.6%, n=82).

| <Table 12> Separate Promotion System for Specialists |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Valid                                             | Frequency | Percent |
| Yes                                               | 44        | 33.6%   |
| No                                                | 82        | 62.6%   |
| No Opinion                                        | 5         | 3.8%    |
| Total                                             | 131       | 100.0%  |

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

Even if specialists sometimes felt that they had no control over staff reporters, as mentioned by a music specialist (KIM, interviewed 2001), this does not imply that they wanted to be assignment executives. Most journalists argued that specialists should give up a desire to become a desk news executive or the editor because they have chosen a course of reporter not manager (KOH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). To propose an assignment executive post to specialists is, therefore, regarded as depriving them of specialist status (JSH, environmental specialist interviewed 2001).

To sum up, these findings suggest that the limitations of promotion can cause vulnerability in the specialist status, even if this is compensated for by preferential pay. Though this worry is apparently resolved by possible
promotion to non-assignment posts, the journalists interviewed in this study were dubious about the effect of this separate promotion system. They preferred to be allowed to return to the managerial ladder in certain cases. The specialist status cannot be easily secured by any personnel management policies, especially when specialists are recruited from inside news organisations. This examination indicates that the existing news organisational culture is so rigid that most generalists would not admit any disfavoured policies against them, and accordingly specialists would not trust the promise of news organisations. This rigidity might be also presented in the policy of journalist desk circulation.

4.3 Desk Circulation

Negrine (1996: 82) observes that the basic reason of allocating journalists, particularly as specialists, relates to labour division. It is a way of dividing up responsibilities to secure stable and regular news supply. A problem, here, is: how long can specialists stay as specialists? Most generalists interviewed saw specialism as a way of providing long-term tenure in a subject. A news executive who takes charge of establishing the specialist system in his company contended that to become a specialist is to hold his/her subject, in fact, ‘forever’ (JJS, interviewed 2001).

Specialists are exempted from desk circulation in their subjects. In most cases, specialists monopolise their subject areas unlike generalists who have to circulate among various subjects and desks according to news organisation decision, regardless of whether they want or not. Before introducing specialism, the personnel management of Korean journalism had been organised in accordance with this principle of circulation.

For generalists, rotating posts is seen as depriving them of the chance to specialise. By contrast, specialists worry about being relegated from their
specialist status since this can lead them to job insecurity. Stability based on long-term tenure is viewed as a pre-requisite for job security of specialists. An arts specialist stated that:

I have been a news executive of the Cultural desk. If I stay as generalist, I may be promoted at least to assistant managing editor. If, again, I quit specialist status, I have to return to the managerial ladder. Unfortunately, there is no vacancy of managerial posts for me. These posts have already been occupied by my colleagues and my juniors. In a word, I am and should be forever specialist (LY, interviewed 2001).

However, some generalists contended that a chance of circulating should be permitted. A senior generalist insisted that “senior specialists should be open to moving towards newsgathering executive posts in order to pass their speciality to their junior staff” (KYM, interviewed 2001). The speciality of specialists should be utilised not for specialists’ interest, but for the news organisation’s interest. Furthermore, there is an argument that specialists should be circulated in order to share the opportunity of specialist status with other applicants. A senior generalist argued that “the principle of circulation is also applied to specialists in order to permit the other applicants with the chance of specialist” (JJH, interviewed 2001). Specialists’ circulation indicates that specialists would then be specialists no longer. This attitude denies the stability of specialist status since specialist tenure becomes highly vulnerable. Such an unusual argument seems to be related to a severe competition of specialist designation. Sometimes, the long-term tenure of specialists can cause a conflict with generalists who are looking for specialist posts. Some generalists interviewed demanded an open path to specialist posts. Seven specialists out of 10 do not agree with this approach, again 5 of them are former experts recruited from outside news organisations. They would like to keep the status of specialists for as long as possible.
The gap between them regarding desk circulation is also identified in another aspect relating to settling down specialist’s job insecurity. A junior generalist demonstrated that:

In fact, it is impossible for specialists to work as newsgatherers beyond at most 50 years of age. This is a reality of Korean journalism. I have not met reporters over 50 years old on the spot. After this age, news organisations should give them a chance to return to the ordinary course in hierarchy. Without this safety valve, specialist positions cannot afford job security (PKI, interviewed 2001).

This examination is related to concern about the promotion system. As seen in the survey, more than half of respondents demanded the single system rather than the separate system. In in-depth interviews, some generalists supported this idea. The single system implies that specialists are allowed to return to bureaucratic ladder in hierarchy, whereas the separate system restricts specialists to specialist status. However, to remain ‘forever’ as a specialist is unlikely to be possible in practice. Newsgathering activities are limited by routines of Korean journalism. The long-term tenure of specialists relates to the security of the specialist post as long as they work as newsgatherers. The chance of returning to a generalist status also provides job security. This contradiction indicates that news organisational culture in relation to newsgatherer’s retirement age disturbs a specialist’s devotion to his/her job.

However, specialists, especially the former experts, are less conscious about the problem of retirement age. They are apparently confident working as specialist newsgatherers throughout their career. That is, there is a significant difference in the approaching to specialism between generalists and specialists. This difference leads news organisations to difficulty in preparing personnel management policy for specialists.
4.4 Job Evaluation

From these examinations, personnel management policies such as designation, reward management, and desk circulation are eventually problems of how to evaluate a specialist's job. According to Armstrong, "job evaluation is a system of comparing different jobs to provide a basis for a grading and pay structure" (1991: 523). This observation implies that job evaluation in addressing specialism is important and difficult since news organisations recruit them from two different sources. They have different objectives of specialism, and accordingly, have different worries about specialism. News organisations should assess these different specialist sources in different ways.

This appears to be a highly difficult task. Armstrong adds that pay structure, which is normally hierarchical, is decided on how and where jobs should be fitted into that hierarchy. Given that the reward management in Korean journalism has been dominated by seniority practices, to introduce a preferential pay structure for specialists is not a simple task. There are no relevant practices for employing the specialist system. A news executive mentioned that:

Specialism has been discussed for several years. The survey of newsroom members showed that more than 80% of them supported an introduction of specialism. However, it has not reached a definite accord of what specialism is or what the qualifications of specialist are. There is no precedent for this. Examples of foreign countries cannot be directly applied to Korean journalism since backgrounds between them are definitely different. Most prominently, the seniority system has been rooted so deeply that it seems to be highly difficult to introduce some policies that would be disagreeable with it (JJS, interviewed 2001).

Job evaluation has emerged as the most important procedure in evaluating a
specialist's performance. Besides designation itself, the job evaluation is applied to specialists who are recruited from inside the news organisation (Hankyurae Daily, internal document 2001). A rule is that the news organisation will evaluate a specialist's performance 3 years after starting his/her specialist responsibility. This regulation has two purposes. The first is to judge whether or not the specialist can continue his/her specialist responsibility, that is, to review capability as a specialist. If a news organisation decides that specialist's capability is insufficient for continuing specialist work, the specialist has to move to generalist status. It, thus, relates to a procedure of re-designation and desk circulation. The second purpose is to evaluate performance in order to reconsider reward for the specialist, meaning a possible salary change.

A news executive of the Hankyurae Daily (JJS, interviewed 2001) explained that the issue of judging capability is a highly significant concern of generalists who want to be specialists. If a news organisation judges that they are incapable of conducting specialist work, they ought to come back to the generalist status or managerial ladder, different from expert-rooted specialists who can find themselves another career as experts. However, as observed above, most generalists worry about job stability because it is not easy to return to the managerial ladder. To ease this anxiety, the Hankyurae Daily has established a rule that provides an opportunity to return to managerial course if specialists want to.

Yet, he contended that specialists could find it is difficult to return to the managerial ladder. Juniors can be promoted to upper posts in a hierarchy, within 3 years. If they want to return managerial ladder, specialists would have to work under their juniors, but Korean journalism seniority practices would make it difficult for senior reporters to work under their former juniors (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001; JAK, 25th September 2000; JAK, 1st May 2002). The specialist ladder is not a simple decision for generalists, in
spite of their substantial demands for it.

To sum up, job evaluation is related to all aspects of personnel management of specialists such as designation, reward, and desk movement. Through job evaluation, news organisations expect to identify exactly what specialism is (PMH, managing editor interviewed 2001). As indicated by Armstrong (1991: 524), job evaluation is a method of comparing different jobs in that it establishes the relative positions of the specialist job in a job hierarchy. However, job evaluation for specialism seems to be highly difficult at present. Besides the fact that news organisations would select specialists from two different groups, namely expert groups outside an organisation and senior generalist group from inside an organisation, most generalists presented mixed responses, such as a desperate appetite for specialism as well as uncertainty about specialism. They had no confidence in the specialist system. Various contradictory responses across all issues of personnel management account for such lack of confidence in the system.

Most Korean newspapers have no precedents for specialism, and no cultural grounds for preparing the specialist system. This is more problematic when news organisations employ specialists from generalists in a newsroom than recruiting experts as specialist.

Summary

In conclusion, this study’s arguments show that news organisations do not have a clear assessment of their generalist and specialist resources. Many difficulties of personnel management seem to be related to routes of recruiting specialists: the internal recruitment of former senior generalists and the external recruitment of former experts.

Different approaches to personnel management highlight different attitudes towards how to evaluate specialist work or the factors that are
required for specialism. On the one hand, in evaluating specialists who are former senior generalists, most journalists interviewed demanded an objective institutionalised system for designation which could allow greater trust in the news organisations. On the other hand, journalists were concerned that recruiting external experts as specialists could create problems in the areas of newsgathering skills and journalistic judgements. This problem influences various issues relating to management policies, for instance division of responsibility or desk circulation.

However, there seems to be less conflict in personnel management policies when recruiting experts rather than senior generalists. This indicates that competition for specialists is highly intense between generalists themselves rather than between generalists and experts. The evidence is that delicate and controversial arguments about personnel management policies focus especially upon the generalist-rooted specialists. It appears to be partly because it is not simple to set a clear demarcation between generalists and the generalist-rooted specialists, in that this type of specialist largely depends on length of experience in a certain subject. This phenomenon is evident in the case of expert-rooted specialists whose expertise is admitted as a convincing ground for preferential reward. The issue of personnel management for specialists becomes problematic when news organisations deal with generalist-rooted specialists who share the same culture as generalists.

The difficulty of establishing personnel management policies eventually effects policies of organising specialists in practice. Subsequently, this instability seems to be linked to conflicts between specialists and generalists in news production routines. In the next Chapter, this study will explore how this uncertainty caused by lack of a specialist culture influences the newsgathering activities of specialists.
Chapter 5
JOURNALISTS' ROUTINES

As mentioned by Kung-Shankleman (2000: 12), organisational culture is related to a product and a process. Organisational culture is presented by its products and through the process of producing the product. Journalist routines regulating news production process are a procedural part of news organisational culture, while news reporting is culture in the form of a product. Analysis on the news organisational culture in the form of product will be conducted in the later part of this study.

An organisation tries to routinise the elements of practices related to production into paradigms that tie together the members of an organisation (Schein, 1992: 10). In the case of a news organisation, Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 108) note that it tries to routinise in order to improve the efficiency of the news production process. News organisational culture needs to be approached in terms of routines of news production, the most salient of which can be found in newsgathering activities and organising journalists in the news production process. This Chapter explores what these routines have to do with specialism.

5.1 Routines of Newsgathering Activities

5.1.1 Newsgathering Efficiency

Newsgathering routines are one of the distinctive aspects of news organisational culture. As a process, the routines related to newsgathering activities cover almost all aspects of producing the news across planning, gathering, selection, and presentation of news. Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 107) demonstrate that newsgathering activities are the routines of news
organisational practices that constitute the immediate environment of journalists. Newsgathering routines are the most detailed cultural aspects of a news organisation. This study construes that to examine how specialists adapt to newsgathering routines could provide an understanding of the implementation of specialism into news organisational culture.

One of the most manifest factors of newsgathering routines may be the routine of the beat system. Fishman (1980; 1982) elaborates how significantly journalists depend their newsgathering activities upon beats of bureaucratic organisations. Beat is such an efficient means to gather news. Journalists do not think that news is everywhere at all times. Instead, they follow routines of coverage. According to Fishman, journalists “favour coverage of prescheduled activities (news conferences, trials, legislative sessions) because these allow news personnel more control over their work” (Fishman, 1982, in Berkowitz 1997: 214). Most of these ‘prescheduled activities’ occur at beats or are, at least, related to beats. Thus, “news organisations also spatially allocate their newsgathering resources according to a system of beats and bureau that locates reporters almost exclusively in legitimated institutions of society” (Fishman, 1982, in Berkowitz 1997: 214). The beat system provides journalists considerable convenience in newsgathering since it includes a routine round of coverage activities that routes reporters through a small number of governmental agencies. A journalist’s view is bureaucratically structured so that it is the basis upon which the journalist can detect news events. This observation has been identified in various studies (Sigal, 1973; Tuchman, 1978; Gans, 1979; Hess, 1981).

The impacts of the beat system on newsgathering activities are also prominent in Korean journalism. However, the routines of the beat system in Korean journalism differ significantly from Anglo-American journalism. Reporters can be broadly divided into two types: general assignment reporters and beat reporters. In Anglo-American journalism, general assignment
reporters are generalists while beat reporters are specialists. Keeble (1998: 6) explains that general reporters often arrive in the newsroom with no idea about what they are to cover until they are briefed by their news editors. Specialists, who are generally more experienced reporters, tend to originate far more of their own material relevant to their beats, and so are normally beat reporters. The beat assignment enables specialists to have different routines in the newsgathering process, in that reporters working at beat are rarely assigned stories. Fishman (1980) describes the expectation for beat correspondent as follows:

They are expected to generate news from their beat on their own initiative. Routinely they spend more time stationed at their beat locations than in the newsroom. In comparison with general assignment reporters, beat reporters work autonomously. [...] The beat reporter is largely responsible for deciding what to cover and how to cover it (Fishman, 1980, in Tumber 1999: 102).

The beat system is employed for efficiency of the newsgathering process. Tuchman (1978: 45) argues that in an attempt to regulate the ‘glut of occurrences’, news organisations routinise news coverage through the establishment of news beats. That is, “having reporters assigned to beats and bureau means that they each interpret their task as ‘filing [at least] a daily story’ about occurrences at their various locations” (Tuchman, 1978: 45). This point of view regarding efficiency is also found in Negrine’s (1994: 125) argument on specialism. Specialists working specific beats cover specific areas and this enables them to direct and have regular contacts with their sources of news. He states that “the creation of specialism and specialist correspondents ensures a regular supply of material” (1994: 125).

However, in Korean journalism it is difficult to directly connect a reporter’s status with the beat system. It has developed regardless of
specialism and before the division of a reporter’s status into specialist and generalist. This phenomenon is related to the fact that Korean journalism heavily depends on the beat system for gathering news. According to a survey by Park, Y. K. (1996: 96-97), 80% of respondents admitted that they produce news reporting based mainly on beat press releases that are used verbatim. The survey of You & Lee (1994) indicates that the rate of dependence on press releases from beats is nearly 90%. It is no wonder that reporters think they cannot learn or detect news events without beats. Another survey revealed that 83.9% of respondents supported a need for the beat system (Seo & Kang, 1990). This seems to indicate that it is virtually impossible to cover news without beats.

This heavy dependence on the beat system is a consequence of a news organisation’s aim towards efficiency and cost effectiveness in newsgathering activities (You & Lee, 1994: Park, D. S., 2001). More importantly, the beat system of Korean journalism is related to the government’s reluctance to open information on its activities. A senior generalist argued that “under such closed practices of supplying governmental information, the beat system is the most efficient means to guarantee the people’s right to know and scrutinise governmental activities (N & B, September 1999). The beat is also a kind of information pool where reporters can conveniently approach governmental bodies and effectively collect information, which would otherwise be difficult to access. Accordingly, most newsgathering activities are conducted with priority given to the beat. Almost all reporters, even junior generalists, have their own beats regardless of their status. The beat system, therefore, is a key issue to newsgathering in Korean journalism.

5.1.2 Conflicts among Journalists

Many studies about the beat system have normally focused on the issue of
sources (Sigal, 1973; Ericson et al. 1989; Fishman, 1982). These studies are, however, interested in how the beat impacts on the structure of newsgathering and on the way of shaping news contents (Sigal, 1973, in Tumber 1999: 224-234), rather than on what implications the beat has in terms of a reporter’s identity.

In the sense of a journalist’s existence in relation to beat, Fishman’s analysis (1980, in Tumber 1999: 104) provides some significant insight. He sees that the relationship between the beat and sources can be approached in terms of ‘topic’ and ‘territory’. Some journalists see the beat as topically linked in topics such as environment, education, politics, and art. While others relate the beat to physical locations, for instance parliament, government offices, or police stations, where reporters are subject to the same standard operating procedures. In relation to the beat, a journalist’s existence is identified as his/her ‘topic’ or ‘location’. Fishman acknowledges that if the beat is related to topic, a journalist considers the beat as a series of topics he/she is responsible for covering. When the beat is territorial, it involves going to a place or seeing people. Similarly, Tuchman (1978: 25-31) also divides the beat as a news net into three methods: geographic territoriality, organisational specialisation, and topical specialisation. Of these three methods, organisational and topical specialisations suggest different types of beat system. Organisational specialisation is the method “to establish beats and bureaus at organisations associated with the generation of news and holding centralised information” (Tuchman, 1978: 27). It is equivalent to the territorial beat of Fishman’s categorisation. Topical specialisation is, on the other hand, similar to ‘beat-as-a-set-of-topics’. It is organised according to subject area such as “finance, sports, and family/style or so-called women’s department, as well as culture and education” (Tuchman, 1978: 29). This method bypasses the territorial desks.

This duality of the beat in accordance with physical location and topic or subject is unlikely to be applied to Korean journalism, since the beat system is
highly focused on physical location. For instance, beats in Korean journalism such as ‘Policy Agency’, ‘Prosecutor’s Office’, or ‘the Ministry of Health and Welfare’ indicate physical location as the territory of beat reporters even if these beats are also related to subjects. In the beat system, the jurisdiction of physical location takes precedence to that of subject. If a subject not relevant to the physical location occurs on the beat, the responsibility and right of dealing with it is up to the beat reporter. When a broadcasting law is in procedure at the National Assembly, responsibility or jurisdiction for covering this issue is with the political reporter who is beat reporter at the National Assembly. If a media reporter wanted to cover it, he/she would need permission from this beat reporter before dealing with it. Even in this case, the news item could also be discussed with the Political desk. In the case of a music reporter, he/she usually investigates news events out of physical locations. This reporter certainly seems to be a subject-based reporter, not a territory-based reporter. However, a music reporter’s identity is recognised by established relevant organisations such as the National Music Institute, although he/she rarely visits this location.

This phenomenon has a significant implication for specialism’s beat relationships. In Korean journalism, specialists are identified and characterised by the subject of their speciality. Most generalists and specialists interviewed recognised the specialist’s identity in accordance with his/her subject area rather than physical location. The subject area relates to their specialities or expertise. In Korean journalism, a specialist is a reporter of ‘the beat-as-a-set-of-topics’, while a generalist is a reporter of ‘the beat-as-a-territory’. But the subject-oriented specialist’s identity results in their exclusion from the beat since the beat system in Korean journalism is based on physical location whereas Korean specialism is based on topics or subjects.

Traditionally, the generalist is responsible for the beat, even if the topic is closely related to a specialism. This creates significant inconvenience for
specialists in their newsgathering activities. Most pieces of information generally flow around the beat. This may be one of the prominent differences from Anglo-American specialism in that specialists of Anglo-American journalism generally monopolise the beat in both terms of subject and physical location, resulting in increased efficiency of newsgathering activities, whereas specialists in Korean journalism are at a disadvantage in this respect.

This discrepancy of beat beneficiary eventually brings about conflicts between generalists and specialists. It may be because "the social world as so organised that topics and territories tend to coincide" as claimed by Fishman (1980, in Tumber 1999: 104). The subject of specialism seems to inevitably collide with the physical location of a generalist's beat. The problem is how to resolve the collision. In Anglo-American journalism, it is unlikely to develop into a significant conflict. Fishman sees that there are stable locations in which certain topics stably reside, which is the perceived order that the newspaper beat system relies upon to organise their coverage of the world. Negrine also acknowledge that such collisions do not appear to be a source of major friction. He states that "when asked about such issues, reporter resorted to explanations such as 'It's simply the way it works', 'It's related to what I have covered before so the news desk will obviously send that sort of thing to me', and even 'It's all ad hoc and there is a lot of co-operation'" (1996: 88). That is, in Anglo-American journalism, any conflicts resulting from jurisdiction overlap are rare, and easily settled by the control of desk news executives.

By contrast, in Korea this conflict does not seem to be comfortably solved. An environmental specialist experienced conflicts with the generalist who works the beat of the Ministry of Environment (JHS, environmental specialist interviewed 2001). When a food specialist submits an article on food hygiene, the generalist in charge of the beat of the Ministry of Health & Welfare contests that it is his news (KCH, junior generalist interviewed 2001). A medical specialist noted that "conflict between generalists and specialists is inevitable if
they share the same subject” (KYS, interviewed 2001). It follows that if news organisations expect specialists to produce the same type of reporting on the same subject as generalists, conflict regarding the beat can develop into a serious level.

Conflicts surrounding the beat are not a unique phenomenon between specialists and generalists. It also happens between generalists, and even within the same desk. A news executive illustrated that:

One of the most deep-rooted newsgathering routines is a jurisdiction over the beat, to be more precise, an inviolability of beat jurisdiction. This has been structured between reporters and desks. This jurisdiction is based on location of news events not on the subjects of news events. Ideally, a reporter of a North Korean relation subject should have access to every relevant institution such as governmental offices, the opposition party, academic sectors, entrepreneurs, the NGO groups, and other relevant organisations. However, under the routines of beat jurisdiction, political agenda proposed by political parties are dealt with by political reporters, issues of international relations regarding the reunification by the beat reporter of the Ministry of Foreign Policy, news events concerning entrepreneurial activities in North Korea by a reporter of the Economic desk, the NGO issues by the Home news desk, and cultural activities with North Korea by the Cultural desk. Jurisdiction is strictly applied between reporters of the same desk. Within the Political desk, the responsibilities are divided between the beat reporter of the Ministry of Foreign Policy and the Parliament reporter. Even if issues provided by other beats are their subjects, reporters cannot access the issues out of his/her beat. Consequently jurisdiction of the beat causes a lot of problems. One of the salient examples is that news reporting is limited to the news without developing investigative reports. These problems eventually lead reporters to transgressing and violating the jurisdiction of the other beats. Conflicts are, therefore, inevitable (N & B, June 1998: 28-33).
This observation indicates that conflict regarding beat jurisdiction is the most delicate and controversial issue in newsgathering activities of Korean journalism. This problematic feature is also applied to specialism. The beat is the primary concern of news organisations for specialist management.

Most news organisations would like to draw a line of responsibilities between specialists and generalists (JJS, news executive interviewed 2001). Each should develop different news types. Beat generalists deal with hard news, breaking news, straight news or brief news. They mostly cover 'news' such as the first occurrence, or the news briefings that happen at the beat. They have to stay at the beat mostly all day in order to cover these types of news coming from the beats. By contrast, specialists are responsible for the subsequent reporting followed by these generalists' coverage: 'non-news' such as in-depth reporting, commentary, or analysis. When dealing with 'non-news', specialists are more or less free from a deadline, enabling them to have much more time to treat news events. By contrast, generalists are strictly bound by deadlines because they have to process breaking news or brief news. Specialists are responsible for 'developing' the existing issues while generalists focus on 'spotting', 'detecting', or 'recognising' news. As categorised by Tuchman (1973; 110-131), spot news is a rather unexpected event so there is not so much time to deal with it. On the contrary, if news events take a while to learn the facts associated with a breaking news, it is developing news. The criteria dividing responsibility between specialists and generalists is related to the amount of time needed to process news events.

Tunstall's (1996: 156-161) examination also supports this approach in that news organisations expect the so called 'soft news' from specialists. He identifies specialism as 'non-news' such as feature coverage on consumer themes. This suggests that generalists usually cover 'news'. Specialists deal with 'soft news' whereas generalists cover 'hard news'. According to Tuchman (1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 176), hard news consists of 'factual
presentations' of events, while soft news is features or human interest stories, concerning human foibles and the texture of our human life. Based on this explanation, specialism focuses on non-time bound stories.

In the 1990s, specialism of British newspapers became even softer than in the 1960s. Specialist subjects moved towards consumer, leisure, and life-style areas. Tunstall examines that "even in a traditionally 'hard' field, such as finance, much of the increase has been in the form of 'Personal Finance' coverage about your bank, your home, and your pension" (1996: 160). This 'non-news' aspect of specialism involves changes of who the specialist is. While migrating towards 'soft news', specialist reports are written by personality columnists, not newspaper staff. Generalists are responsible for the news reports, while the specialists for feature articles or commentaries, according to McNair's (1998: 9) division of basic types of news. This approach elucidates that news organisations have to introduce a policy of division of the labour between specialists and generalists by different expectations of them.

However, there is a significant premise for specialists in Korean journalism: they have to produce stories based on their own speciality. They are required to cover events free from the information provided from the beat. This freedom is, at the same time, the other side of coin indicating that specialists cannot and should not approach to the beat. Specialists in Korea are reporters who have no beat as stable information sources, and nevertheless are responsible for producing different reporting from that of the beat. A senior generalist, accordingly, argued that "specialists must elaborate other ways of newsgathering without depending on beat information since their responsibility is to cultivate different types of news reporting" (KHJ, interviewed 2001). A junior generalist (PKI, interviewed 2001) also held that when the specialist's job is defined as producing different reporting from that of generalists, they have to cease to depend on the beat in order to widen their interest. He added that the information obtainable from the beat may not be
sufficient to produce in-depth reporting, analysis, or commentary. Two thirds of generalists and most executives interviewed in this study consented to this position.

Undoubtedly, specialists have a different attitude than generalists towards this restriction. All specialists, along with a third of generalists, insisted that specialists should be allowed to approach the physical location of the beat through an open beat policy. They argued that meaningful and useful information is monopolised by organisational sources, for instance official institutions or government offices, which are mostly charged by beat reporters. Correspondingly, specialists think that they cannot develop news stories without access to the beats (LY, arts specialist interviewed 2001; JHS, environmental specialist interviewed 2001). The beat is seen as an information pool (KYS, medical specialist interviewed 2001). A film specialist pointed out that “even if most information provided by official sources of the location is open through the Internet, it is true that the beat reporters are far more competitive than the others” (LDH, interviewed 2001). An environmental specialist argued that:

I concluded that it is definitely difficult to detect the development of a news story without access to the beat. In this situation, without an awareness of what happens at the beat with regard to news events, it is also nearly impossible to produce feature stories about the news events. The official sources of the beats still have a lot of information that may contain one of the highest qualities. Almost all information is gathered and occupied by the beat sources (JHS, interviewed 2001).

Specialists insisted that an open beat policy is needed to produce more developed and deeper stories. The environmental specialist above elaborated that:
Specialists have to cover much broader areas than generalists. For instance, the environmental specialist is not a beat reporter of the Department of Environment. I should be allowed to investigate the issues related to the other beats such as the Department of Construction, the Police Agency, or the Department of Science and Technology. All beats should, therefore, be open to specialists (JHS, interviewed 2001).

This implies that an open beat policy can allow specialists more flexibility in newsgathering. It can be argued that there is a different appreciation towards the usefulness of the beat among journalists. The generalists in this study saw the beat in a more limited way, in order to discover sufficient information to deal with in-depth reporting. By contrast, the specialists appreciated the beat as the centre of information, which enables them to develop news stories.

Furthermore, these different positions indicate that the beat is essentially assumed as a kind of right or sovereign territory. Conflicts between specialists and generalists may be evidence of struggle to access this ‘right of the beat territory’. However, sharing beats between specialists and generalists does not seem to be simple at all. A senior generalist’s observation illuminated that:

Any reporters can be allowed to access to beats, especially of official institutions. Discrimination of access beats against specialists should be abolished in the end. However, the priority of access should be decided by the relevance of subjects. In some cases, reporters having priority may monopolise information of the locations because of competition with colleagues even within the same organisation (KOH, interviewed 2001).

To sum up, this conflict seems to originate from the fact that the beat is seen as a property, or territory of a particular reporter. Tuchman (1978: 79) also observes this aspect in her study: a reporter is protecting his sources as ‘private property’ and so protecting against possible future poaching. When
protecting beat territory, interdepartmental struggles do happen. According to Tuchman, "particularly in organisations having overlapping bureaucratic responsibilities, one department will try to assume more power at another's expense (1978: 79).

5.1.3 Negotiation

Conflict over beat can be resolved by negotiation. Tuchman (1978: 80) sees it as an 'exchange' or 'contract'. This negotiation is arrived at when information is located in another's territory. However, negotiation may be based on a reporter's flexibility. Tuchman briefs that "whether such contracts qualify as professional courtesy or organisational exchange, these exchanges demonstrate that reporters and bureaus must be flexible" (1978: 80). Negrine (1996: 88) also notes that overlapping is not necessarily connected to friction. Reporters might leave a decision about allocation to the news desk.

Several generalists proposed a compromise. Specialists recruited from inside news organisations, who have been experienced senior generalists, can approach a beat as well as beat reporters, as they did when they were generalist beat reporters. Or some news organisations have introduced a more positive policy entitling the internally recruited specialists as exclusive beat reporter. A news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001) demonstrated that this type of specialist should be guaranteed to monopolise the beat. He/she is a beat reporter as well as a specialist. In this case, the 'beat-as-territory' would be the 'beat-as-a-set-of-topics', so there should be no conflict surrounding beat jurisdiction.

It was found that specialists who are former experts have no regular access to beats, since they are perceived as having a low level of newsgathering skills, and cannot cope with hard news requiring improvised skills of handling changeable situations with speed (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001). Most generalists interviewed maintained that beat work requires a somewhat
integral newsgathering skill. They considered that specialists lack those crucial yet basic skills for covering the beat, and these cannot be learned in a short time. This assumption is also suggested by Fishman. He sees that, in order to enjoy the benefits of the beat, journalists have to learn the necessary newsgathering skills. Fishman describes that:

Reporters must learn bureaucratic phase structures when they learn how to cover their beats. They employ these idealisations as schemes for interpreting bureaucratic activities, just as the officials they observe employ these idealisations to produce what the reporter sees. If the reporter does not have cognisance of the specific phase structures of the beat, the reporter cannot understand at the simplest level what is happening there, what officials mean by what they are doing. Lack of understanding this basic could be seen as serious journalistic incompetence (Fishman, 1982, in Berkowitz 1997: 217).

The generalists who supported dividing responsibility between specialists and generalists related this to difference between hard news and soft news. Hard news is basically time-bound. Tuchman observes that “because it is timely and urgent, hard news demands speed, especially in gathering facts and meeting deadlines” (1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 179-180). By contrast, soft news stories do not need to be “timely” since these stories are non-scheduled events-as-news whose date of dissemination as news is determined by the reporters. Likewise, Tuchman pays attentions to the aspect of how an event is scheduled. That is,

Most hard news stories concern prescheduled events (a debate on a legislative bill) or unscheduled events (a fire). Newsmen do not decide when stories about prescheduled and unscheduled events-as-news are to be disseminated. [...] Members of the news enterprise almost always control the timing and flow of work required to process soft news stories. [...] A reporter may be assigned to these stories days in advance, and the specific information to be
included in the story may be gathered, written, and edited days before its eventual dissemination (1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 180).

This examination demonstrates that news organisations should prepare a clear policy of involving reporters in news events according to their status. However, such compromise through division of responsibility is unlikely to settle conflict between specialists and generalists. Because of the advantage of the beat, sharing a beat with other reporters easily triggers conflict between colleagues, even if he/she is specialist who has been generalist. An environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001), who has been a beat reporter in the Ministry of the Environment as a generalist, described the difficulty in reconciling conflict. Even if he routinely checked the beat of the Ministry of the Environment, he had to stop doing so because of the anxiety of his junior reporter, the present beat reporter. The latter was anxious about sharing information with him, believing this could shrink his role and reduce his chance of exclusive news stories. This conflict between specialists and generalists can be an intrinsically territorial jurisdiction conflict. According to Tuchman’s examination, the winner of this conflict may be the beat reporter of the physical location rather than the topical specialist. Tuchman states that “topical specialists are subordinate to territorial editors” (1978: 30).

The ambiguity of beat jurisdiction can easily lead to conflicts between reporters. Organising beat jurisdiction and reconciling or negotiating jurisdiction conflicts are manifest responsibilities of news organisations. Even if news organisations can develop general rules to resolve the conflicts caused by overlapping coverage, it cannot anticipate all possible problems. Tuchman (1978: 30) notes that if news organisations generate concrete delineations of responsibility, it could impede them from responding to unanticipated situations and problems in the everyday world. In this way, flexible negotiation is an organisational necessity. According to Tuchman, this
negotiation requires "a great deal of flexibility on the part of reporters and editors" (Tuchman, 1978: 30). Jurisdiction conflict is closely related to control over the specialist. This issue will be explored later.

5.1.4 Duty

As examined above, the beat in Korean journalism is admitted as sovereign territory of the beat reporter. Yet at the same time, it is recognised as a duty or burden. Even if the beat is essential and beneficial for newsgathering, it sometimes charges some burdens for journalists. If reporters want to take advantage of beats, it is their job to take responsibility of routine duties at beats.

As noted before, some news organisations provide a beat monopoly for specialists who are former senior generalists. In this case, specialists do not need to worry about conflict caused by beat jurisdiction. A news executive evaluated this type of specialist status as "the monopolistic right over the primary property of a reporter" (JJS, interviewed 2001). However, this policy has another problem, that of the routine duties of beat reporters.

In spite of securing an exclusive right to the beat, some journalists interviewed insisted that specialists should be exempted from routine duties related to beats. Not surprisingly, all specialists strongly contended it, and three of generalists agreed with this approach. The routine duties of the beat result from the dependence on the official information issued by the beat, where most newsgathering activities are conducted. A senior generalist who is a beat reporter of the criminal court retorted that "without the beat system, is it possible to cover news events?" (N & B, March 2000). According to him, if reporters ignore the beat, they are simply alienated from the information pool. However, they have to pay the price for routinely checking everything that occurs on the beat, which is the most important routine duty of beat reporters (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001). These routine duties of the beat
could inhibit beat reporters from focusing on the feature stories rather than 'news'. The beat reporters are, consequently, restricted to issues provided and developed by the beat (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). They are unlikely to cover a feature story, which needs broad and various approaches to the relevant subjects. In this sense, they require specialists' exemption from the beat routine duties so as to expand their interests. A medical specialist elaborated that:

A specialist's job is to produce a 'non-news' style of reporting rather than 'news'. For this job, a specialist does not have to and should not be attached to the beat routine duties. The routine duties of the beat are, in fact, so enormous that the beat reporter cannot produce these pieces of reporting except 'news'. The beat reporter has to spend nearly all working hours at the location checking happenings of the beat. In this situation, the beat reporter cannot be free from the bureaucratic sources of the beat, from selection of the news items to judgement of news values (KYS, interviewed 2001).

A senior generalist pointed out that the beat system is to compartmentalise newsgathering activities, which prohibits reporters from investigating in-depth reporting. According to him,

News swiftly flows the current of the river of news events. The beat system is a method of keeping reporters observing compartmentalised areas according to physical location. However, reporters cannot grasp the whole story of news events without following down the current of the river of news events (N & B, September 1999: 91).

Beat coverage is, therefore, a dilemma for specialists. While the beat provides important information, it simultaneously restricts a reporter's activities. An environmental specialist elaborated that:
With my experience, the problem of the beat is the most difficult dilemma for a specialist. Even if the beat is a pool of information, to treat a number of occurrences at the beat leads me to sticking to daily routines of the beat. Furthermore, to be a beat reporter indicates a heavy responsibility of being aware of competitive colleagues from the other companies. Under this situation, it is impossible to cover feature stories demanding a long-term approach (JHS, interviewed 2001).

Although most Korean newspapers acknowledge that the dilemma surrounding the beat may be a consequence of heavy dependence on the beat system in newsgathering activities, this practice is very unlikely to be reformed. Some news organisations’ trials to exempt specialists from the beat duties have failed (N & B, March 2000). Most trials have focused on reforming the newsgathering activities from the beat-centred practices to a topic-centred task team strategy. This reform is, however, limited to a few subjects such as health, education, or lifestyle, and not applied to hard news areas such as politics, economics, and home news, the so called the major desks. “This reform could generate a negative knock-on-effect on the beat-centred existing newsgathering routines”, according to a managing editor (N & B, March 2000). The topic-centred task team strategy has resulted in reporters ignoring the main sources of the beats, and so news stories have failed to develop. A senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001) pointed out that team reporters turn back to the beat rather than investigating the other sources resulting in inefficiency.

The inefficiency of a topic-centred task team strategy is also identified in another study. Hansen et al.’s (1998: 803-821) study elaborates that the team system predominantly affects the news process negatively. According to their study, under the team system, the production time needed to put the paper together has increased. A team system does not enhance the ability to meet deadlines because journalists spend more time in meetings. Furthermore,
journalists tend to not have a clear idea about who makes the final decision about their work.

Besides routine beat duties, routine office work is another type of routine duty for reporters. Typical office work duties are composed of a night duty and desk assistance. Night duty deals with unexpected events during the night, thereby requiring reporters to stay in the newsroom office through the night. Desk assistance is carried on in the daytime, where journalists have to stay in the newsroom all day long in order to help news executives, by dealing with fax messages, rewriting updated news from the news agency, answering phones, or liaising with colleagues outside the office. Reporters on office duty cannot concentrate on their own work, and regard this duty as cumbersome to their newsgathering activity.

It is difficult to delineate a decisive pattern for imposing specialist office work. Two thirds of generalists in this study suggested that specialists, especially former experts, should take on this duty as generalists do, and specialists who were former senior generalists or news executives should be relieved from this duty. In fact, a medical specialist (KYH, 214: 31005), formerly a medical doctor, does all the duties including supporting night duty for the Home news desk even if he belongs to the Cultural desk. Office work duty is assumed to be a basic role to be applied to every reporter. A senior generalist held that “specialists have to share office work duty because it is essentially the basic job of journalists to deal with the news production process” (KOH, interviewed 2001).

The problem here is not whether to exclude specialists from such duty, but the specialist’s capacity dealing with the duty. This is also because the specialists from former experts have low level of newsgathering skills. A senior generalist elaborated the importance of taking office duty in that:

I am the beat reporter of the Ministry of Construction. In particular issues of
real estate are my main subjects. However, as night duty, I should deal with very delicate and cross over issues irrelevant to my area. Yesterday, the National Assembly required a delay of the bankruptcy declaration of D Construction Corp., one of the major construction companies in Korea. This is not solely an economic issue, but also a political one. As night duty, I have to decide the value of this development even if I can discuss it with the beat reporter of this issue. I thought the first brief news should go to the local edition of tomorrow, and then a brief analysis could be delivered into the economic page with a report from the reporter of the National Assembly of the Politics desk. I required the Politics desk to submit it in 30 minutes to meet the deadline of the following day’s city edition (KDH, interviewed 2001).

This illustrates that night duty is never a simple job for specialists of former experts to deal with such in a short time. This is also asserted by two focus group discussions (FJAK focus group discussion 2001; FUMH, focus group discussion 2001). Most discussants, all of them are generalists, assumed that it is hard for expert-rooted specialists to deal with such work due to lack of experience. They emphasised the training period for apprentice generalists. For more than 6 months, training is comprised of basic skills in news production from interviewing sources, taking notes, reporting to their senior, dealing with sources, writing brief news, to presenting their own columns. However, the most important point that discussants focused on is the fact that this training is conducted by engaging in real newsgathering activities, and something which expert-rooted specialists have not had.

However, some proponents of specialist office duties saw this as a way for expert specialists to learn basic newsgathering skills, even if not enough to compete with generalists, and to enable them to adapt to news organisational routines. Interestingly, several specialists also consented with this attitude. A medical specialist, formerly a medical doctor, mentioned about office work policy that:
Now I am free from daily office work. However, at the beginning of my specialist work, my news executives ordered me to do every routine work, including office duty as do the generalists. The reason was to learn how to cope with the development of news events and to have an understanding of the neighbouring subjects. I had to take part in every desk meeting (KCJ, interviewed 2001).

Specialists doing office duties is seen as a form of reporter training. Some generalists disagreed with this stance. They thought that a specialist's job is different from that of a generalist, so specialists do not have to learn a generalist's work. According to them, the capacity of dealing with neighbouring issues is more closely related to the generalists' job rather than that of the specialist. A senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) maintained that there is no need to bring specialists into this duty since specialists normally focus upon commentary or analysis, not on-the-spot news or brief news. Exemption from routine duty is considered to provide specialists with flexibility of newsgathering activities. Supporters for specialist exemption from routine duty assumed that flexibility enables the specialist system to become more established.

There is another position. A managing editor was decisive about applying the same policy of duties to both specialists and generalists. He stated that "although the discriminatory policy of routine duty can be applied to the specialists according to the situation, basically it depends on how many journalists we can retain" (KYJ, interviewed 2001). If a news organisation has enough reporters to organise a separate policy for specialists, it deserves to take advantage of specialists by focusing on their speciality. It implies that the policy of office work duty for specialists is not always a problem of managerial choice, but can be one of scarcity of human resources. Specialists' exemption from duties is unlikely to be possible because of various reasons.
To sum up, newsgathering routines, especially those of the beat, are of important interest to journalists. The routines provide duties as well as benefits. Division of responsibility between generalists and specialists can resolve conflict. Negotiation seems possible depending on how a news organisation sets the relationship between a specialist and the established routines of news production.

One important feature of the routines may be the general newsgathering skills. If a news organisation exempts a specialist from routine duties, then it is assumed that the specialist does not have to stick to general skills. By contrast, those skills are normally demanded for generalists. This case implies that a specialist can be alienated from routines of the news organisational culture. The dilemma of the routines relates to how to establish and assimilate the identity of specialism into the news organisational culture.

Shoemaker and Reese say that “the routines form a cohesive set of rules and become integral parts of what it means to be a media professional” (1996: 106). The routines are sometimes presented to the members of a news organisation as an institution that regulates journalists’ work. Routines may be omnipresent within a news organisation, so it seems to be hard for journalists to disregard them in practice. Yet, regarding specialism in Korean journalism, the routines can be differently applied to journalists according to their own responsibilities. Specialist routines are also delicate issues in organising them in the newsgathering process, which is discussed in the next.

5.2 Routines of Organising Journalists

5.2.1 Organisational Control

Breed (1955) takes a functionalist approach to control in the newsroom. According to him, there are six factors to control the newsroom: institutional
authority and sanctions, feelings of obligation and esteem for superiors, mobility aspirations, absence of conflicting group allegiance, the pleasant nature of the activity, and news value. These factors appear to be related to maintaining a news organisation's capacity for organising and regulating reporters. These also refer to the socialisation of journalists by creating conformity. Breed explains that:

[A journalist] identifies himself through the existence of these six factors with the executives and veteran staffers. Although not yet one of them, he shares their norms, and thus his performance comes to resemble theirs. He conforms to the norms of policy rather than to whatever personal beliefs he brought to the job, or to ethical ideals (1955, in Boyd-Barret and Newbold 1995: 280).

This points out that making news is highly dependent upon a news organisation's norms to control journalists. Even if news is apparently an individual journalist's product, a journalist's activity, however, presupposes interactions, compromises, or conflicts with their management group. News products are inevitably influenced by the news organisation's control, that is, management control. With regards to organising journalists for news production, the management such as news executives or the editors intend to exert control over its journalists. Specialists are also not exempted from this. Tunstall (1971: 106-107) demonstrates that specialists experience the highest tension in dealing with news executives and desks.

Management is responsible for monitoring news workers and making sure that their contributions to media content support the ideological or economic objectives of ownership (Napoli, 1997: 213). Managerial control is required for the purpose of organisational efficiency to cope with environmental change, for instance caused by new technology. Tjernstrom (2000: 156) demonstrates that the context in which media companies are active can be defined in terms of the pace of change in the environment, the degree of
uncertainty, and its phase of development. Emphasis on control system is presented especially when the environment is constantly experiencing change such as the digital media environment. Management in media companies in this context needs to revise its control system in order to deal with tasks where technology is constantly changing, where work methods are continually improved, and demands on output are ever more demanding. Managerial control is, thus, one news organisational method directed at improving efficiency (Shoemaker and Reese, 1996: 108).

There are several contexts to legitimate management control over journalists. One of the well-known theories is the agency theory. Napoli (1997: 207-219) assumes that management is an agency of the owner; management controls employees for the purpose of realising organisational goals on behalf of the owner. Provided that news organisations are broken down into three hierarchical arrangements such as ownership, management, and employees, management has two different levels of relationships with the owner and employees. According to Napoli (1997: 212), however, the managers are of the same mind as the ownership. The ownership creates greater congruence of objectives between ownership and management to keep their relationship, and management keeps the role of the ownership's agency with control over journalists. In this case, the control assumes an oppressive power over journalists.

On the contrary, Tjemstrom (2000: 153-164) suggests another reason for management control in terms of organising labour resources. According to him, management is, firstly, the nerve centre of its organisational units. Management is active in gathering, storing, moving, sharing, processing, and disseminating information. Management controls the organisation and members of the organisation with formal and informal information. Secondly, for this purpose, the managerial class is someone who controls the individual workers in the labour process. More substantially, managers co-ordinate
Half of the generalists and two specialists interviewed supported control over specialists to some extent. Even conceding the need for differing specialist status and expectations, they argued that this differentiation should be conducted within teamwork. Their argument is related to the assumption that specialists do not normally co-operate with other reporters. Those interviewed assumed that this causes conflicts between generalists and specialists during the news production process. They insisted that desk news executives should be responsible for teamwork by resolving this conflict. One way to resolve this problem is to take control over the specialist. A sub-managing editor indicated the priority of teamwork over the individual speciality as:

Even though specialists are employed on the basis of their speciality, they have to comply with the basic policies of the news organisation from editing principles to routine activity. In order to follow these policies, to keep teamwork stable is the most essential task. If speciality is overemphasised, teamwork could be destroyed. Accordingly, specialists should be accustomed to build up teamwork (CSH, interviewed 2001).

A senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001) regards teamwork as one the basic rules of journalists as members of a newsroom. Specialism can weaken teamwork at hard news desks. A news executive recognised that “the specialist system based on individual newsgathering style can destroy teamwork of some desks dealing with straight news or hard news which requires an intensively interrelated co-operation among the colleagues” (JJS, interviewed 2001).

Poor teamwork can worsen the relationship between specialists and generalists. For instance, two medical specialists of the same newspaper were
criticised by their senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001) for failing to co­operate with generalists during the Health care reform dispute in 1999-2000. According to this senior generalist, the two medical specialists should have brought relevant reporting to the desk, even if there were no clear orders to cover the issue from the desk. He argued that they must have known how to cope with this case. Provided that they had been trained in generalist routines during their apprenticeships, he concluded that specialists appear to dislike hard news events, which usually require producing brief news at speed. He understood that specialists are individual workers rather than team workers. However, one of the medical specialists blamed above rebuked that "generalists’ routines for co-operation are too strict for me to meet their request" (KYH, interviewed 2001). This indicates that teamwork routines can restrict the individual work and flexibility of specialists.

Making journalists conform to routines can be regarded as one of the ways of socialising the members of a news organisation. While some specialists would like to be free from this routine, as seen at the case of medical specialists who failed to cooperate with generalists, news executives try to encourage specialists to follow generalist routines, which are considered general rules applicable to both types of reporters. Such news executives’ approach appears to be related to specialists’ socialisation. Socialisation is linked with organisational culture. As held by Schein, "organisational culture is a mechanism of social control and it can be the basis of explicitly manipulating members into perceiving, thinking, and feeling in certain ways" (1992: 13). The management control over specialists is a way of socialisation.

A music specialist (LJJ, interviewed 2001) held that a conflict with his news executive is the most serious problem. His news executive forces him to conform to generalist routines. The background of this specialist seems to be related to the conflict. His deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) indicated that the music specialist would not change his working style of a
freelance music critic. The music specialist admitted that friction may result from the gap of newsgathering practices between a freelance critic and a newspaper reporter. News executives require specialists to conform to the working mechanism of a news organisation such as meeting a deadline, keeping objectivity, or distinguishing several types of reporting. Yet, a specialist may desire more flexible newsgathering activities such as more time to deal with events, more freedom of evaluating news events, and being free from the existing organisational practices.

This gap of attitudes between the specialist and the generalist can lead generalists to mistrust the specialist. Another music specialist (KIM, interviewed 2001), a former critic and classical singer, talked about severe discord with his news executives. His executive would not permit him to utilise his own criteria for judging news events, as he has done for more than 15 years as a critic. The news executive forced him to follow 'journalistic practices, not that of a freelance'. An arts specialist, a former senior generalist, warned about the problem of the individual style of specialists. "An individual newsgathering style can bring about a problem in co-operation with generalists" (LY, 226: 31307). His statement clearly suggested that there is a significant tendency that generalists would never admit specialists' outstanding performance beyond general routines. A medical specialist, formerly a medical doctor and now working for the Home news desk, elaborated on the breach of attitudes between specialists and generalists when dealing with news events:

*News executives want me to exaggerate the issue when composing articles. This approach causes me to confront with executives. I argued the problem of accuracy. In this case, I have never won the debate. The gap between us is too considerable to reach compromise. I know that this confrontation leads executives and generalist colleagues to mistrust specialists. If I deal with a certain issue in the manner of in-depth investigation, the executive of the Home*
news desk tells me to bring it to the Culture desk, not to the Home news desk. He regards this type of reporting as a soft story, not news. Otherwise, he kills it (HHK, interviewed 2001).

HHK's complaints that news executives treated him as a generalist and did not acknowledge his speciality led him to think about leaving his job.

Most executives do not seem to be satisfied with specialists who are former experts without training in journalistic routines even if their advantages are undeniable. Negrine's examination here suggests a significant point. He sees specialists as "a particular category of journalist who 'has developed an expertise interest' rather than one who comes to his/her (original) specialism with that expertise or interest already developed" (1996: 85). Negrine's definition, in this way, places more emphasis on the established news organisational routines rather than the specialised knowledge or skill itself. This supports the argument of that managerial control over specialists who are the former experts is necessary. In other words, specialists who are recruited from former senior generalists are seen as highly satisfactory.

Negrine's observation, on the other hand, indicates that news organisational control over specialists starts from a designation of reporters. Designation is one of the typical management behaviours of news organisations. It serves to allocate resources for news production, which is the first step in the entire spectrum of journalist management. Negrine demonstrates that:

The news organisation does play a part in designating specialist areas and in allocating specialist correspondents. It may build up an area (education, media, law) because it wishes to bring in new readers and/or advertising revenue; it may decide which of its reporters is best suited to cover that area; it might decide which areas are of interest to its readers and in keeping with the traditions of the paper. All these decisions are in the main made by executives,
though specialists will retain some power to determine the actual contours of
their designated area (1996: 84).

This power of designation enables a news organisation to organise journalists
and to charge them with responsibilities. The way of designating specialist is
probably related to how specialists develop their speciality. Recruiting experts
externally as specialists eventually produces the different results from the case
of recruiting them internally. The way of recruiting, thus, depends on the
focus of management strategies. If the designation or recruitment of
specialists is related to the managerial strategy of a news organisation, then the
issue of organisational control is how the news organisation operates this
system. How do news organisations develop it, and what is the most
significant factor to develop it? While designation could be a step to introduce
specialism, organising specialists for newsgathering activities may be a stage for
embedding it into a news organisation. When it approaches this issue in line
with organisational management, the 'flexibility' or 'autonomy' of a specialist
seems to be the critical factor.

5.2.2 Specialists' Autonomy

Flexibility is likely to be prior to autonomy. It is, in general, an ability to
conduct something without breaking basic rules. Flexibility can be understood
as letting people who have the necessary skills undertake different tasks,
possibly in different situations, in accordance with their needs (Armstrong,
1991: 697). Whereas, autonomy is “the capacity to be self-governing, self-
controlling and to be able to act in an independent manner” (Watson & Hill,
1997: 12). Autonomy is, therefore, defined as the extent to which one is
committed to one's profession as one of the key elements in supporting a sense
of attachment to a profession (Russo, 1998: 75). Flexibility, in this sense,
appears to be a rather prerequisite action for achieving autonomy.

A specialist's flexibility in the news production process is based on the intrinsic aspect of newsgathering activities: non-routine unpredictability (Tunstall, 1971; Soloski, 1989). Tunstall (1971: 25) argues that editorial news organisations have a basically non-routine character. According to him,

Non-routine work favours an unclear authority structure, shallow hierarchy, and broad lateral span. The emphasis on innovation and creativity requires quick communication with the top – and hence non-routine work follows a shapeless, or apparently 'chaotic' arrangement (1971:28).

As a result of the unpredictability of the news production process, journalists normally deal with exceptional news events, with the news value of 'exceptionality'. In this situation, the hierarchy or bureaucracy may be unclear, hence it follows a 'shapeless' or apparently 'chaotic' arrangement. This examination implies that journalists cannot deal with non-routine situations without flexibility in their activities. Provided that specialists are not the beat reporters in Korean journalism, they seem to deal with more non-routine situations or work than generalists. An environmental specialist indicated that a specialist's job is to produce issues not bound by beat, but which cross over the beats.

When I was a beat reporter of the Ministry of the Environment, my job description was rather simple. Around 9 a. m., I arrived at the beat reporter's room of the beat. First work was to check my pigeon-hole of press releases. With information based on these press releases, I reported news items to the desk. During the morning, I checked several offices at the beat. This work was shared with my junior reporter. Normally I decided what issue was the main news of the day. I had dinner with officials of the beat talking about relevant issues to the beat. At 2 or 3 p. m., I wrote and sent reports that would
be finished by 4 or 4:30 p.m. After sending my reports, I met bureaucrats to discover news items for the next day. In a word, a generalist charging a beat can hardly travel out of the beat routines. However, a specialist is expected to produce news stories of inter-beats. For instance on the issue of dam construction in the National Park Forest area, now I have to cover the offices from the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Construction, the Ministry of the Interior, the Forest Office, the Ministry of Industry & Resources, and the Department of Local Government. Without flexibility, I cannot approach to this kind of news (JHS, interviewed 2001).

From this statement, it can be inferred that specialism under the current practices of the beat system of Korean journalism is highly restricted in terms of flexibility of newsgathering activities. He insisted that specialists should be given much broader flexibility than generalists, if news organisations intend to cope with the challenges of the new media environment. News quality cannot be achieved without the flexibility of a specialist's newsgathering activities. Such a specialist attitude indicates that two different features coexist in the beat practices of Korean journalism. One is a definitely advantageous aspect, in that it functions as an information-pool and makes efficient contacts with important sources. The other is an aspect of burden, as examined earlier. In return for these advantages, beat reporters have to tie themselves to the beat, and sacrifice other work. This situation suggests that beat practices of Korean journalism, to a significant extent, disturb the implementation of specialism.

A specialist's beat relationship can be approached in terms of flexibility, given that the beat restrictions and beat burdens could limit a specialist's flexibility. The argument on flexibility is also identified in a survey conducted by the JAK. According to this survey (JAK, 25th September 2000), flexibility in newsgathering activities was suggested as the most essential feature of specialists. As examined at the discussion of specialist's duty, most journalists
pointed out that routine activities should be reduced in order to enlarge flexibility of specialists.

Especially when specialism is a strategic choice of a newspaper to compete with the Internet challenge, specialist flexibility is possibly a more critical issue. Habann (2000: 17) maintains that strategies in an effort to coping with the new media are closely related to the flexibility of the members of a news organisation. Whether or not the new media business succeeds largely depends on the flexibility of business and personnel management, whereas traditional media business focuses on stabilisation. This is particularly because new media business is more dynamic than that of the old media. On the Internet, time sequence is destroyed by a de-linearised value chain as observed earlier in Chapter 3. Flexibility, here, has a relation to time management. Limited time is a critical restriction in the newspaper production process. Castells (1996: 437) maintains that the skilled labour of the information age is required to manage its own time in a flexible manner. It has to enjoy a broad extent of latitude, sometimes adding more work time, at other times, adjusting to flexible schedules, and in some instances, reducing working hours. He indicates that the ability of organisations to adapt to market demands and technological changes is at the root of their competitiveness.

A senior generalist also agreed with flexible working practices, especially deadlines. Established deadlines can discourage journalists from investigating news stories further. He argued that:

Internet news produces incessant news stories. Of course, Internet news is different from newspaper news in many points. However, the problem is the way of producing news not news itself. Given that a newspaper has to keep two or three deadlines a day, reporters have to meet the deadline times. The importance of specialists is here: a newspaper has to invent a new field beyond the daily deadline routine. While Internet news generates news ceaselessly, it
is hard to find some historical and structural stories from them. If a news organisation expects this kind of news from specialists, they should be able to enjoy flexible deadlines and flexible activities free from desk control (JJH, interviewed 2001).

However, it is unlikely that flexibility is enough for specialists to develop reporting different from that of generalists. While flexibility can be seen as adaptability to newsgathering activities, autonomy is a concept opposite to control. As stated by Russo (1998: 75), autonomy on the job has long been a key factor for a definition of professionalism since it refers to the extent to which one is committed to one’s profession. Autonomy on the job is especially important for journalists. According to some studies, it refers to how much autonomy journalists have in assuring coverage of stories they feel should be covered, selecting the particular stories on which they work, and deciding which aspects of a story should be covered (Johnstone et al., 1976; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986, 1996).

Most journalists interviewed acknowledged that this aspect of autonomy relates to the independence of a specialist, a concept that is the opposite of managerial control. An arts specialist pointed out that:

If there is only one reason for becoming a specialist, it must be independence: independence from the control of executives, independence from daily routines, independence from organisational work, independence from regular competitors at beat. A journalist is essentially an ‘author’ in the end. As an author, I have always dreamed of writing articles about what I want to write solely in my own way. This sort of independence was, in fact, highly unlikely before specialism (LY, interviewed 2001).

Pollard discovers that more professional newsworkers, who focus on one specific area, exhibit more job satisfaction than less professional co-workers.
He argues that "greater job codification may be seen as a threat to effective newswork activities, especially among older, more educated, and more experienced newspaper workers" (1995: 692). Hansen et al. also maintain that "reporters with highly specialised beat knowledge may develop autonomy from editors who cannot match reporters' subject expertise" (1998: 804). Specialist journalism based on broader autonomy and independence leads to more job satisfaction, which is consistent with the results of this study. This discovery deduces that specialists prefer intrinsic rewards for job satisfaction, typically autonomy, to extrinsic factors such as payment or promotion as mentioned by Pollard.

This exploration also appears to be identified in Tunstall's (1996) study. Tunstall sees that specialists such as star journalists have a high degree of autonomy. This autonomy in turn restricts the exercise of editorial power. The editor exercises control by retaining strategic power and having the power to sign contracts. He elaborated that:

Once the editor (and news editor) assigns a journalist to one of these specialist roles they ask and expect him or her to acquire specialist expertise. The specialist then quickly acquires a considerable element of control over the day's choice of story; typically the specialist would tell the news desk executives what he or she proposed to cover that day and, more times than not, the desk people would agree (Tunstall, 1996: 158).

Specialists normally have complete control over their space and are subject to only the most minimal sub-editing. This suggests that the specialist's autonomy is effective across most of the range of news production routines. Specialists are not even subject to normal editorial constraints. Given the benefits of time and space (Tunstall, 1996), this autonomy in routines permits a specialist to develop his/her specialised subject. It can be argued that these
elements of autonomy and advantages of time and space are the basic characteristics of a specialist.

5.2.3 Compromises between Control and Autonomy

From these examinations, it can be inferred that news organisation would like to maintain control over specialists as a method of organising them, whereas specialists try to preserve their autonomy even if this could never be totally achieved. The organisational norm is different from the individual journalist's norm, particularly the specialist's norm. As identified by this study, many studies have analysed this aspect of conflict between news organisations' control and journalists' autonomy.

Specialists employ several apparatus for sustaining their autonomy. Firstly specialists would like to strictly organise their standards. Fincham and Rhodes (1992: 282-283) argue that specialists guard their monopoly of knowledge and mystify their knowledge in order to make it appear that there are other indefinable skills. Secondly, specialists have their own ethics such as standards and norms of behaviour, stressed by the highly distinctive and integrated nature of their occupational cultures. They share a common sense of identity and values, and consensus as regards their social role (Fincham and Rhodes, 1992: 282).

With autonomy, specialists can retain an independent power base in a confrontation with management. The tenet of specialism limits management's control, related to the news production process (Soloski, 1989: 215). According to Kepplinger and Kocher (1990: 293), the specialist's standards, on the one hand, regulate the behaviour of the specialist group according to generally accepted principles. On the other hand, they serve to protect the specialist group from outside forces.
This self-defending feature of specialist autonomy is linked to conflicts between news executives and specialist journalists. News executives normally try to control individual journalists in terms of managing news organisations through hierarchy in the newsroom. Tunstall (1971: 107) identifies that specialists undergo tensions from the way in which competitive and other pressures are channelled through the news organisation. This managerial control is exerted by the routines of the news production process. Rock (1973: 73) holds that news is the result of an organised response to routine bureaucratic problems such as the need to produce material according to strict limits on space and timing.

More basically, one of the causes of conflict may be the bureaucratic routine in news production. McNair (1994) argues that news organisations constrain journalists' ability to gather news, influence journalistic practices, and then control the news form and content by the routines. For the purpose of adapting to this constraint, journalists usually internalise news organisational demands. Journalists tend to compromise their autonomy with news organisational control. This indicates that there is a power relation between news executives and journalists. Accordingly, the degree of flexibility or autonomy of specialism is possibly contingent on such a power relation between them. A question is, here, how news organisations successfully set power boundaries or autonomy between them.

However, news organisations and individual journalists are not always in confrontation with each other. Even if the power struggle of specialists may be an attempt to preserve their identity, their identity does not essentially collide with the news organisation. A specialist’s identity cannot be established without a news organisation in practice. Zoonen's analysis of organisational identity (1998: 137-138) explains the aspect of co-operation between them. Journalists construct their identity through negotiating with the organisational structure. The concept of organisational identities, thus,
implicates that the journalists are a kind of organisational people or team players. In spite of this negotiating aspect, organisational power usually restricts journalist subjectivity since specific organisational policies and budgets, routines, and market needs are intersected by discourses of subjectivity. That is, the organisational identities are comprised of both individual journalists' styles or preferences and the structural imperatives of the news organisation. Zoonen presents the concept of the organisational identities in reference to specialism in journalism that:

Thus, a journalist who moves from one kind of journalism to another is expected to find her or his place and to develop a kind of organisational identity that meets the new requirements of specialism and organisation. (1998: 138)

Journalists would like to negotiate with news organisations to find and materialise their identity. This implies that journalists are intrinsically destined to look for security of their identity while news organisations also have their own logic to control journalists. Hence, news organisations develop a compromising policy in an effort to resolve conflict. News organisations establish a different role and division of responsibility between generalists and specialists. One of the methods is to establish a separate space for specialists and to separate the control tower.

The majority of specialists interviewed, on the one hand, contended that separate spaces for specialists can develop their competitiveness. An IT specialist (KTH, interviewed 2001) mentioned that a specialist’s speciality cannot be presented in the traditional manner of pagination, so separate spaces from this tendency should be allowed for the specialist. A music specialist (LJJ, 225: 31303) also demonstrated the problem when unable to present his speciality. He argued that:
In fact, specialists do not have so many advantages compared with generalist. It must be in a few points. The effect of the specialist is to add a small amount of distinction to the generalists. To make this difference efficient, I think specialists should be provided separate spaces. That is, it is not easy for specialists to develop their speciality competing with generalists in such circumstances (LJJ, interviewed 2001).

Most specialists in this study pointed out that separate spaces for their columns and reports may be a basic condition to prove a specialist's identity. Specialists particularly require a separate column space. Some generalists agreed with that this enables the specialist system to become embedded (KYM, senior generalist interviewed 2001). When specialists focus on analysis or investigative reporting, allowing separate spaces for them is to enhance the competitiveness of newspaper.

However, not all specialists are allowed in reality. This study found that there is a difference in the allowance of separate space between former experts and former senior generalists. A medical specialist (KYH, interviewed 2001), formerly a medical doctor, had been asking for separate column space for 2 years until he was allowed it. By contrast, an arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) of the same newspaper, a former senior generalist, was entitled to individual column space as soon as he was designated a specialist. Generally speaking, the separate column space is likely to be allowed to the specialist who is the former senior generalist.

Opponents for separate spaces for specialists, who are mostly generalists, suggested basic skill problems of specialists recruited from experts. A junior generalist observed that:

I do not agree with separate spaces for specialists. In the case of my company, specialists, the former experts, were favoured by the organisations in the early days of this system. Regardless of the quality of reporting, specialists'
reporting had to be preferred to that of the generalists. That was done in order to root the system. However, their reporting was so low in basic quality. They were ignorant of the timing and lack of density to deliver all relevant stories into one article (KCH, interviewed 2001).

This is also argued by a deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) of the same company as this generalist. He criticised the specialists' column for 'delivering lectures' or 'writing a history book'. Yet again, the problem is the lack of basic skills of the expert specialists. A senior generalist also noted that separate spaces do not guarantee quality reporting (KDH, interviewed 2001). This argument suggests a doubt about the competitiveness of specialist reporting (JSH, a deputy managing editor interviewed 2001). Generalists' resentment for separate space is also related to the limit of spaces. As mentioned by a senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001), even if separate spaces for specialists are preferable, the lack of spaces in practice can restrict it. A senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001) suggested a competition for space between specialists and generalists. If specialists' reporting is judged to have a higher quality than that of generalists, then that reporting automatically takes a separate space.

Competition for space might be related to whether the specialists have distinctive subject areas. A junior generalist's (CUS, interviewed 2001) recognition on who the specialist is explains the specialist's identity. According to him, a specialist is a reporter who has a definite and specific subject area of his/her own. The distinguished subject area permits specialists to enjoy a kind of monopoly in the subject. For instance, a medical specialist of this junior generalist's company contended that "I have never experienced conflicts with colleagues regarding spaces because they admit that the medical subject is a untouchable area for them" (KCJ, interviewed 2001). He added that he can produce any news stories related to medicine and bring them any pages. With this flexibility of accessing news events, he can improve the
quality of news stories. He described that "the more references and evidence, the better quality of news items". This case is unusual in that generalists clearly agree and accept the specialist's subject. Flexible access to news events and spaces can bring up the potential of a specialist's speciality. From this evidence, the clear perception of the specialist's subject in a news organisation creates an acceptance of separate space.

Different control tower system is suggested as a way of resolving conflict; this indicates that specialists should be under the control of the editorial board, while generalists are controlled by desk news executives. Most specialists interviewed assumed that if specialists are under the control of the editorial board, they can benefit from a wider latitude in newsgathering activities, and have greater autonomy, whereas fixing them to a desk emphasises the aspect of control over them. A medical specialist (HHK, interviewed 2001) complained that since four senior journalists of his Home news desk, including the executive, supervise his reporting, he has no chance to exercise his speciality.

Control by the Editor or the editorial board is seemingly looser than desk control. Most specialists who were senior generalists belong to the editorial board, so they normally take advantage of autonomy in their activities. An arts specialist stated that:

I am under the control of the editorial board. I submit my writing directly to the sub-managing editor bypassing the news executive of the Cultural desk. I have full power in newsgathering activities based on my own scheme so that I decide nearly everything from reporting and planning to news value judgements. Even though the editorial board is responsible for my activity, I have not been intervened by them. Instead, I am used to reporting something important if necessary (LY, interviewed 2001).

It seems difficult for news executives to manage this type of specialist since they are mostly journalists senior to the executives. An environmental specialist of
this type noted that seniority practices prohibit them from controlling these specialists. He maintained that:

I am a former news executive. Now my junior colleague is in charge of the desk. Because of the seniority practice, it is not a simple problem for the executives to supervise their senior journalists' activities. To resolve this problem, my company needs to create another board of the specialists which is comprised of senior specialists who have experienced news executives. This board can be controlled by the managing editor (JHS, interviewed 2001).

As observed earlier in Chapter 2, seniority practices are one of the most influential features dominating the routines of Korean journalism. JHS's observation exemplifies a typical aspect of the seniority system. Normally all apprentice reporters learn everything from their seniors about how to gather news information, from learning news stories to writing articles. This aspect of apprenticeship is also found in Anglo-American journalism. Sigelman (1973) sees that this apprenticeship is a means of socialisation. Sigelman states that "unquestionably, a process of 'anticipatory socialisation' is at work, with cub reporters attempting to tailor their own performances to the patterns set by their role models, the veterans" (1973, in Tumber 1999: 89). Through this contact with the veterans, junior reporters can solidify their general outlook on the reporter's roles as well as their specific attitudes towards organisational members and news production processes.

The socialisation process through apprenticeship seems more prominent in Korean journalism. During apprenticeship, the relationship is consolidated as between teacher and pupil or officers and men at personal as well as an organisational level (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001). Given this circumstance, it is unlikely to be possible for a junior journalist to supervise or even control his/her senior.
The problem of the desk control over specialists can also cause conflict between specialists and generalists within the desk. An IT specialist (KTH, interviewed 2001) who had been scouted from another company to specialise in the IT field was not senior journalist when he was designated a specialist. He also preferred the control of the editorial board to that of the news executive. He attested that:

When I work for the desk, I cannot have autonomy in my newsgathering activity due to various practices of the desk. If they are senior reporters to me, they are certain to restrain my latitude. Even if the executive would like to permit me to enjoy autonomy, the other generalist colleagues of the desk would never agree with it in practice. Of course, I would follow the practices in order to avoid conflicts with my colleagues. Instead, I have to pay a consequence for oppressing my speciality. The specialist should, therefore, be under the control of the editorial board (KTH, interviewed 2001).

He recommended a separate system for organising specialists, namely, a pool of specialists, supervised by a member of the editorial board.

A few specialists, of course, enjoy considerable autonomy even under the control of the desk news executives. A medical specialist (KYH, interviewed 2001) stated that even if he is a junior reporter, he decides all the steps of production from selecting news items to deciding final copy. A music specialist (KIM, interviewed 2001) also stated that, except for one case, he has been able to deal independently with the news. Such autonomy is possible because the news executives admit the specialist speciality and their advantages, as identified earlier in the case of KCJ, a medical specialist. By contrast, if a desk executive deals with specialists in line with generalist routines, this autonomy is likely to be abolished. This can occur when a desk executive has to consider the goal of the desk as a whole.
At the level of news production, news executive control is related to a need to organise a number of pieces of news reporting into an integrated product. News executives plan the composition of their assigned pages by operating and manoeuvring reporters belonging to the desks. For this purpose, they need to sift a lot of news occurrences in the light of newsworthy, sorted, categorised, and classified events. As maintained by Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 105-108), the routines of news production are designed to help the news organisation cope with the physical constraints of news production practices such as time and space.

Two thirds of generalists interviewed supported desk executives’ control over specialists. As indicated by a junior generalist (KCH, interviewed 2001), news executive control starts from how to divide a beat territory between the specialist and the generalist when specialists are under control of the desk. To orchestrate the roles of the specialist and the generalist is a division of labour. This focuses on co-ordinating journalist resources to keep a consistency and balance of all the articles and, moreover, of teamwork. Of these, orchestration of reporting may be placed as the top priority. A senior generalist argued that:

I cannot imagine news production without the news executive's intervention or control. A newspaper is not a simple congregation of a number of reports. For example, a medical news story in the lifestyle page should not support the claims of doctors when the top article in the front page criticises doctors. Even if the medical reporting is covered by the specialist, that is making one of the whole pages. In this sense, the news executive's deskwork is essential for gatekeeping the specialist's reporting. Deskwork is to exert quality control focusing on the cohesion of the pages (KOH, interviewed 2001).

The desk is the basic unit of news production. That is why the power of page designing belongs to the desk news executives (KHJ, senior generalist interviewed 2001). The control over reporters is, thus, the primary function of
the desk news executives. It denotes that the desk news executives should arrange all the newsgathering activities of the reporters of his/her desk. A senior generalist (KYM, interviewed 2001) noted that the desk news executive's control is an exercise across most steps of the newsgathering activities from the selection of news items to deciding a direction of reporting. An arts specialist also supported this approach. He is a former news executive of the Cultural desk.

Desk news executives have to deal equally with specialist reporting. The importance of specialist reporting can be found by comparing it with that of the generalists. It must be nonsense that specialist reporting should be preferred to other reporting without consideration of the comparison with generalist reporting (LY, interviewed 2001).

This type of control practice can lead news executives to ignore the difference with specialists. It seems a typical example that desk news executives dominate the decision making power when a collision occurs to evaluate news events between the executive and the journalist. This decision making also applies to the specialists so that their specialities are treated as no different to that of the generalists. An indifferent approach to the specialist eventually creates competition between specialists and generalists. A junior generalist (KCH, interviewed 2001) testified that a specialist ceased to develop in-depth news because of the desk news executive's close intervention in his newsgathering activity. According to him, the desk news executive had always required him to comply with generalist principles. This attitude seems to be linked to competition between specialist and generalist within the same desk, and this can eventually result in destroying the speciality. A senior generalist elaborated that:

If news executives or generalists assess the integrity of specialists by the
standards of the generalists, the specialists cannot have a chance to develop their specialities. However, the existing practices of news organisations intend to judge specialists with generalist viewpoints. Without specific criteria, specialists come to follow generalist norms. This leads specialists to focus on competition with the generalists (KDH, interviewed 2001).

Specialists' satisfaction in newsgathering activities could be lower when they are under desk control rather than editorial control. Pollard (1995: 690-691) concludes that perceptions of greater organisational control, such as more rule enforcement, lead to less job satisfaction, and more job codification means less job satisfaction. Although news executive control intends to impose more visible managerial policies on specialists, it does not do so since it could restrict specialist autonomy. Pollard observes that "typically, organisations emphasise routinised, predictable, and standardised activities that contribute to profitability, while professionalism emphasises excellence, ethical performance, and social responsibility" (1995: 682). These specified job codifications of organisational control seems to focus on making control over specialist observable. Tunstall (1971: 120-121) notes that "since observability so shapes the opportunities for organisational control, struggles for more autonomy will take the form partly of struggles to escape surveillance by the news organisation" (1971: 120). This study found that the control of desk news executives permits news organisations a wider observability in controlling specialists than that of the editorial board.

However, the existing news organisational culture seems to be too rigid to admit this different policy. According to the outcome of the survey in this study (Table 13), nearly two thirds of respondents supported the control of desk news executives (60.3%, n=79), while a third (33.6%, n=44) preferred editorial control. This result is similar to the outcome of the generalists' interviews as observed before. Ironically, on the autonomy of the specialist (Table 14), nearly two thirds (64.9%, n=85) of respondents agreed that the specialist should
have more autonomy than the generalist. Under a third (29.8%, n=39) asserted equal autonomy with the generalist. That is, journalists wanted specialists to have wider autonomy not under the control of the editorial board, but under the desk executive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>Control over Specialists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk News Executives</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Specialists' Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Autonomy than Generalists</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Control than Generalists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.*

This assumption can be identified by cross-tabulation of autonomy and control. Respondents supporting desk control with more autonomy were most frequent (Table 15). Those journalists in the survey considered that while a specialist's autonomy should be broader than that of a generalist, desk news executive control is unavoidable in practice.
<Table 15> Specialists’ Autonomy by Control over Specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialists' Autonomy</th>
<th>Control over Specialists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Autonomy than Generalists</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Control than Generalists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reality indicates that the basic unit of news production is certainly the desk. The news executives in charge of the desks regulate almost all the pages. While the editor can organise the pages, this is limited to general orchestration. The detail of controlling reporters depends on the desk news executives. Under this practice, the control of the editor is considered an unrealistic approach. An environmental specialist's commented on this reality as:

Because I belong to the editorial board under the control of the managing editor, I submit my writing to the sub managing editor. However, I think it has some problems in that my writings eventually go to the executive of the relevant desk. All the pieces of reporting are regulated in line with subject pages of the desks (JHS, interviewed 2001).

Based on these examinations, it seems that compromise between organisational control and specialist autonomy is hard to achieve in reality. However, this study noticed that if a specialist's subject area is clear and admitted by both generalists and desk news executives, whether specialists are under desk or editorial board control does not influence their autonomy. This finding has been found in several cases of medical specialists and music specialists. That is, compromise seems to be available only when specialists' identity is established within the news organisation.
Summary

Examinations of news organisational routines relate to two points. One is on the newsgathering routines, and the other relates to organising or controlling reporters. One of the typical routines of newsgathering activities is the beat system. Korean journalism's news production is characterised by heavy dependence upon the beat system. On the one hand, it is a system for the efficiency of newsgathering activities since various pieces of information are merged at the beat. The beat is thus a pool of information. The beat is assumed as the territory or property of reporters. However, the beat practice of Korean journalism is centred on generalists not specialists, and physical locations not subjects. Specialists are normally excluded from the beat, since their responsibility is divided by subject not physical location. Consequently, conflict between them appears to be inevitable.

The dependence on the beat, on the other hand, implies a burden for reporters. Beat reporters cannot escape from beat routines since they have to stay at beat nearly all day long. Specialists are usually exempted from the duties of these routines, because they are responsible for developing 'non-news' reporting which needs more flexibility. The conflict concerning beat benefits and burdens involves a division of responsibility between generalists and specialists. Most Korean journalists interviewed admitted that specialists should be free from the burden of routine duties just as they should investigate news events without beat conveniences. However, there is another problem: specialist’s beat relationships are dealt with differently in accordance with the types of recruiting. In principle, the expert-rooted specialists are excluded from beat access and also exempted from routine duties, whereas specialists recruited from senior generalists monopolise the beat. The ground for this distinction is the low level of newsgathering skills of the expert specialists.

Conflicts between specialists and news organisations also occur in the
routines of organising or controlling specialists. Normally news organisations control their reporters in terms of quality control of news products, while reporters seek flexibility and autonomy in their work. This confrontation is more salient in the case of specialists because their responsibilities of 'non-news' require much broader autonomy. The journalists interviewed suggested two different control tower systems: one is control under the desk executive, the other is by the editor or the editorial board. The former is supposed to be much stricter than the latter. However, news production is organised by the desk executive rather than the editor. Even if specialists are under editorial control, they have to be aware of the desk related to their subject, since desk executives have the primary power and right to organise and paginate news stories. Therefore, the desk is the basic unit of the news production process. From these examinations, conflicts between specialists and generalists or a news organisation do not seem to be easily resolved.

When the flexibility and autonomy of a specialist is related to the Internet environment, such restricted autonomy could be highly significant. The features of specialists' flexibility and autonomy seem to be directly linked to an efficiency of dealing with the de-linearised time sequence of the Internet (Castells, 1996; Habann, 2000). They insist that it is because new media like the Internet has characteristics of flexibility, while traditional media focuses on stability. This investigation indicates that the existing newspaper routines of newsgathering activities and controlling or organising specialists appear to limit the advantages of specialism.

So, specialism under the rigid news production routines of Korean journalism, on the one hand, does not seem to offer a sufficient solution to the Internet challenges. However, the example of a few medical specialists (KCJ and KYH), on the other hand, suggests a possibility of efficiency for specialism when coping with the Internet challenges. If a specialist's subject area is clearly acknowledged by his/her generalist colleagues and the news
organisation, conflict can be significantly relieved. These medical specialists enjoy flexibility and autonomy in the news production process, ranging from news selection to news value judgements. Owing to this autonomy, they held that they can develop differentiated news stories from the Internet and improve the quality of their news items.
Summary & Conclusion

ORGANISING SPECIALISTS

Throughout the analyses of Chapters 4 and 5, this study has investigated how news organisations establish and organise the specialist system and how specialism relates to the routines of the existing news organisational culture. This study analysed personnel management policy for specialists in Chapter 4, and the routines related to newsgathering activities and organising journalists in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 4, it found that many journalists interviewed would not admit preferential rewards for specialists. One the one hand, they denied preferential payment for internally recruited specialists who were formerly senior generalists, since they did not evaluate journalistic experience as a cause of preferential payment. On the other hand, they also declined to permit separate spaces for expert-rooted specialists because of a disbelief in their news writing skills. Particularly, the journalists interviewed paid attention to specialists recruited from the senior generalists inside a news organisation. An important point, here, is to establish an authoritative and institutionalised system for designation. This demand is related to resolving significant distrust in news organisations’ policy as well as protecting specialists’ identity. In personnel management policies, the more important aspect is how to evaluate specialism or access its main elements. Some journalists in this study focused on expertise or speciality, others on journalistic experience. News organisations’ management policy can differ significantly in accordance with their emphasis. Even if the resources of professional journalists are a core competence of newspaper as discovered in Chapter 3, news organisations have no clear criteria for assessing these values.

Chapter 5 examines that the routines of organising reporters, such as the beat system and the control system, contain several aspects causing complaints
from both generalists and specialists. Since Korean journalism depends heavily on the beat system, one of the salient conflicts occurs in the right of accessing the beat. Most generalists recognised that the beat is generalist territory, and specialists should be out of the beat, since the responsibility of specialists, that is, 'non-news', is assumed to not be related to the beat. However, specialists want access to beats with an open beat policy. In spite of these problems, news organisations are trying to find compromises to resolve those conflicts. The criteria of compromise are newsgathering skills. Expert-rooted specialists who have no training to acquire these skills are excluded from the beat, whereas specialists recruited from senior generalists can monopolise the beat. The existing routines of news production rule out expert-rooted specialists' access to the beat.

The flexibility or autonomy of specialists is also unlikely to be free from the routines of news production. Most journalists interviewed agreed with allowing specialists broader autonomy. Yet, the practice of news production routines disturbs this: the news production process is highly centred on the desk news executives rather than the editor. Desk executive control is much stronger than that of the editor since executives ask specialists to conform to generalists' norms in order to maintain teamwork or the quality control of pages. Given that specialists need much broader autonomy than generalists in order to have various perspectives free from beat boundaries, specialists under desk executive control are likely to be more restricted in autonomy. So, the control system centred on how much desk news executives limit a specialist's autonomy.

From these examinations, this study can verify the second hypothesis: "Specialism is restricted by news production routines". Firstly, this study found that some journalists argued that personnel management policies should be applied equally to both specialists and generalists, although others see that the expert-rooted specialists can have exceptional qualities. This approach
certainly brings specialists to an insecurity of their status, especially for specialists recruited from senior generalists. Secondly, more clearly, the existing beat routines inhibit specialists of former experts from accessing the beat. Some journalists in this study explained that this is because of a lack of basic newsgathering skills. Even if the expert-rooted specialists have a different responsibility from beat reporters, they are required to have the same skills as beat reporters. However, another fundamental reason seems to be the generalists’ intention to protect their own beat territory. In any case, specialists are frustrated in accessing beats by the existing criteria of newsgathering activities. Thirdly, the existing routines of control over specialists discourage specialists’ specialties. The needs of organisational control for the sake of quality control dissuade specialists from insisting on their autonomy. Desk executive control forces specialists to correspond to a generalist’s norm rather than a specialist’s. Sometimes this control frustrates specialists’ wish to differentiate themselves from generalist approaches.

This study can, therefore, conclude that there are several aspects of significant resistance in the existing organisational culture when introducing a new policy such as specialism. This resistance appears to be related to several levels of psychological insecurity, economic situation, and status (Brown, 1995: 128). Firstly, changes of news production routines due to the implementation of specialism is somewhat stressful regarding the generalists’ existing habits. Every member of a news organisation has habits allowing them to deal quickly and easily with routine situations. If the habits are ingrained, proposed changes to them may be resisted. Moreover, when current working practices are more familiar and thus less threatening to the psychological security of individuals than a new system, then changes may also be resisted. This study indicates that generalists are highly uncomfortable with changes brought about by specialism. Secondly, individual reporters can oppose alterations in specialism because of economic disadvantages. Any change which could
threaten an individual's pay, bonus or other element in a reward package may be resisted. In practice, specialism is a ground for preferential payment for specialists, which leads to a relative dispossession of generalists. Thirdly, generalists sometimes view specialism as causing a reduction in their own status and so resist the changes brought in by specialism.

Most problems prohibiting specialists from developing their speciality might originate from the failure of a clear strategy to utilise specialist resources. This seems to be linked to a difficulty in assessing specialist resources. The journalists interviewed were confused in addressing the quality of specialists. Sometimes they insisted on the importance of the journalistic experience rather than expertise. At the same time, they refused to provide preferential benefit of personnel policy for such factor, whereas agreed with preferential payment for expert-rooted specialists. This unsettled approach to specialism is possibly linked to competition between generalists.

Through identifying resources, organisations can assume "both the identification of resource requirements and how those resources will be deployed to create the competences needed to underpin particular strategies" (Johnson & Scholes, 1999: 446). News organisations seem to have several problems in establishing specialism. Firstly they do not ensure that unique resources are protected. Particularly, given that the experience is an outcome learnt and accumulated over time, utilising these resources is cost efficient. Although senior generalists' journalistic experiences are regarded as one of the qualifications of specialism, news organisations have no specific policy to introduce a framework to protect this resource. Secondly, news organisations do not prepare a policy of mixing resources such as 'journalistic experience' and 'expertise'. Even if they try to divide responsibility between them, this policy is unlikely to be connected to the practice of news production. The evidence is that most cases of control over specialists are conducted by the desk executives. To sum up, the policy of Korean newspapers for implementing
specialism appears to lack an approach of re-allocating journalist resources in the way in which journalists can be adapted to fit specialism. This finding indicates that the routines of news organisational culture are relatively rigid enough to defeat the implementation of new system.

Based on these analyses, it is now relevant to identify whether or not specialists develops its speciality for improving news quality compared with generalists under these circumstances of news production reality. That is, it is important to understand how the routines of news organisation control or newsgathering activities influence the news selection of specialists. The next part of this study will examine how specialists decide what news is.
The organisational culture is materialised at two different levels: product and production process (Kung-Shankleman, 2000: 12). In the earlier Chapter, this study examined that routines of newsgathering activities relate to the production process. News is, on the other hand, culture in the form of a product. This part pays attention to the feature of 'product', that is, news contents. Likewise the news production process, news in terms of 'product' or 'content' also reflects the routines of news organisational culture. Berkowitz posits that "news becomes the outcome of strategic work routines that journalists apply to meet organisational expectations" (1997: 169). He, in this sense, argues that news is not defined entities but amorphous occurrences. News is learned and defined through common work routines. News is not produced separately from news organisational culture.

This study, here, explores the news contents of specialists. For this, it will analyse news organisational routines related to the news product. This examination will answer the question of whether specialism provides better news than generalists do. For this purpose, in Chapter 6 this study investigates how news selection, especially the specialists' news selection, is influenced by the routines of news organisational culture. Chapter 7 examines the contents of specialists' news to identify how different their news product is from that of generalists through a case study with content analysis of news items. This study posits the third research question as "Is specialism effective in providing 'better journalism'?" Accordingly the third hypothesis is suggested as "Specialism develops better news in an effort to pursue audience interests". Of course, 'better news' is for audiences.
Chapter 6
NEWS SELECTION

Undoubtedly, the first producer of news must be a journalist. A journalist represents his/her professional judgement or individual inclination through news contents. However, this process of news production is inevitably influenced by several factors from news organisational interference to manipulative sources. News sources have, especially, been analysed in terms of 'powerful' influence (Hall et al., 1978, in Tumber 1999: 257). News sources exert the power of gatekeeper in an effort to control journalists and news outputs by suggesting raw materials of news and instilling guidelines of newsworthiness in journalists. This influence is made in various ways. One of these ways is the beat. The beat is a major source of information, and therefore it could be considered the first definer of news events. News organisations also impact on journalist news selection through the control process. In this sense, this study examines how specialism is influenced by the routines of news production such as news sources and news values.

6.1 News Sources

6.1.1 Journalist-Source Relations

Sigal's (1973) observation on channels of newsgathering illustrates various channels of news information sources. According to him, there are three categories of channel such as routine, informal, and enterprise. He defines routine channels as (1) official proceedings such as trials, legislative hearings, and election tabulations; (2) press releases; (3) press conferences, including daily briefings by 'official spokespersons; and (4) non-spontaneous events, such as speeches, ceremonies, and staged demonstrations. Informal channels
include (1) background briefings; (2) leaks; (3) non-governmental proceedings such as professional association meetings; and (4) news reports from other news organisations, interviews with reporters and newspaper editorials. Enterprise channels are (1) interviews conducted at the reporter's initiative; (2) spontaneous events witnessed firsthand, like fires, riots, and natural disasters; (3) independent research involving quotations from books and statistical data; and (4) the reporter's own conclusions or analysis (Sigal, 1973, in Tumber 1999: 225).

As identified by Sigal, routine channels are the major source of obtaining news information. More importantly, they are normally made at the beat sources. Even if relatively loose, the other channels are also related to the beat. Regardless to what channels, Sigal's examination expresses that sources are major suppliers of raw materials for news. The earlier examination in Chapter 5 on the beat system indicated that specialists appear to have flexibility in newsgathering activities since they are relatively free from the beat routines. However, in a similar sense to Sigal's observation, it was also true that they cannot do without beat information, since Korean journalism depends heavily on beat information.

Most studies on news sources, in this sense, focus on the source influences on journalists' newsgathering (Hall et al., 1978; Ericson et al., 1989; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996; Schlesinger and Tumber, 1994). Source-oriented newsgathering routines can be identified in attitudes towards those news sources as 'primary definer', as proposed by Hall and his colleagues (1978). Sometimes news sources are assumed to monopolise the journalists' time. Journalists are, here, passive receivers of information from the sources. Such dependence on sources is certain to make journalists more easily manipulatable.

Alongside a source-centred approach, news sources are also examined in terms of conflict as well as cooperation relationship with the journalists (Gans, 1979; Schlesinger and Tumber, 1994; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996). Their
relationship can be assessed in the way of gauging the balance of power between the two. Tumber (1999: 215) argues that the study of news sources should focus on the relationship between the media and the exercise of political and ideological power, especially by governments. In this case, they can easily enter into conflict situation. However, sources and journalists have a reciprocal relationship. As stated by Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 127), journalists and sources adapt to each other's requirements, making it hard to determine which comes first. For instance, for journalists, the powerful influence of source can be regarded as the major means of newsgathering. News sources can be primary properties for journalists. Journalists try to obtain and preserve their own sources. The part taking an initiative is the journalist, not the source. Source relationship creates competition between journalists. As maintained by Gans (1979, in Tumber 1999: 235-248), competition with other journalists in an effort to retain source access could bring journalists into conflict since they are typically oriented towards their sources. Although source is normally assumed as a forcible influence on journalists, the relationship between them is not characterised in a unilateral way. As viewed by Gans, “in effect, then, sources, journalists, and audiences coexist in a system, although it is closer to being a tug of war than a functionally interrelated organism” (1979, in Tumber 1999: 237). From these various relationships between sources and journalists, Tumber concludes that “by analysing the relationship between journalists and sources, an understanding of the relationship of journalism to society at large can be gained” (1999: 215).

Therefore, it is hardly possible to discuss journalism without an analysis of source-journalist relations. At least, journalists cannot include in their news reporting what they do not know. Shoemaker and Reese argue that the routines of news production are “an adaptation by news organisations to the constraints imposed by their sources” (1996: 127). The source-journalist relation is one of the most salient aspects of news production routines. How
journalists have a relationship with sources can illustrate their source strategies in the point of news organisational routines. From these perspectives, it seems necessary to examine what strategies specialists have in relation to sources in order to identify their news selection.

6.1.2 Professional Sources

Most journalists interviewed acknowledged that specialists have different source relationships compared with generalists. Particularly they pointed out that specialists are normally in a more advantageous position than generalists to access professional or expert sources. By contrast, generalists depend on official beat sources. Most generalists in this study saw that specialists can benefit from professional sources. A senior generalist stated that "news organisations nominate specialists in order to obtain their professional sources which are unlikely to be accessed by generalists" (KDH, interviewed 2001).

One of the advantages of the specialist is access to professional sources outside official sources of the beat, especially government ones. It implies that specialists' source relation practices are outside the routine channels of the official beat. Several generalists interviewed assumed that governmental sources would provide only official information supporting their situations.

A senior generalist of the Political desk also pointed out that governmental bureaucrats are highly cautious about providing information for journalists (N & B, September 1999: 93-95). Korean journalists have complained for a long time about the governmental practice of concealing information. This restricts the right to know, and harms the credibility of governmental activities. To correct this problem, the Korean government introduced the rule of opening public information by law in 1996. However, this law still blocks too much information. The government excludes important issues from the catalogue of the public information. It can at any
time cloak information by exploiting the ambiguity of the law (N & B, December 1998: 96-99). Under this circumstance, it is hardly possible to get expert views from them (KDH, senior generalist interviewed 2001).

One of the main purposes of introducing specialist journalism was to reduce the dependence on governmental sources, and allow a more critical approach (JJH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). According to a managing editor (KYJ, interviewed 2001), by relying on government information, reporters are restricted to the issues provided by the governmental organisations.

A senior generalist (KHJ, interviewed 2001) explained more elaborately why the dependence on governmental sources limits a critical approach. Firstly, the beats of governmental offices generate a continuous flow of news issues that leads beat reporters to following those issues and discouraging interest in other issues. Competition at the beat would never allow them to miss the given beat news items. Under such a passive recipient situation, it is unlikely for beat generalists to investigate other issues. A deputy managing editor (CSH, interviewed 2001) argued that the bureaucrats at the beat try to exert control over beat reporters by issuing news items incessantly. Secondly, this heavy workload and competition at the beat consequently do not seem to permit the development of critical viewpoints about news issues. That is, specialism is considered a chance of developing critical viewpoints against governmental activities.

Those practices of governmental information provision suggest that the source supply exceeds the journalists' demands for information. This feature implies a significant relationship between news sources and journalists. According to Gans (1979, in Tumber 1999: 238-247), news story selection is comprised of two processes: availability and suitability. Availability of news is done by sources that try to access journalists and persuade them about their information. Deciding the suitability of news is the journalists' job.
Journalists assess the source information provided in terms of audience interests. Therefore, there are always 'tug of war' between sources and journalists. Sources seek to manage journalists and the news, whereas journalists would like to manage the sources in an effort to draw out the information they want.

In Gans's terms of 'tug of war' between source availability and journalist suitability, Korean journalism's dependence on official sources can be explained in that source availability restricts journalist suitability. That is, beat reporters in Korean journalism lose the tugs of war by delivering governmental news events, instead of judging the suitability of information in line with audience interests. This may be related to the power of sources to create and increase the suitability of news (Molotch and Lester, 1974, in Tumber 1999: 39-40). According to them, powerful sources attempt to increase the correspondence between their needs and those of reporters by manipulating and pressuring journalist work routines. For instance, governmental bureaucrats would exert control over reporters "through regularising interviews, leaks and press conferences which inhibit follow-up, experimentation and deviation" (1974, in Tumber 1999: 39). This subtle attempt discourages reporters from taking critical approaches to news events.

Emphasis on professional sources outside governmental sources is, therefore, an intention to preserve and increase the suitability of news. Professional sources outside the beat are considered a way of escaping from governmental information dominance. Even if news organisations concentrate on routine channels such as beats as identified by Sigal's (1973) analysis, at the same time, it needs to evade the dominance of official information.

Generally speaking, professional or expert sources are an important component of source-journalist relations. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) understand that journalists rely on them to put events into context and explain the meaning of news. For the objectivity of news, journalists find experts "to
provide understandable analysis of the meaning of news events” (1996: 130). However, this study indicates that the value of professional sources is supposed to provide not only objectivity but also a critical approach to news events. An arts specialist indicated the importance of professional sources as:

It is a common principle for all the journalists that the competence of journalists normally lies on what their sources are and how many sources they have. This is especially true for specialists. The specialist should have exclusive sources of experts or professionals. The professional sources enable the specialist to keep in touch with the central issues of the subject and to provide quality information. With professional sources, specialists can develop and approach news events in critical and investigative attitudes. To sum up, the specialist is a journalist who has differentiated professional sources (LY, interviewed 2001).

Professional sources are persons who provide authoritative knowledge, not manufactured information. A deputy managing editor (HHP, interviewed 2001) contended that even if most news information in Korea relies on governmental sources, it does not indicate that those pieces of information always are truthful. Those journalists in this study were dubious about governmental information. A news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001) argued that governmental information is regarded as manufactured and needed to be verified by ‘authoritative’ and ‘independent’ professionals. Professional sources are therefore assumed as having authoritative standpoints independent from governmental influence. The emphasis on professional sources relates, thus, to the ‘authorised knowers’ (Ericson et al., 1989). Ericson et al. define news as representing those “who are the authorised knowers and what are their authoritative versions of reality” (1989: 3).

Some generalists were concerned with a specialist’s possibility of developing new areas of news based on professional sources. A senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) distinguished the specialist from the
generalist by the capacity to access uncommon news information through professional sources. By 'uncommon news information', he indicated different types of information from that provided by official sources. That is, government sources produce rather stereotyped information. According to a senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001), firstly it is information that naturally does not contain any critical points on governmental activities. The important point, here, is that government bureaucrats try to explain information to reporters in highly articulated ways, and inexperienced reporters may be easily persuaded. Secondly, they restrict information variety in an effort to prevent reporters from turning their interests to critical issues. There are several tactics for regulating information. For instance, bureaucrats ingeniously leak irrelevant information on current issues leading to diluting attention to present problems. Most generalists testified that sometimes it is hardly possible to obtain differentiated information from governmental sources. If reporters are inexperienced new-comers to the beat, they cannot help but be exploited by government sources (JJH, senior generalist interviewed 2001). From this perspective, specialists are supposed to develop uncommon news information not affected by official source manipulation.

Some specialists had a different approach. Professional information or critical viewpoints can also be obtained even from the official sources at beats. An environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001) argued that a problem is whether or not reporters can monopolise the sources. He added that most governmental offices retain first class professionals even if they normally refuse to provide expert information for beat reporters. Governmental sources have the potential of professional sources although they exploit their status by providing information to suit their own interests. The journalists argued that how much journalists learn unusual information depends on how intimate they are with those governmental sources. This environmental specialist illustrated that a journalist's relationship with governmental sources needs to be close
enough to monopolise these sources. Specialism is thought as a system of guaranteeing a monopoly of sources. According to a news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001), in charge of preparing the specialist system, the biggest benefit of specialism is that it can allow a monopolising of sources by exclusive contact with the source. This is because a designation of specialists suggests a monopoly of the subject in dealing with news events.

However, as examined above, externally recruited expert specialists are unlikely to access such governmental beats, and they have to focus on 'non-beat' sources. For instance, it was found that medical specialist reporters, formerly doctors, often obtain information from personal sources such as doctors. The question is what relationship do these specialists have with their non-beat sources. While beat reporters exploit their intimacy with beat sources to monopolise them, expert specialists depend on their own specialities. This is closely linked to journalist credibility.

Gans (1979, in Tumber 1999: 238-247) argues that most sources provide information in a bid to meet their objectives. But, when information is not fully understood, sources regard this is as due to the reporters' lack of ability to appreciate the information. Therefore, they want to deliver their information to the 'right person'. They consider that specialists are the right journalists since they believe specialists are reporters who retain special knowledge of the subject (KYM, senior generalist interviewed 2001). A sub-managing editor (CSH, interviewed 2001) noted that this capacity of specialists to have expert sources enables them to develop in-depth reporting or feature stories. To retain professional sources is, thus, considered the potential base of developing news quality. A managing editor anticipated that "the specialist can extract exclusive information from the professional sources enhancing the quality of the news" (PMH, interviewed 2001).
By 'professional sources', many specialists indicate academic sources or sources with academic backgrounds, even if they admit that some government officials are also expert sources. An environmental specialist argued that:

After being designated as the specialist, I have tried to gain the academic professionals and now they are my main sources. Accordingly I have come to focus on academic events such as seminars more than ever. Sometimes I participate in a seminar as a discussant. My news stories also involve more academic issues (JHS, interviewed 2001).

He argued that this tendency refers to the specialist's speciality. Speciality seems to be closely related to academic speciality. Specialists are firstly approved by academics. This phenomenon is clearly found in most medical specialists who are former doctors. One medical specialist (KYH, interviewed 2001), who specialised in oriental medicine at the university, also stated that he retains a number of sources who are doctors of oriental medicine at university.

As noted by an environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001), a specialist's relationship with academic sources is likely to lead them to producing academic issues more than any other issues. Another medical specialist (KYS, interviewed 2001) confirmed that most medical specialists regularly read a number of medical academic journals, which is hard for generalists to read and understand. This phenomenon appears to be related to the belief that a relationship with academic sources provides accuracy of reporting. Another medical specialist (KCJ, interviewed 2001) argued that generalists of the medical area normally have no accurate knowledge of specialised terminology or jargon of this area. Accordingly, this could result in misunderstanding the issue. By contrast, the special knowledge of the specialists can make it easy to deal with professional sources since they are more at home in the field with ease in communicating with them. The majority of specialists held that the capability of thorough investigation based
on expert knowledge about a subject also enables them to speed up the newsgathering activity (HHK, medical specialist interviewed 2001). Generalists would take much longer to understand the same problem. The specialist's specialised knowledge can lead to increased efficiency of newsgathering activities.

However, this relationship between specialists and professional sources is not automatically provided when they are designated. They may have to pay a price. Firstly, specialists should have a long-term association with professional sources. In the case of specialists who are former senior generalists, their speciality is based on long-term relationships with people in the field. An arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) noted that he has kept contact with most of his sources, such as painters, critics, or dealers, for more than 13 years. According to him, high quality information cannot materialise without a long-term relationship. A senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001) viewed specialist speciality based on long-term relationships with sources.

Secondly, professional sources can be established in terms of personal relationships, which are sometime also long-term relationships. With personal relationships, specialists can have the benefit of tip-offs. According to a medical specialist (KCJ, interviewed 2001), 50% of his reporting is based on doctors' tip-offs, since doctors consider him their colleague having the same occupation. As seen before, this is related to the doctors' belief that the medical specialist can correctly understand what generalist medical reporters cannot.

Personal sources can also form an intelligence network even if they involve people from official institutions such as governmental bureaucracies. These sources often allow the specialist to access hidden information or private information. An environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001) disclosed his relations to personal sources that:
I have been a beat reporter of the Ministry of the Environment for more than 10 years. I have several reliable sources in the department who have kept in touch with me for such a long time. With their help, I can access data that are forbidden from disclosing publicly, especially to reporters. I owed a few scoops to them. Besides such tip-offs of exclusive stories, they routinely informed me about stories behind the Ministry. These pieces of information are beyond tip-offs and nearly intelligence. One of the most precious materials from them may be a story of the dynamics of human relations within the department. With this kind of information, I can judge how a situation surrounding important policy issues is developing, and predict a direction of these policies. Of course, this predicting reporting leads to having more developed information from bureaucrats of the department (JHS, interviewed 2001).

A music specialist described the advantage of personal relationship with sources:

I have several channels from whom I can learn private information about musicians. They have a lot of stories of musician's private lives and are willing to transfer them to me. Through the personal sources, I have the chance of hearing about new faces. In this way, I discovered many unknown musicians who had been shadowed by prominent musicians. Whereas generalists focus on the established names, I take advantage of discovering new faces. By doing this, I can also broaden categories or kinds of my subject. Besides this, I can regularly update new trends or new information due to this relationship with personal sources (KIM, interviewed 2001).

This implies that personal sources are linked to private connection. Another music specialist introduced his personal source strategy as:
In most cases, news sources are eventually going to be shared with the other journalists after being disclosed on the media even if they are personal sources. Moreover, when they become one of the sources, the value of sources will certainly be diminished. Accordingly, journalists should excavate new sources. I am in a favourable situation to get new sources in that I have been personally keeping acquaintances with unknown sources. For this purpose, I expand personal relationships with unfamiliar but latent sources. Specialists, in this sense, take advantage since they can easily access potential sources based on specialised knowledge of their subject (LJJ, interviewed 2001).

That is, specialists are in a preferable position to obtain professional or expert sources. Specialists can understand their sources’ issues better with their expertise than generalists. This advantage is based on their long-term and private relationships with professional sources. However, this source routine of specialists can have some limits and problems.

6.1.3 Limitation of Specialists’ Sources

Journalists’ heavy reliance on governmental information has been shown by Sigal’s (1973) study, which quantifies the dominance of official sources in the news production of the ‘New York Times’ and the ‘Washington Post’. While the informal channel accounts for 15.7%, the enterprise channel 25.8%, routine channels more than double at 58.2%. Governmental sources at beats are typical routine channels. Reliance on the beat, according to Sigal, seems to be due to the centralisation of news dissemination rather than to a reporter’s specialisation. He elaborated this feature that:

Men on a beat have a wider circle of contacts in the agencies they cover than outsiders do. They have built up relations of trust with officials. They know
which officials to seek out and what questions to ask them (1973, in Tumber 1999: 232).

This indicates that journalists depend highly on official beat sources. This is not limited to brief news but also to more classified information such as background stories. Sigal (1973) notes that beat reporters also take advantage of accessing informal channels such as backgrounders and leaks at the beat. Of course, these channels are less accessible to those who do not cover the beat regularly. This argument provokes a question about the efficiency of a specialist's professional-centred source routines. That is, it is doubtful that specialists can survive in practice without the beat sources. An environmental specialist, in this sense, simply concluded "no" (JHS, interviewed 2001). This aspect has been identified in Chapter 5. More concretely, according to this environmental specialist, it is highly improbable that specialists can compete with generalists who regularly cover the beat and exclusively access authoritative sources without contact with official sources, even if they can utilise their specialities. He demonstrated that:

Environmental topics in Korea are entering into the second stage. The first step might be that of bringing this topic into mainstream society. The NGO groups have been worked hard for this purpose. This time is the second stage, which the government begins to have interest in this subject. This indicates that a number of news events can be produced in government departments or institutions under the government. These issues are normally focused on policies. In terms of making policies, most authoritative information is inevitably provided by these official sources, not by non-official sources. Due to this phenomenon, I have to stick to governmental official sources along with professional sources outside the government (JHS, interviewed 2001).
A senior generalist also supported this position saying that "even if social diversity appears to be linked to an increase of civilian or NGO areas, the diversity implies that the realities become more complicated than ever" (KHJ, interviewed 2001). Consequently, a journalist's dependence on the official sources has increased recently. A managing editor pointed out that, "in spite of the importance of the civilian sector, I think it needs to secure governmental sources more than ever, since news comes from them" (PMH, interviewed 2001). Another managing editor (CHU, interviewed 2001) stated that governmental sources at least guarantee to provide a stable news supply. He argued that plenty of news events occur in every hour, and the most important task is to guard the corner of news. Shoemaker and Reese also acknowledge that "the government provides a convenient and regular flow of authoritative information, which reporters find efficient compared with more labour-intensive research" (1996:130).

However, it seems to be different according to the specialist's subject. As implied by an environmental specialist's argument, the necessity of depending on governmental sources appears to be true in the case of hard news areas such as home news, politics, or economics. These desks usually deal with policies like environmental policies. By contrast, it is different story in soft news, such as music, art, or medicine. Soft news subjects have no concrete beats unlike hard news areas. An arts specialist described that:

Art news comes mainly from individual artists not institutions. If there are any organisational sources related to this area, it can be art galleries. However, these are also not institutions in themselves, but individual and private sectors. I don't have to adhere to specific beats, especially government sources. Sometimes, the government involves art events such as the Biennale. However, in this case, most persons concerned are actually individual artists who I already know very well (LY, interviewed 2001).
The contrast between hard news and soft news in terms of source routines illuminates that a professional-centred source strategy is apparently more efficient and suitable for soft news areas rather than those of hard news.

Another limitation of the specialist's source strategy is the possibility of a weakening critical approach. One of the most worrying features, in this sense, is the fact that a specialist's source relationship could be developed to a personal level. A junior generalist (CUS, interviewed 2001) testified to the case of a defence specialist. Generally speaking, most generalists are eager to book a golf match with high ranking military officials. But, this defence specialist has his own waiting list containing the names of army generals who wanted to play golf with him. This example can be explained with two different features of specialist source relations. One is that specialists have an established advantage recognised by the sources. This, as examined above, originates from the specialist capacity to understand correctly the issues of his/her subject. The other is the possibility of negotiating with sources. A senior generalist warned "it is highly possible for a specialist having a close relationship with sources to bring a negotiation between tip-off and protection of sources from criticism" (KDH, interviewed 2001). According to him, source protection is carried on in various ways. One is to intentionally drop the source from the arguments of the issue if the source is loosely related to the issue. When the source is a crucial factor of the issue, a reporter can dilute the source's charge by criticising both sides concerned. Moreover, the case of the defence specialist indicates that specialists' negotiations with sources could lead to 'chonji' (a kind of bribe to produce positive reporting) in the form of a free golf playing, for example. It implies that specialists could be more susceptible to financial gratuities for positive coverage than generalists. This relationship naturally results in corruption in reporting.

Of course, this negotiation between sources and journalists can also happen with official as well as personal sources. Moreover, the personal
relationship with sources is also available with official sources, as examined by Park, D. S. (2001). Park investigates that the private relationship between beat reporters and bureaucrats of the beat occurs because of difficulties of discovering governmental information besides publicly available information. As examined above, governmental sources do not provide information other than supporting their interests. To establish private relations with the governmental sources helps to discover hidden information. Park also finds there are some bargains are struck between them such as tone-downing or weakening criticism of the sources. However, the degree of bargaining is different between official and professional sources. A senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001) argued that beat reporters cannot monopolise official sources since they are open to all beat reporters. Furthermore, negotiation or bargaining between reporters and sources is revealed in the end. He indicated that “most beat reporters are able to recognise any negotiation through the news stories as news events develop”. By contrast, closed personal relationships with professional sources makes negotiation or bargaining easier than open relationships with official sources (LY, arts specialist interviewed 2001).

Beyond weakening the critical approach, personal relationships with sources could lead to biased viewpoints. Nearly half of the generalists in this study indicated that the specialists’ source relationship is highly susceptible to bias. A junior generalist, in charge of the health and medicine area, especially found this possibility from the medical specialist, formerly doctor, in that:

The medical specialists, former doctors, normally have close relationships with doctors. I think it is inevitable for them to be involved in the specific subject which was their former job. The problem is, here, that they focus excessively on it, that is, on the doctors’ interests, not on the interests of the public. This attitude is related to the fact that they prefer academic issues to other issues. For instance with the Health care reform dispute, this approach led to a critical
problem. This issue was related to the people’s health costs and doctors’ profits. In this case, medical specialists mainly paid attention to doctors’ interests ignoring the people’s interests (PKI, interviewed 2001).

To be more concrete, the cause of a biased approach may be that the personal relationship between specialists and sources is based on colleague-ship. This junior generalist again described that the sources consider the specialists not as journalists, but as their pupils or colleagues. Specialists also do not dare defy this attitude of sources. A medical specialist, formerly a doctor, admitted this possibility of bias as “colleague-ship can spoil the objectivity in approaching an issue” (KCJ, interviewed 2001). Especially he admitted that even if it is a very unusual case, he sometimes writes news stories which look like the PR materials of the sources. He confessed that “it seems to be inevitable in order to keep the relationship with them”. Besides this intentional negotiation, there seems a problem of unintentional bias. This medical specialist again acknowledged that he experiences difficulty in keeping a balance between information and publicity:

Sometimes, I doubt that I write reports by copying the publicity for the sources. As far as generalists are concerned, such reports can be regarded as definitely biased stories. That is, the medical news stories include ambiguity between news and publicity, since most medical news usually focuses on the latest development of medical technologies, invention of medicines, or imports of state-of-art medical apparatus. In this case, I decide the value of the issue by whether or not it is useful for the audience. In spite of these criteria, if the generalist reported it, it could be considered as publicity. However, my status of specialist provides me with a credibility that the audiences approve of. Based on this credibility, I write seemingly suspicious news events (KCJ, interviewed 2001).
Another bias of this type of medical specialist may be an inclination to western medicine. According to a junior generalist (PKI, interviewed 2001) the medical specialists who are former doctors heavily emphasise western medicine, ignoring oriental medicine. He argued that more than 90% of their reporting relates to western medicine.

These problems caused by personal relationship with the sources are also identified in specialists who are former senior generalists. Several specialists of this type have experience of producing favourably biased reporting for their sources. An arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) illustrated that the danger of flattering the source could not happen until the relationship has been running for four or five years. This length of time brings journalists into a private relationship. The private and emotional bond between the specialist and the sources could be generated after four or five years. In the case of a personal source, this private relationship easily leads specialists to producing biased reporting. He indicated that the most difficult responsibility of specialists may be to keep a distance from the sources. However, he admitted that it needs the most delicate skills and it is also hardly possible in practice.

In order to resolve this dilemma, some executives suggested a protection system. A news executive (JJS, interviewed 2001) recommended a system of competition between specialist and generalist within the same area. Another deputy managing editor (HHP, interviewed 2001) maintained that the specialist should be given a regular assessment every two or three years. This examination identifies how difficult it is for specialists to deal with their sources. Source relationships can result in destroying critical journalism. It seems to be true that the professional source advantage of specialists produces differentiated outcomes of improving news quality or newsgathering efficiency. It, nevertheless, requires specialists to keep a delicate equilibrium in order to stay away from source influence. This requirement of impartiality is accordingly connected to the news value of the specialist.
6.2 News Values

6.2.1 Two Levels of News Values

Journalists produce news relying on a set of guidelines to discern newsworthiness when they deal with news events. It is inevitable because the time and space for news production is limited. Galtung and Ruge (1969: 262-264, in Negrine 1994: 120-121) elaborate eight major factors and four cultural ones as key influences on the choice of news items. The eight factors are frequency, amplitude, ambiguity, meaningfulness, consonance, unexpectedness, continuity, composition. In addition, the four cultural factors are elite nation, elite people, personalised, and negative. Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 111) summarise news values as importance, interest, conflict or controversy, the unusual, timeliness, and proximity.

Regardless of the criteria for news values, the process of selecting news has notable feature, in that it is a rather routinised performance. Gans (1979, in Tumber 1999: 235-236) puts forth about how the news values for selecting news stories are routinised. One type of theory is journalist-centred: this argues that the news is selected by the professional judgement of a journalist. A second type emphasises the routinisation in the news organisation of how story selection is influenced by organisational requirements. This approach has two points: one focuses on the commercial imperatives of news companies; the other is concerned with the news organisations themselves in relation to how their structures and division of labour affect story selection. The third approach is the so-called mirror theory, which is event-centred and proposes that journalists simply reflect the events. The final theory, a rather deterministic one, explains that news selection is forced from outside the news organisation, by factors such as technological determinism, economic determinism, or ideological determinism. In addition, Gans himself explains
news selection in terms of a source-journalist relationship. Journalists summarise, refine, and alter what becomes available to them from sources in order to make the information suitable for their audiences.

These approaches explain that news selection is affected mainly by two factors: the internal and external factors of news organisations. The journalist-centred theory and organisational routine approach are associated with influence within news organisations, whereas the other two assumptions argue the impacts from outside news organisations. Given that this study examines how the news organisational routines are involved in specialists' newsgathering activities, it would focus on the internal factors of news organisations.

In fact, it is highly impossible to find definite news values. Tunstall (1971: 261) argues that it has been a mistake to assume that news values are somehow standardised and uniform. McNair also holds that whatever else news values are, they are cultural, conventional, and changeable (1998: 81). If any, they may be only inclinations or tendencies. This assumption appears to be true in journalist-centred news values in particular. According to Tunstall, journalists have an inclination to rely on standardisation of news values. “This standardisation is in part a reaction of journalists at various stages in the flow to the uncertainties and ambiguities of news definitions” (1971: 262). It is also a consequence of competition with competitors. Tunstall again states that journalists get a feeling of security if they follow stories that their competitor-colleagues will be covering. However, this standardisation does not indicate the existence of a specific value judgement system. He, therefore, concludes that “news values are in general fairly vague” (1971: 263).

Instead, Tunstall points out that news values “in individual journalist’s specific work situations are more clear-cut” (1971: 263). News values depend on individual journalists’ decisions in accordance with specific situations. News values constitute only general guidelines; there is always some discretion. Every single news event in a specific situation is judged by a journalist’s
individual discretion. McNair (1998: 77), therefore, regards news values as part of a journalist’s professionalisation, constructed through training, peer group pressure and newsroom discipline. Likewise, journalists also would and must “routinise their task in order to make it manageable” (Gans, 1979, in Tumber 1999: 235). News values in practice are the individual routines of journalists.

On the other hand, news values are related to news organisation requirements. One of which is news gathering efficiency. News organisations are not passive receivers of a flow of events. News values are routinised for consistency and convenience in news production. Tuchman (1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 173-192) understands that to make news is done by routinising unexpected events. Journalists impose priorities and routines upon unexpected events through typified news values. With news values, journalists can efficiently reduce the variation of the raw material of news. Routinised news values explain “what gets defined as news in the first place” (Shoemaker and Reese, 1996: 120). In this sense, Shoemaker and Reese argue that “news is what an organisation’s routines lead it to define as news” (1996: 120). That is, news values are constructed as routines of news production in news organisations.

News values in terms of organisational routines seem to be more closely related to organisational control. News organisations look to control the flow of work and the amount of work to be done through routinising the way of treating unexpected events (Tuchman, 1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 173). Tuchman finds that journalists ‘typify’ news events with an assumption on how news organisations must deal with them.

Beyond both approaches, many studies on news sources have paid attentions to their impacts on news values, as Gans’s (1979) argument that sources are the main influence on news values. Of source influence, the beat may be the centre of discussion. Fishman (1982, in Berkowitz 1997: 210) finds
that beat reporters' "'sense of events' and their methods for seeing the newsworthiness of occurrences, are based on schemes of interpretation originating from and used by agency officials within the institutions beat reporters cover" (Fishman, 1982, in Berkowitz 1997: 210). This suggests that beat reporters share standardised guidelines for selecting and treating news events with colleagues at the beat. This, at the same time, indicates that reporters outside the beat finds it hard to access this news sense, since non-events are specific happenings that are seen as out of character within the institutional settings.

From these perspectives, this study analyses how specialists' news values can be characterised. It also aims to explore the relationship of news values between individual specialists and news organisational control routines in the news production process. In this examination, the implications surrounding the beat system will be addressed in line with specialists' news values.

6.2.2 Journalist-Centred Values

Shoemaker and Reese (1996) see that news values are related to audiences' interests. In this vein, they argue that "news values provide yardsticks of newsworthiness and constitute an audience-oriented routine" (1996: 111). This indicates that the production routines related to news values embody assumption about the audience. Even if there are some differences, news values solidify what the audience finds interesting and important to know about. That news values focus on audience expectations on news is because of the limited attention and interest of the audience. Compared with this attitude, the specialists' approach of journalists-centred news values indicates a clear difference from those of generalists.
Specialists' confidence in personalised news values seems to be partly due to the peculiar character of their subjects. A medical specialist observed this aspect as follows:

In case of the medical area, it is not easy for generalists to understand the meaning of the issues because they are related to highly specified and technological subjects. Due to this aspect, the generalists are, first of all, limited to find and understand facts. However, I have no problem to learn and understand news facts, so I can develop my expert opinion into news stories. Comparing with generalists, the possibility of expert value judgement is a big advantage. Therefore, I normally focus on exerting my own specialised value judgement on news events (KYH, interviewed 2001).

As seen in the case of medical specialist, a specialist's subject area functions as a barrier, which provides specialists with a distinctive discretion to exert a value judgement including a personalised approach. Another medical specialist (HHK, interviewed 2001) suggested that specialist news values can lead to developing other news stories. According to him, different value judgements are essentially linked to other issues interrelated to the events, and this approach is assumed to be impossible for generalists. He described that:

Value judgements on news events basically imply that reporters would like to see the events in a different way from the others such as other competitors, sources, experts, or audiences. When a reporter exerts value judgements on a certain event, he/she already has other ideas related to it. For instance, in the case of an outbreak of an epidemic, if reporters could not develop their own judgements on it, they consequently have to stick only to the on-going situation for a long time. By contrast, I can easily and very quickly judge the circumstances around the outbreak of that disease. I know how far the story will go and how much it is related to other stories. Of course, as time flows, generalists also follow and seek these stories. However, the problem is the
Specialists are recognised as reporters who produce different contents as well as different styles of news from generalists. The personalised news values of specialist make specialist identify his/her status differently from generalists.

Personalised news values appear to be a consequence of different specialist responsibilities. Sometimes, it may be a forced outcome due to a responsibility to differentiate themselves from generalists. An arts specialist (LY, interviewed 2001) asserted that he is stressed since he had to pursue the other issues that generalists cannot investigate. This pressure is regardless of the fact that specialists retain a capability to discern a subject better than generalists do. An environmental specialist also presented this aspect. However, he suggested another pressure, namely, that specialists have to be different from the experts as well as the generalists. He considered that a specialist’s duty is to advance a new paradigm in dealing with news events. He addressed that:

When an accident happens, generalists, before everything else, try to deliver breaking news information as much as possible. At this stage, expert diagnoses are treated as of minor importance. Straight news reporting of a breaking event is the most demanding story. I can’t deal with this type of war simply because there are too many outlets of news such as the Internet. How can I compete with this speed and volume of information? Furthermore, as the event is developing, most reporters begin to produce analyses with their own value judgement. As far as I am concerned, the only way is to propose a different paradigm of news reporting. This paradigm should depend on the critical journalism that enables scrutiny of the background of society. Most experts are lacking of see the reality comprehensively. Specialist journalists have to possess a framework to discern the societal meaning of events
especially with critical viewpoints. To be more concrete, the critical approach indicates focusing on bad stories. I know that bad stories are always preferred to other stories (JHS, interviewed 2001).

This attitude relates to why specialists should be conscious of a critical approach in judging news values. Several executives interviewed supported this attitude of specialists. A managing editor (PMH, interviewed 2001) concluded that he would not employ specialists if he expected specialised information from them. It implies that while generalists are limited to exerting the established and standardised value judgements, the specialist can present different angles on news events.

Some journalists interviewed presupposed that the specialist is a reporter who provides newsworthiness for the issues ignored by generalists. Specialised knowledge is regarded as containing viewpoints to exhume buried values. In this sense, news organisations try to introduce a regulation to evaluate how many different stories specialists have produced (JJS, interviewed 2001). That is, the specialised knowledge of the specialist is assumed as a base for developing 'new' or 'different' stories.

Through critical attitudes and interest in ignored issues, specialists establish a new way of approaching the audience. Most specialists interviewed supposed that their specialised knowledge leads them to providing audiences with more practical, more effective, and structural solutions to problems. A medical specialist argued that:

I think one of the most important virtues of specialists is a critical viewpoint. This is the crucial feature in terms of how journalists serve audiences. The critical approach indicates grounds for tracking solutions to problems. Specialists' expertise enables to develop solutions by providing practical information, which is possible through critical scrutiny. Although generalists also aim to serve customers, the quality of service must be different from those...
of specialists because of the possibility and capability of critical investigation. I try to write reports in an attempt to provide practical and active information that enables the audiences to utilise them instantly (HHK, interviewed 2001).

This argument indicates that the critical viewpoint is connected with better service to audiences. As contended by Eide (1997: 177), specialism provides the readers with guidance, enabling them to act as rational consumers of commodities and social rights. An environmental specialist (JHS, interviewed 2001) held that a specialist's advantage lies in the capacity for providing active solutions to audience problems. He stated that:

Normally, generalists worry about reaction from the criticised readers even if they have some clear reasons for a critical approach. The emphasis on objectivity may also be an excuse for this stance. However, in the name of objectivity, they escape from such troubles. As far as I am concerned, it is because of lack of confidence in the accuracy of the reporting. By contrast, specialists can insist on the legitimacy of their assertions since they have enough specialised knowledge to defend themselves from reaction of criticism (JHS, interviewed 2001).

The specialist's accurate knowledge differs from the generalist's critical approach which normally emphasises objectivity. This attitude is also found in several studies on the objectivity of news. Tuchman (1977: 660-679) argues that objectivity is a ritual that serves primarily to defend organisational production from the critics. Shoemaker and Reese also maintain that "objectivity is less a core belief of journalists than a set of procedures to which journalists willingly conform in order to protect themselves from attack" (1996: 112).

Most specialists in this study emphasised an active and critical approach in news selection. A managing editor (CHU, interviewed 2001) admitted that
generalists depending on beat information are inevitably restricted to a beat-centred approach, whereas specialists can see the official agenda of the government at a distance from the beat. Specialists can more easily find what the problems are and how to resolve them.

However, there are some different assumptions for the expert-rooted specialists. More than half the generalists and executives interviewed were dissatisfied with their scope of views. They considered that this type of specialist could exhibit a serious bias in the name of different value judgements due to limited scope. According to a junior generalist (PKI, interviewed 2001), the limited scope of medical specialists who are former doctors may be an inevitable outcome ironically due to specialised knowledge. He attributed this problem to an absence of a journalistic sense of understanding news events in relation to the whole of society. By focusing on a certain subject, this type of specialists usually pay less attention to other areas and other aspects. As argued by generalists about the beat system in Chapter 4, specialists of this type also have problems that their lack of journalistic experience provokes in selecting news.

One example may be the medical specialist's emphasis on academic issues. The former doctor specialists explain this inclination of depending on academic issues as an emphasis on accuracy. This assertion is also true for other specialists such as environmental specialists. Contrary to this explanation, the junior generalist saw it as the result of narrow news scope. Focus on the latest news is also criticised. He argued that "the whole meaning related to news events requires journalistic insight into society, but they lack this quality" (PKI, interviewed 2001). Due to this, they depend on the latest news, which is relatively handy for them to obtain. A medical specialist (KCJ, interviewed 2001), a former doctor, demonstrated that the portion of the latest news in his reporting would be increased from a then 10% of all medical news to 50% in the future, usually taken from foreign medical journals. He explained that the
capacity of appreciating foreign journals is one of his competitive advantages over the generalists, which brings him into differentiating from the generalists in accessing high quality information.

To sum up, the personalised individual value judgements of specialists contain two contradictory aspects: advantageous and disadvantageous. An advantageous point is to develop new and different news stories, which lead to active information for the audience. A disadvantage is the danger of bias. By focusing on limited scope and specialised knowledge, specialists may easily lose some relevant aspects of news stories that can be found in other areas. Related to this, news organisations tend to intervene and control specialists’ value judgement routines.

6.2.3 Standard Guidelines

Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 119) point out that news organisations construct some routines with their own special logic on news events to help fit the flow of news information into manageable physical limits. This logic is a news perspective or a news value that explains what gets defined as news. This is constructed through the process that Tuchman (1973; 1978) calls ‘typification’. Tuchman’s examination on typification of news seems to indicate the way that news organisations can process information about unexpected events. She observes that “news organisations can process seemingly unexpected events, including emergencies and disasters, because they typify events-as-news by the manner in which they happen and in terms of the ramifications ‘this manner of happening’ holds for the organisation of work” (1973, in Berkowitz 1997: 188). According to Tuchman:

‘Typification’ refers to classification in which the relevant characteristics are central to the solution of practical tasks or problems at hand and are constituted
and grounded in everyday activity. The use of 'typification' connotes an attempt to place informants' classifications in their everyday context, for typifications are embedded in and take their meaning from the settings in which they are used, and the occasions that prompt their use (1978: 50).

Typification, in this way, enables journalists to locate a number of news events in a certain way. Journalists typify unexpected news events based on classifications and settings that the organisation must deal with. These settings or classifications are standardised in terms of news value guidelines. That is, news organisations generalise or routinise the way of dealing with events.

Sigelman (1973: 132-151, in Tumber 1999: 85-96) sees that routinisation of standards of news selection is constructed through socialisation. According to him, editorial revision and editorial conference are well known mechanisms of socialisation. News executives instil within journalists a strong perception of what is acceptable and what is not. Napoli (1997: 213), in a similar sense, holds that managerial control relates to the instillation of the psychological mechanism of the anticipation of censorship. By these socialisation mechanisms, journalists come to internalise organisational norms and objectives so that they produce content more likely to coincide with the interests and objectives of the ownership or management.

In the practice of news production, organisational control over news selection relates to desk executive's control. It is linked to the need to organise a number of pieces of news reporting into an integrated product. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) maintain that the routines of news production are designed to help the news organisation cope with the physical constraints of news production practices such as time and space. News executives are in charge of planning and organising assigned pages by operating and manoeuvring reporters. For this purpose, they need to recognise many news occurrences as newsworthy, sorted, categorised, and classified events.
The first reason for standardised value guidelines of a news organisation focuses on the efficiency of page designing in the case of newspaper. The emphasis of page designing lies in the consistency within pages. For this purpose, as examined in Chapter 5, news organisations force specialists belonging to a specific desk to follow the general rules of the desk. Page design is one of the manifest causes that urges specialists to keep the organisational guidelines of news selections, not their own personal values.

More concretely, desk news executives' control is carried out by desk-working. Most generalists interviewed indicated that the desk-working of news executives is the process of making page integrity (JSH, deputy managing editor interviewed 2001). Desk-working includes ordering news involvement, cooperating with other reporters, and rewriting or cutting articles. To do this, the news executives step into the reporter's work through selecting news issues, intervening in the value judgement of events, correcting writings, and deciding to publish. Specialists under desk control cannot escape from these interventions. Most news executives interviewed considered these as reasonable measures because all the job requirements should be applied universally to all the members of news organisations (HHP, news executive interviewed 2001).

A medical specialist (HHK, interviewed 2001) was highly concerned about the power of deciding the final copy since this is regarded as the most important aspect of the desk-working in the news production process. It indicates the power to decide whether or not the reporting is to be submitted to the Copy desk for publishing (JHS, environmental specialist interviewed 2001). However, this medical specialist attested that the power of deciding the final copy is most oppressively operated over his news selection. According to him, sometimes news executives hold his articles. Even if he can protest against delaying publishing, the final decision is up to the executives. Normally news executives answer that his stories are ill-matched with the page or not within
general news selection guidelines. As far as specialists are concerned, organisational control over the specialists' news selection process is regarded as oppressive for specialists' identity since the speciality in their subject is ignored.

By contrast, a senior generalist (JJH, interviewed 2001) suggested that desk-working for specialists is essential to prevent them from specialists' biased dogma. He held that the news value can be decided through a discussion with generalists of the desk in order to keep a consistency of the desk page. A deputy managing editor insisted on much broader control over specialists' news selection beyond checking the final copy. He maintained that "when specialists are covering or planning feature stories, they have to discuss with the news executives in order to check the relevance the other stories of paper (CSH, interviewed 2001). Another deputy managing editor (JSH, interviewed 2001) explained the executive power of desk-working is for the purpose of quality control. Quality control power or revisionary power over a number of articles is necessary for the consistency of contents in the paper. Sigelman describes that the desk executive control process presents the news hierarchy with a built-in 'quality-control check' on reporters' performances (1973, in Tumber, 1999: 92). Most executives contended that for quality control over news reporting, news executives have to establish a certain set of standard guidelines to judge the value of news.

A strategic option of news organisations is to draw guidelines for specialists. A senior generalist (KYM, interviewed 2001) maintained that the specialist's attitude of exercising value judgements should be controlled in accordance with newsroom strategy. An individual and inconsistent viewpoint is not supposed to be allowed unless it complies with organisational strategic guidelines. This posture is also related to the stability of an organisation. According to the senior generalist, the possibility of conflict with colleagues is the reason for requiring news organisational guidelines.
This proposition can undoubtedly restrict the autonomous newsgathering activities of specialists, and lead specialists to assimilating with generalists’ approach. A medical specialist (KCJ, interviewed 2001) confessed that his news value guidelines have become assimilated with those of the generalist after 2 years designated as a specialist. “Even if I knew that the generalist news value judgements clearly had problems, I had to follow them”, he said. As a matter of fact, such a negotiation of news value occurs with the specialists in order to comply with organisational consistency.

The second reason for standardised value guidelines of news organisations relates to an assumption that journalism should represent the universal values of the world. A managing editor (KYJ, interviewed 2001) noted that the truth of news events is the same regardless of the status of the reporter. News can be different only in terms of the extent to how deliberately they look at the world. He suggested that the practical guidelines of news selection lie on the interests of the public. This implies that the universal values of news indicate popularity. A senior generalist (KOH, interviewed 2001) also contended that the reporting of specialists should eventually serve ordinary audiences, as generalists do. The speciality of the specialist is postulated to produce a higher degree of readability for an audience. One consequence of this adaptation is to focus on producing stories which appeal easily to readers rather than produce critical arguments (KCJ, medical specialist interviewed 2001; LJJ, music specialist interviewed 2001).

Such an audience-oriented news value appears to have a practical purpose. According to many studies (Schlesinger, 1978; Schudson, 1978; Gans, 1979; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996), news value or news judgement is decided in terms of what an audience will find appealing and important by constituting an audience-oriented routine. This audience-oriented news value serves a defensive function. Consequently, organisational standardised value guidelines could lead specialists to compromising viewpoints with audience
interests. The specialist's assimilation with the organisational guidelines of news value could badly impacts on the efforts of developing their own specific values (KIM, music specialist interviewed 2001).

Besides this, news organisational identity also demands standardised value guidelines shared with members of a news organisation. Just as generalists, specialists cannot be free from the characteristics of news organisations, for instance an organisation's ideological standpoint (KDH, interviewed 2001). Accordingly, the personal and individual news value system of the specialist is controlled by the organisation.

Along with organisational control over specialists' news values, the routines of the beat system restrict the individual value judgement of specialists. In explaining the sense of news events, Fishman proposes the term of 'phase of structure', which is a scheme of interpretation (Fishman, 1982 in Berkowitz, 1997: 212). He maintains that journalists see news events by the same phase structures provided by beat agency officials. In Fishman's argument of 'phase of structure', many Korean journalists warn of the possibility of homogeneity of news values. A senior generalist of the Political desk, (N & B, September 1999) is a strong supporter of the beat system. He pointed out that the beat system is the minimum apparatus for watching governmental activities. However, he admitted this problem:

Beat reporters normally stay at the press office at the beat all day long. Their main routine at the beat is to meet and talk with bureaucrats of the beat. This routine inevitably makes beat reporters resemble the ways of bureaucrats in dealing with events of the beat. The critical approaches are restricted due to this intimacy with sources. More importantly, most beat reporters from various companies are essentially assimilated into the same viewpoints (N & B, September 1999: 95).
This implies that the ‘phase of structure’ provided by the beat creates a homogeneity of news and weakens critical viewpoints. The ‘phase of structure’ at the beat leads beat reporters to support the beat’s position. A news executive described that:

Beat reporters side with their beat. One example is on the issue of the independence of the Police Agency. The Prosecutor’s Office confronted with the Police Agency around this issue. Interestingly, beat reporters of both beats also confronted each other. Their viewpoints were critically divided even within the same company. They produced a number of reports supporting their beats (N & B, January 2001: 81).

According to a senior generalist (KDH, interviewed 2001), this assimilation of news values into beat angles appears to be inevitable as long as beat reporters owe their news information to the beat. They share a few specific phase structures so as to organise complexes of newsgathering activities into news events within the organisational setting of the beat.

Furthermore, the phase structure of the beat system provides journalists with a convenient and routinised newsgathering base. With this, they can be free from the risk of missing news events that their competitors might do. Beat reporters can also monopolise news events by “systematically and exclusively exposing themselves through their rounds to formally organised settings that present them with bureaucratically packaged activities” (Fishman, 1982 in Berkowitz, 1997: 217).

The beat routines are likely to affect standardised guidelines for specialists as well as generalists. As analysed before, the beat system is partly an essential institution for reporters, even for specialists. However, for this, specialists have to pay the price by assimilating into beat interests.
Summary

In conclusion, the news selection routines of specialists are contradictory with the existing newsgathering practices in various aspects. Their news sources are focused on professional or expert sources, which are thought to be one of the specialists’ competences. Given the closed practice of the Korean government’s public information provision and a heavy dependence on official sources, this competence is certain to provide a new possibility of developing critical approach. Sometimes a specialist’s specialised knowledge guarantees monopolistic relationship with these sources. Nevertheless, the specialist-source relationships have the limitation of a lack of authoritative information provided by the official sources and a danger of bias due to over-dependence on personal sources. Specialists’ source relations have two contradicting aspects: one is the advantage based on specialists’ individual and personal relationship with sources; the other is that these source practices lack authoritative information.

This situation occurs regarding values for selecting news. Specialists take advantage of specialised knowledge to develop news quality by obtaining accuracy. They can exploit their personal viewpoints depending on this advantage. Their expertise-centred values provide active information that enables the audience to solve problems. This approach is based on a specialist’s critical approach. However, specialists are likely to be affected by organisational standardised guidelines. News organisations control and intervene in specialists’ news values in an effort to keep consistency and quality control. News organisations also require specialists to follow principle of universal values, which is related to increasing readability for audiences. A specific identity of news organisations also forces specialists to conform to standard norms. Moreover, beat routines also lead specialists to adapt to homogeneous news values.
So, the news selection of specialists can be characterised by routinised inter-relationships between specialists' individual ideology, news organisational control over news contents, and external influences from sources. Regardless of the different routines of news selection, both specialists and generalists indicated that the ultimate purpose of news selection should be focused on the audience's interests. In this sense, this study will analyse some news items in a case study to identify how specialists develop their news selection routines in terms of service to the audience.
Chapter 7
BETTER JOURNALISM

7.1 Service to Audiences

7.1.1 Role of Journalism

One of the purposes of this study is to look at the question of "Is specialism effective in providing 'better journalism'?" In Chapter 6, this study found that the key criterion of news selection is connected to audience interests. It indicates that 'better journalism' is for audience interests, as Eide and Knight mention that modern journalism has a characteristic of serving the audience (Eide, 1997: 173-182; Eide and Knight, 1999: 525-547). This attitude is related to a democratic role of journalism. McQuail (1992: 307) contends that issues of audience or public interests in the media focus upon the chances of the media to the informed debate for healthy democratic politics. Curran elaborates the media's informational role in as much as "this is usually portrayed in terms of facilitating self-expression, promoting public rationality and enabling collective self-determination" (1996: 97). These observations imply that the responsibility of the media to serve audience interests refers to enabling them to express their own concerns in the way that they participate in democratic debate. The expressed concerns are related to their benefits. For instance, when journalism provides audiences chances to present their concerns, the news information should be beneficent for audiences. 'Better journalism' is to relate the audience to their benefits through democratic debate. That is, 'better journalism' is more than just delivering what the audience is interested in. The informed debate refers to making possible an active debate by providing a diversity of concerns among majority of citizens so that it can lead the audience to play an active role of citizen rather than consumer.
The question here is what the elements of better journalism are in practice. One of the practical factors of audience interests suggested by many studies is news quality. As examined above, this study operationally defines news quality in terms of information utility and integrity. However, news quality seems to be elusive to define in practice. Hansen et al. (1998: 806) find that audiences and journalists do not always agree in their assessments of the importance of some traditional standards of newspaper excellence. The indices of news quality seem to be varied according to the research objectives. In the research of news on environmental risk, Salomone et al. (1990: 117-130) propose such explanatory variables as accuracy, emphasis on risk, trust, alarming facts, alarming images, loaded alarming, and seriousness of the problem. Lacy and Fico (1990: 43-56) also suggest notably different variables as the index of news quality in their study of newspaper quality and ownership. Their indices are such as commitment to locally produced copy, amount of non-advertising copy, ratio of non-advertising to advertising space, number of interpretative and in-depth stories, amount of graphics, number of wire services, story length-more depth, and reporter workload. These studies illuminate how wide the spectrums of news quality characteristics are according to the research objectives when they are applied to actual and specific realities.

In relation to audience interests, this study in Chapter 3 discovered that the journalists interviewed recognised that better journalism can be viewed as the quality of news stories compared with the Internet. They indicated two factors of news quality that audiences expect: information utility and integrity of news. ‘Information utility’ is largely related to the usefulness of news information, and ‘integrity’ refers to critical approach. These qualities of news are supposed to be missing in Internet news whereas newspapers can develop them based on professional journalist-oriented competence. Audience interest-based news selection is likely to be judged by how much news provides useful information with a critical sense.
Another issue is what sorts of information are better. According to Eide and Knight, to serve the audience is "the way the news media provide their audience with information, advice and help about the problems of everyday life" (1999: 525). A journalist is an advocate for the audiences, and aims to solve their problems through journalistic intervention. This assumption is, of course, applied to both specialists and generalists. Whether or not specialism is better than the generalist approach is thus dependent on how much, efficiently and differently specialists provide more active information when they serve the audiences.

There seems one possibility that specialists can provide better journalism than generalists. It is closely related to specialist expertise and professional approach. Journalism concerns everyday problems such as grievances and risks to the public (Eide and Knight, 1999: 525-547). While grievance presupposes awareness that something is wrong, risk-based problematisation begins from an unawareness of potential problems. In both cases, people are not aware of how to resolve the problem. Accordingly journalism's primary role, here, is to arrange information to resolve the problematic situation so that the audience can re-establish a state of normalcy in which the problem is eliminated or at least mitigated. This information ranges from an alternative solution to professional advice. For the purpose of suggesting proper advice, specialist's expertise is more advantageous compared with the generalist's. Specialists seem to have the chance of providing better news for the audience.

However, there still remains an uncertainty to be resolved: how to deliver such information efficiently to audiences. The manner of dealing with news is important. Given that journalism aims to propose solutions with professional advice, the arrangement of information by the media is clearly different from presenting or delivering information. Eide and Knight (1999: 530-531) argue that journalists should suggest prognostic and active news rather than diagnostic and reactive news. According to the journalists interviewed in this
study, the Internet provides audiences with fragmented interests and separated and individual concerns. This makes the prognostic analysis of news difficult. In terms of serving audiences, Eide and Knight argue that journalism should not only frame the problems of everyday life, but also help audiences to act on social subjects (1999: 544). Specialists should provide information that facilitates audiences to act in solving their inconveniences. This approach is related to the specialist competence of developing news quality. As examined in Chapter 3, the journalists interviewed in this study viewed the quality of news as retaining 'information utility' and 'integrity'. The service of audience interests in terms of facilitating audiences to act on their problems refers to providing quality news preserving 'information utility' and 'integrity'.

This approach should also appreciate changes in audiences. As identified in Chapter 3, the democratisation in Korea in 1987 was one of the main stimuli to bring social diversity that required to enhancing quality of news. Even if most journalists noticed technological developments such as the Internet are the main impetus for the change of audience interests, political democratisation is another significant momentum. Democratisation leads the interests of the public to move from issues of politics to other various issues such as economic, cultural, and ones of everyday life (KYJ, interviewed 2001). After that, the public has its voice in various areas of everyday life or welfare. The dispute surrounding the issue of the Health care reform of Korea in 1999-2001, which is chosen as the case study for content analysis, is one of the prominent instances to refer to change of the audiences. This issue was a problem bringing significant inconvenience to the public. This inconvenience contains a number of aspects, which can be easily referred to grievances or risks for people. Given this, it might be worthwhile to probe the role of Korean journalism’s attitude towards this issue during this period in the light of how journalism serves the audience. From this perspective, this study aims to explore such questions as how journalists, especially specialists, define the locus
of the problem, how they attribute blame, how they reveal debates, how they evaluate remedies, and how they provide advice.

7.1.2 Mobilising Information (MI)

In relation to a prognostic and active approach, journalists have a responsibility for 'persuading' the audience to 'realise' self-interest by delegating that self-interest to the care of another. With this respect, Eide and Knight (1999: 539) see that the relationship between journalists and audiences is a professional-client relationship. This statement is true not only for specialists but also generalists. In the view of better journalism, the issue of specialism is, therefore, how efficiently specialists embody this relationship in news production compared with generalists.

Eide and Knight insist that the professional-client relationship is "ideology or ethics of service whereby the professional commits to protecting and furthering the interests and well-being of the client as his or her sole objective" (1999: 539). Although the role of journalism would be argued as accommodating informed debate, there is a distinction between 'informing' and 'mobilising' or 'carrying on' as mentioned by Schudson (1993: 143-163). It is possible to argue that if, in practice, specialists were to provide 'mobilising' or 'carrying on' news, not limited to 'conveying' or 'representing' reality, more than generalists, specialism would be better journalism than the generalist approach. The notion of 'mobilising information' seems to suggest a significant insight of how this relationship could be established.

Mobilising information (MI) is a particular kind of reader-useable information. In news stories, MI is "information provided in a story which helps readers turn their attitudinal reactions into behaviour" (Bybee, 1982: 399). It is also defined by Lemert and his colleagues as "any information which allows action by persons willing to do so" (1977: 721) or as "any information
which allows people to act on the attitudes and desires they already have” (1984: 243). From these definitions, it can be concluded that MI is not assumed to directly create a motivational force for action but to facilitate action when combined with a prior need for action. If people already have a need for a certain commodity, a duty to vote, or a sense of inconvenience about public policies, MI appears to be able to guide that motivational force into certain channels of activity. That is, MI is not to incite action, but rather to inform about the issue and to help audiences act on the information if they are so inclined (Rossow and Dunwoody, 1991: 89).

One of the prominent examples can be frequently found in advertising as well as in special sections of newspapers. Information categorised as MI includes store addresses, shop hours, recipes, TV listings, garden tips, fashion advice, and other information directly related to audience necessity. Besides these seemingly clear types of MI, normal types of news such as Political news also includes MI: the names of people and organisations promoting a point of view, with enough accompanying information to enable persons to contact them; meeting times and places of critical legislative hearings; or the names of key legislators whose votes could decide an issue, with enough accompanying information to enable persons to contact them (Lemert, 1981: 119). According to Lemert (1981: 121, 1984: 244), MI is identified more categorically in three types in the media such as: locational MI, identificational MI, and tactical MI. The first usually provides information about time and place for activity. The second involves both names and enough locational MI to enable persons to recognise and/or contact the persons, groups or entities identified. The third is information to make available explicit and implicit behavioural models. It would give information on how to register, analyse campaign ads, and even write stories about campaign issues. MI could be a potent, short-run agent for activating audience participation in social events.

Citizen’s public-affairs participation and decision-making abilities are
related to the availability of information. Newton (1999: 581) holds that easier access to ever larger amounts of political information have helped to mobilise citizens, both cognitively and behaviourally. According to Newton, "higher levels of exposure of the British public to the mass media, especially the news media, including television news, will tend to inform people about politics, give them a better understanding of politics, heighten their subjective efficacy and, therefore, mobilise them politically" (1999: 582).

Lemert maintains that less MI in news stories could ultimately impact negatively on people's participation in news events.

MI in the mass media facilitates linkage between large segments of the population and decision-makers. In Schattschneider's terms, MI in the media enlarges the "scope" of an issue and thereby may very well change the outcome of the influence process. Without MI in the media, participation still will vary with attitude intensity and salience (1981: 154).

Participation of audiences in social agendas is certain to increase understanding shared with the other members of society, so it can develop a unity of society.

In this vein, this study explores grounds and contexts in which specialists produce news stories mobilising the audience to act. Especially in relation to news selection of specialists compared with that of generalists, this study investigates how their routines of relating to sources and news values have to do with MI.

7.2 Case Study: Health Care Reform in Korea

7.2.1 Background of the Issue

For analysing the information newspapers provide their readers, this study selected 303 news items in two major newspapers, the Chosun Ilbo and the
Joongang Ilbo, which retain medical specialists. The clipped and coded items dealt with the development of the case of Health care reform as their primary concern in the period 1 of July to 15 of November 2000. During this period, newspapers focused on various events developing towards peaks of the issue such as implementing the new system, increase of conflicts and negotiations among doctors, pharmacists, and government, intervention of NGO groups, and governmental responses. Public inconvenience caused by the row reached very high levels.

The central issue of the Health care reform dispute dealt with separating the overlapping professional roles of dispensing medications between doctors and pharmacists. The new regulations were to rule out the doctors' in-house dispensaries, and also prohibit pharmacists from writing their own prescriptions. The plan of introducing the new system originated from rampant drug misuse and abuse in Korea, which posed several serious risks to public health. Official data suggested that the nation's tolerance to antibiotics had reached more than six times the average of countries with a divided medical service delivery system. Korean doctors and pharmacists were blamed for prescribing higher than necessary drug dosages, partly because the more drugs they sold the more profits they earned. In an attempt to put a stop to such practices, the government decided to divide the role of doctors and pharmacists.

The discussion on reforming the health care regulations had been raised for many years. In 1993, the Ministry of Health and Welfare (MHW) took legal steps to divide the role of doctors and pharmacists, and set the time of July 1, 1999 as the deadline for implementation of the new system. In 1997, the MHW delayed the implementation of the new system to July 2000 at the request of the two parties who wanted more time to prepare for the change. In February 2000, doctors launched a massive outdoor rally and nation-wide strike led by the Korean Medical Association (KMA) and the Korean Hospitals Association
(KHA) since they considered the new system to be unfair and unfavourable for them. Following the doctors' action, local clinics took the action of suspending their services in March 2000. In May 2000, the doctors' group tried to defy the government with a trial run of the new system scheduled to start in July of that year. Throughout these developments, the government started employing the new regulation by introducing a trial run period for one month in July 2000. Conflicts surrounding the new regulation were resolved by agreement among the medical sector, pharmaceutical sector, and the government on 11 November, 2000. During this period, the public started to experience unprecedented inconvenience and grievances. Accordingly, consumers' claims for resolving such inconvenience came to the surface and became an issue. Based on this situation, this study selected news items from the period 1 of July to 15 of November, 2000 in order to scrutinise how journalists dealt with this issue.

This issue implies such sub topics as: the trial run ahead of the full-scale implementation of new regulation, limits on allowable medical service insurance fees, damage to doctors' finances, a heavy dependence on drug sales, substituting replacement drugs for doctors' prescriptions, and the establishment of a body to oversee sales by pharmacist's for self-prescription drugs. There are various actors related to this issue as follows: the Ministry of Health and Welfare, the Fair Trade Commission, the Korean Medical Association, the Korean Hospitals Association, the Korean Intern and Residents Association, regional clinics and pharmacies, the Korean Pharmaceutical Association, NGOs like the Health Solidarity or the Citizens' Coalition for Economic Justice, and, of course, the public. These actors in the news revealed a series of actions in accordance with the development of the issue. They involved actions such as: a nation-wide doctors' strike, closure of hospitals, suspension of local clinics and pharmacies, public inconvenience, doctors' threats to boycott the new system, doctors' refusal to fill in prescriptions for
outpatients, pharmacists' threats to walk away from the new system, and other related actions.

From these perspectives, the Health care reform dispute was certain to be a contentious issue. Lemert (1984) argues that journalists are seemingly unwilling to include MI in their coverage of such conflict topics. Conflict issues like the Health care reform dispute is a meaningful example for analysing the relationship between journalist types and providing MI. Especially analysis on MI in relation to journalists' routines of news selection could provide understanding of what differences of active approach there are between specialists and generalists.

For this purpose, it firstly investigates how news organisation routines relate to MI. That is, it explores how the news organisational control process engages in MI in accordance with types of journalists. Secondly, it pays attention to whether or not MI is provided enough to enable the audience to act when specialists relate to sources. Finally this focuses on how the concerns over the issue, for instance 'defining problems', 'attributing blame', 'revealing debates', 'evaluating remedies', and 'providing advice', are related to MI.

7.2.2 Data Analyses

7.2.2.1 Organisational Control Process – Mobilising Information Relationships

The Health care reform was centred on the problem of the separation of dispensing medicine. The MHW was the governmental department in charge of that issue. Due to this categorical division of subject, that issue was mainly covered by the Home news desk, which has a responsibility of covering the MHW. Across the 303 news stories of the Chosen Ilbo and Joongang Ilbo covering this issue in the period 1 of July to 15 of November 2000, 249 news
items (82.2%) were written by reporters of the Home news desk (Table 16). The second most frequent one was the Politics desk (13.9%, n=42). This is because Health care reform was a policy-making and lawmaking issue. Nevertheless, there was a large gap between the two desks’ story volume, and the main desk was clearly the Home news desk while the Political desk was limited to a supporting role.

The two newspapers showed a significant point in organising journalists to cover this issue (Table 17). Generalists, regardless of their desks, produced nearly 9 out of 10 items (89.8%, n=272). Of the generalists, especially the beat reporters of the MHW, who belonged to the Home news desk, Kim, D. S. of the Chosun Ilbo and Shin, S. S. of the Joongang Ilbo, contributed the majority of the items. The number of these two generalists’ items were nearly half (45.2%, n=137), while two specialists, also reporters of the Home news desk, were limited to producing just over 10% (n=31). In the case of the Chosun Ilbo, Kim, D. S. produced very high proportion (43.2%, n=57) of his company’s news stories, while the medical specialist Kim, C. J. made 7.6% (n=10). Shin, S. S. of the Joongang Ilbo was also the key reporter who wrote almost half (n=80) of all the items in his paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk Involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home News</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living &amp; Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
However, Hong, H. K. a medical specialist of the Joongang Ilbo, dealt with over 12.3% (n=21). In spite of the small number of their stories, these two medical specialists produced the second highest number of items following the two beat reporters. That is, the beat generalists of the MHW and medical specialists were the main journalists covering this issue. The rest of the reporters appeared to take auxiliary or subsidiary roles. Hence, this study, from now on, limits the data to analyse these 4 main journalists' news items which tallied 168 in total. This is in order to compare the two different types of journalist status in news selection more effectively without intervention of articles from minor role reporters.

However, even if they were one part of the main reporters, specialists were highly alienated from newsgathering involvement. First of all, the variance of news production in terms of the number of items between them was evidence of this allegation (n. of generalists=137, n. of specialists=31). The beat reporters played a major role, far beyond the specialists' competition. This indicates that both newspapers employed a highly generalist-centred strategy rather than utilising specialists of that subject.

Interestingly, both specialists and generalists were members of the same desk, the Home news desk. It indicates that the desk executive strategy of organising or involving reporters depends considerably upon generalists rather than specialists. From this perspective, specialist newsgathering activities under desk executive control seem to be restricted by the desk executive's

---

**Table 17: Journalists' Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
involvement strategy oriented towards generalists working at beat. That is, this type of control pattern over specialists could be oppressive for specialists’ newsgathering activities.

News executives, meanwhile, seemed to suppose different task objectives for the two types of reporters. A crosstabulation of journalists by types of reporting identifies this presumption. According to Table 18, nearly half of the two main generalists’ news stories (48.2%, n=66) were coded as ‘news’, which normally implies ‘hard news’ focused on facts rather than views. By contrast, more than two third of two specialists’ items (64.5%, n=20) were coded as ‘analysis’, and 16.1% (n=5) as ‘feature’. The two specialists’ items coded as ‘news’ were 6.5% (n=2). This suggests that generalists in charge of the beat had the main responsibility of dealing with ‘hard news’. They delivered almost all the pieces of brief news produced by the beat through press conferences, news briefings, and press releases, whereas the specialists’ responsibility was rather to develop ‘non-news’ or ‘soft news’ such as feature story or analysis. They produced analyses or feature stories based on their own individual sources, for instance from local private doctors, professors of university medical departments.

However, it does not seem to suggest that generalists were far from the ‘non-news’. 35.0% (n=48) of the two beat generalists’ reports were coded as ‘analysis’. Although the proportion of the two specialist’s reporting of ‘analysis’ was 64.5%, the number of articles was limited to 20, less than half of the two generalist’s analysis reports. In feature stories, the number of the specialists’ stories (n=5) were less than that of the generalists (n=18). Given the smaller volume of the specialists’ news items, this appears to be a considerable enough rate to maintain that news executives would not totally trust the specialists’ work of ‘non-news’, unlike the generalists’ responsibility of ‘news’. 
It is also related to the control practices over specialists. When analysing control over specialists in the Chapter 5, this study found that the desk control system over specialists is more oppressive than editorial board control. It also discovered in Chapter 6 that this eventually affects specialists' values for selecting news. The analysis on news involvement in this content analysis again indicates that executive's management, oriented towards beat reporters, could restrict specialists' news involvement. Although this restriction can be interpreted as a division of responsibility, it seems that the specialist's news involvement is more limited than that of generalists.

Therefore, it is important to examine how much this discriminated involvement strategy is related to MI. As examined before, MI is a useful indicator of active journalism approaching audience-interest. An examination is needed of how desk executive involvement strategy and division of
responsibility are related to MI. Measurement of MI was conducted in accordance with the existence of information relevant to MI.

MI types were divided into three areas, namely, location, identification, and tactical MI, as suggested by Lemert. For measuring location MI, this study looked at such information as time and place for involving audience activities, for instance the meeting times and places of critical legislative hearings, or the name of key legislators whose votes could decide on issues. Identification MI was calculated by the information supplying both names and enough location MI to enable audiences to recognise and/or contact the persons, groups or entities identified which could promote a point of view. Finally tactical MI was assessed by the information to make available explicit and implicit behavioural models. It could give information on how to register, analyse campaign ads, and even write stories about campaign issues.

Generally speaking, there were no significant differences of MI by reporter's status (Tables 19, 20, and 21). The two groups of reporters produced similar rate of location MI, and identification MI. In location MI, the generalists supplied 26.3% (n=36), and the specialists 25.8% (n=8). Identification MI was also not significantly varied between them.

However, its quantity was more than double compared with location MI. The generalists' identification MI was 51.1% (n=70), and the specialists 58.1% (n=18). By contrast to these two MIs, the specialists provided more frequently tactical MI. While the generalists revealed 30.7% (n=42) of tactical MI, the specialists' tactical MI reached 41.9% (n=13).

This appears to suggest that the specialists were more deliberate in providing information about how consumers could cope with grievances caused by the Health care reform dispute. For instance, the specialists wrote vivid stories about practical problems in hospitals, taking the patients side, based on the practices of hospital routines. However, the gap was not
considerable enough to differentiate the two types of reporters in terms of providing MI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
<th>Location MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

This data seems to indicate that the journalist's status did not affect the journalist-MI relationship. The desk executive strategy of news involvement oriented to generalists was not related to the amount of MI. This finding does not confirm that greater the involvement of specialists, the more MI could be produced. Besides these findings, identification MI was normally most frequently produced than the rest of the MIs. This is partly because
identification MI was accessed more flexibly in this study. Although identification MI normally requires name, position, and location information, this study coded only with name and position without location information. With name and position, it was assumed to give the reader enough information to pursue further action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
<th>Tactical MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

However, closer investigation was given to the result that the journalists' status did not influence MI provision. One way of relating MI with specialists is the number of words in news stories. A crosstabulation of the number of words by MI indicates that the average number of words of items including MI was bigger than that of MI absent-items, even if location MI was not (Table 22). The average number of identification MI present-items was 1,103 words, while that of absent-items was 911 words. Tactical MI present-item's average number of words was 1,174, but absent-items was 932.

An important point is here whether there is a direct relation between the length of an item and the reporter's status. If there is a proportional relationship between them, it can be inferred that there is a possibility that specialists are in a more favourable position to supply MI than generalists.
Another data shows that the average number of words of specialists' items was 1,632 words, whereas that of generalists' was limited to about half of that, at 855 words (Table 23). It indicates that specialists took advantages of broader space than generalists. It seems certain that the specialists had the benefit of broader space on the news page to produce MI, compared with generalists. From these data, it could be deduced that, given the result of Table 22, specialists were apparently in a more favourable situation to provide at least identification MI and tactical MI than generalists. This finding shows a slight difference from the results of the in-depth interviews.

In the in-depth interviews, both of generalists and specialists squarely confronted the issue of separate spaces for specialists. Specialists interviewed insisted that separate space should be provided for specialists, if news organisations want to exploit a specialist's speciality. They argued that separate space is a basis of their identity in practice. According to them, it is highly difficult for specialists to differentiate themselves from generalists under the general policy of space distribution because it is inevitable that generalist-oriented attitudes towards specialists apply within the same spaces shared with generalists. By contrast, generalists argued that space is distributed in
accordance with competition between reporters since space is limited. Space should be distributed in terms of quality of news, they said, not of a reporter's status. If specialists' news stories are better than those of generalists, specialists' stories would undoubtedly be published, and vice versa. In spite of this point, this data shows that specialists were allowed bigger spaces. However, it is unlikely to conclude that news organisations have a preferable policy of space for specialists. Broader space for specialists appears to be connected with the main type of specialist news stories, that is, they normally dealt with 'non-news' types of news which were longer than 'news' type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Types</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words (Mean)</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other way to relate to MI with specialists is by the type of reports. The reporting type relation with MI could also indirectly indicate the relation between MI and the status of journalists. Unlike the number of words in a story, this assumption did not appear to confirm the proportional relationship between them (Table 24). The average number of words of 'news' type of items (589 words) was shortest compared with the other types. That of 'interview' was longest, at 1,632, 'analysis' was 1,265 words, 'feature' stories were 1,188 words, and 'commentary' was 1,056 words.

If the assumption of a proportional relationship between the length of item and MI provision is true, this should be also identified in the crosstabulation of reporting types by MI (Tables 25, 26, and 27). However, this study failed to confirm this assumption. Items of 'news', the shortest type, provided identification MI the second most frequently (52.9%, n=36) after 'analysis' (57.4%, n=39), whereas 'commentary' was the least provider (33.3%,
n=2). In tactical MI, 'analysis' type stories' MI rate (29.4%, n=20) was similar to 'news' (26.5%, n=18). The types of news story had no direct relationship with MI. From this finding, another reasoning also seemed to be possible: the status of specialists focusing upon 'non-news' was not directly related to more MI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Types</th>
<th>Location MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be inferred that although the specialists had a clear advantage in providing MI, such as broader space, they failed to provide MI in practice. Of several relationships with MI, the number of words is the only code that had a direct and proportional relation with MI: the lengthier the story or the broader space, so the more MI. However, this advantageous position of specialists was not connected with their differentiated responsibility, that is, with MI provision in 'non-news' type stories.
This assumption was also discovered in another way. A specialist is defined as “a particular category of journalist who ‘has developed an expertise interest’” (Negrine, 1996: 85). Specialised knowledge is, therefore, one of the essential elements of a specialist. Through the examinations on in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions, this research also finds that specialised knowledge of specialists could be the base to develop their expertise and differentiate them from generalists.

In this case study, the specialists revealed their superiority of specialised knowledge over the generalists (Table 28). Significantly, nearly half of the specialists' stories (48.4%, n=15) contained specialised knowledge whereas only 2.2% (n=3) of the generalists did. This illuminates that the feature of 'specialised knowledge' is a salient indicator of a specialist. The specialists categorically distinguished what and why both sides of the doctor and
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**<Table 26> Reporting Types by Identification MI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Types</th>
<th>Identification MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
pharmacist stances were problematic based on their expertise as medical doctors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Types</th>
<th>Tactical MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Reporting Types</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journalist Status by Specialised Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
Nonetheless, ‘specialised knowledge’ did not seem to make any significant difference in producing MI (Tables 29, 30, and 31). Items containing specialised knowledge provided 27.8% of location MI, and 26.0% of items without specialised knowledge. Specialised knowledge stories, and non-specialised knowledge stories supplied nearly equal amounts of tactical MI (33.3% and 32.7%, respectively). In identification MI, specialised knowledge stories retained a predominant position over non-specialised knowledge stories (72.2% to 50.0%).

However, this difference is not sufficient to maintain a significant relationship between specialised knowledge and MIs. That is, the specialist’s most prominent virtue did not appear to make any difference in accommodating MIs. They failed to address essential information for audiences to act by limiting their articles to explaining or describing the situation without specific and factual information. This also occurred with the generalists. That is, specialised knowledge did not supply active approaches to the news events.

In conclusion, these results find that the specialists failed to show differences of MI provision from generalists. They had a highly similar approach to MI as the generalists, in spite of different responsibilities and advantages. MI was not associated with journalist status and types of reporting. The two specialists were under desk executive control as were the generalists. Moreover, the desk executives focused their involvement strategy upon the generalists rather than the specialists. In fact, it is doubtful that there was a direct relationship between executive control over the specialists in involving news events and MI. It is true that the specialists under the desk executives were highly restricted in involving news events and failed to reveal higher MI to the generalists. In the light of MI, it is possible to infer that the specialists seemed to follow generalist practices of dealing with MI.
### Table 29: Specialised Knowledge by Location MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location MI</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialised Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

### Table 30: Specialised Knowledge by Identification MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification MI</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialised Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

### Table 31: Specialised Knowledge by Tactical MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactical MI</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialised Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Specialised Knowledge</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
7.2.2.2 Source - Mobilising Information Relationships

Journalist-source routine is another aspect enabling to find how specialists accommodate MI. From this case study, the specialist-source relationship seemed to have some distinctions in several aspects. Firstly, in terms of 'source importance', the specialists' sources were relatively less 'important' compared with those of generalists (Table 32). While the generalists showed 19.7% (n=27) of high ranking sources, the specialists were limited about three times less at 6.5% (n=2). By contrast, their low ranking sources were significantly higher at 38.7% (n=12), more than double that of the generalists' 16.8% (n=23). The 'source importance' was assessed in terms of authoritativeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Importance</th>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
<th>Generalist</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Ranking</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ranking</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ranking</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

Official sources were, here, accounted as authoritative sources, especially governmental ones which were evaluated as typical high-ranking sources, since, as indicated by Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 130), governmental sources provide a flow of authoritative information. Generalists in charge of the beat
of the MHW had a nearly monopolistic power to access high-ranking officials such as the Minister of the MHW or the chairpersons of organisations involved in the Health care reform row. This monopolistic access power to the beat is assumed as the most important right of beat reporters, not sharable with non-beat reporters. Therefore, it seemed inevitable that the specialists had limited access to government sources.

The specialists’ weakness in accessing official sources was also identified in the ‘sort of source’ they relied on (Table 33). The specialists’ dependence on organisational sources was fairly low, at 29.0% (n=9), compared with the generalists’ high dependence, at 80.3% (n=110). Contrary to the generalists’ dominance over organisational sources, the specialists took advantage of individual sources, for instance individual private doctors, university medical professors, or someone concerned with the KMA or the KHA at administrative level. Most of these individual sources were, thus, professional sources. The introduction of individual sources in their items was much higher, at 32.3% (n=10) than the generalists’ 5.1% (n=7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of Source</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Journalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of Source</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Journalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of Source</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Journalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Journalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
This was also recognised in quotes from various professional sources used in the stories (Table 34). The specialists' professional quotes were over half (58.1%, n=18), but the generalists' had a much smaller number (13.1%, n=18). Moreover, as shown in Table 33, the specialists seemed to enjoy a certain degree of accessing organisational sources (29.0%, n=9). This rate was nearly equivalent to their individual source rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Attributes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

This advantage of specialists' sources is likely to be linked to the source varieties they have (Table 35). The source variety were coded as follows: items using more than 4 different sorts of sources were coded as 'broad', 2-3 sorts as 'medium', and less than 1 as 'narrow'. The generalists' source variety was measured as 'narrow', whereas that of specialists was relatively broad. The generalists' source variety coded by 'broad' was just 2.2%, compared with the specialists' 16.1%. By contrast, the 'narrow' variety of the generalists' sources reached 60.6%, against the specialists' 38.7%.

As indicated in Table 33, the 'narrow' variety of the generalists' sources seemed to be related to their heavy dependence on organisational sources, at 80.3% (n=110), whereas their dependence on individual sources was limited to 5.1% (n=7). However, the specialists had a relatively even approach between
individual sources (32.3%, n=10), and organisational sources (29.0%, n=9). This source-reporter relationship seemed to be to some degree linked to MI. Some codes of sources showed a meaningful relevance, but others did not. 'Sort of sources' by MI showed no significant differences between individual sources and organisational sources in relation to MI.

<Table 35> Journalist Status by Source Variety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Variety</th>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
<th>Generalist</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

<Table 36> Source Variety by Location MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location MI</th>
<th>Source Variety</th>
<th>Broad</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Narrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Variety</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Variety</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Variety</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
However, in the crosstabulation of source variety by MI (Tables 36, 37, and 38), identification MI and tactical MI revealed a proportional pattern to the degree of source variety, even if location MI did not. That is, the broader the source variety, the higher the rate of identification MI and tactical MI. Accordingly, it could be deduced that the specialists who were identified to have broader source variety than the generalists were better to producing identification MI and tactical MI. However, regardless of MI, all the items of both types of journalists coded as ‘broad’ were too small (4.8%, n=8) to support this assumption, as can be seen in Table 35. More than half of the items (56.5%,
n=95) were classified as 'narrow' source variety, and 38.7% (n=65) were 'medium' variety.

A more meaningful feature may be the relation between 'source importance' and MI (Tables 39, 40, and 41). Firstly, the generalists were in a more favourable position to provide identification MI than the specialists were. Here, identification MI was in proportion to the degree of source importance. The higher ranking sources showed more identification MI. With high-ranking sources, the rate of identification MI reached 62.1% (n=18), whereas low-ranking sources decreased identification MI to 37.1% (n=13). For instance, the names of the minister of the MHW or chairperson of the KMA or the KHA were identified without exception, while the names of middle-ranking sources such as administrators were dealt with as 'the concerned'. Even if these middle-ranking sources often supplied important tip-offs, their names were not revealed.

By contrast, location MI was in inverse proportion to the degree of source importance: the less important the sources, the more location MI. In the case of tactical MI, the MI were the least when involving high-ranking sources, that
is, 20.7% (n=6). Tactical MI in low-ranking sources was more frequently reached at 34.3% (n=12). These findings indicate that revealing the identity of sources is closely linked to the credibility of source information: the higher the source was, the more credible was the source information.

<p>| &lt;Table 40&gt; Source Importance by Identification MI |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Importance</th>
<th>High Ranking</th>
<th>Middle Ranking</th>
<th>Low Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

<p>| &lt;Table 41&gt; Source Importance by Tactical MI |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Importance</th>
<th>High Ranking</th>
<th>Middle Ranking</th>
<th>Low Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactical MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Source Importance</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

Normally the high-ranking sources announced resolutions because they were decision-makers. However, the middle-ranking sources suggested on-
going issues before the decision-making, which could be changed in the process of decision-making. Accordingly, most middle-ranking sources as well as low-ranking sources would never want their identity revealed. It is risky to reveal the identity of middle or low-ranking sources due to their less credible information.

The result of the higher level of MI in high ranking source implied that the generalists were in a more favourable position to provide identification MI in relation to 'source importance' than specialists were. This is related to the fact that generalists in charge of the beat could far more easily access high ranking official sources of the beat like the Minister of governmental departments or the leading persons of organisations such as chairpersons. Such accessibility to high ranking sources were certainly a competitive element, and accordingly reporters would like to show off the presence of such sources in their stories. The high ranking official sources also provided more authoritative information.

Attributing statements to sources is, thus, a key element of objectivity as maintained by Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 113). That is, the high ranking sources served to defend the reporting from critics. With these reasons, it can be argued that identification MI was more frequently presented in stories with high ranking sources. This finding is consistent with Rossow and Dunwoody's analysis (1991: 96). They discover that MI, such as identification MI, would be more frequent and detailed when it involved governmental and other legitimised sources of information.

In the midst of conflicts between the MHW and doctors when the MHW proposed compromising regulations, but which appeared to be on the side of pharmacists' interests, it was highly difficult to interview the Minister of the MHW. However, Kim, D. S. of the Chosun Ilbo succeeded in interviewing the Minister exclusively. The Minister leaked to him the government's intention of turning policy in favour of the doctors. It was undoubtedly controversial enough to re-ignite the conflict between doctors and pharmacists. Kim, D. S.
chose to identify this high ranking source rather than retain anonymity. Kim, C. J., a medical specialist of his company (KCJ, interviewed 2001), explained that making source identity clear was needed for two purposes: one was to build up news credibility; the other was to defend himself in case of criticism from the parties concerned.

Secondly, the examination of the relation between MI and 'source importance' suggested another significant insight: the lower frequency of tactical MI than identification MI. This allegation seemed to be common for both types of journalists. The average rate of identification MI was 52.4%, while that of tactical MI was 32.7%, as revealed in Table 20 and 21. More importantly, the variance between these two MIs in high-ranking source story was three-fold (Tables 39, 40, and 41): identification MI in high-ranking sources was 62.1%, but tactical MI in the same sources was 20.7%. From this, it could be inferred that generalists who depended more upon high ranking sources than specialists provided far less tactical MI than specialists. Compared with MI in high ranking sources, in middle ranking or low ranking sources, on which specialists depended slightly more than generalists, the gap between tactical MI and identification MI was not as great as in high ranking sources. In the case of middle ranking sources, tactical MI was 35.6% (n=37), against 54.8% (n=57) of identification MI. In low ranking sources, the gap was negligible: tactical MI 34.3% (n=12), and identification MI 37.1% (n=13). From these results, it might be indirectly deduced that specialists provided more tactical MI than generalists did.

Low tactical MI is also recognised in the analysis of Lemert et al. (1977) and Lemert (1984). Based on a survey of news about controversial political issues, Lemert (1984: 249) concludes that MI is missing in news of political disputes at least partly because journalists decide to withhold it. Moreover, journalists will hesitate to provide MI when they are producing controversial news items - even when the journalists have MI in hand. In the same sense,
Paletz (1998: 231) argues that journalists intend to avoid some significant information when the legislation is complex and multi-faceted.

However, this study found that Lemert's conclusion needs to be categorically observed in accordance with types of MI. Less MI in the controversial political issues would be true in terms of tactical MI. However, identification MI with higher-ranking sources conversely increased, contrary to his conclusion. MI in controversial issues needs to be analysed categorically in accordance with types of MI. This study also found that specialists could provide more tactical MI than generalists, although it was based on indirect deduction. Therefore, exploration is needed as to why tactical MI was lessened with higher-ranking sources in politically controversial issue. The question is why journalists tend to withhold or hesitate to provide MI in the case of news items about controversy.

There may be several reasons. According to Paletz's explanation (1998: 231), the media firstly fails to provide enough information. He argues that journalists seem to wait for a law to be passed before examining its details. They are sometimes not prepared to investigate it or they avoid making judgements. Paletz holds that journalists tend to avoid making judgements and predictions about the effects of a just-passed law and stick with the factual details rather than enter the uncertain realm of speculation. Related to the case study of this study, given the generalists' dominance of high-ranking official sources, Paletz's observation provides one possible explanation on the low level of tactical MI, even with high-ranking sources. It is possible to infer that generalists' lack of understanding of specific issues inhibits them from presenting enough analysis. Tactical MI refers to information to make available explicit and implicit behavioural models (Lemert, 1981: 121). Typical tactical MI is tactics used in successful and unsuccessful activities. As suggested by Paletz, it refers to making judgements. Less tactical MI, therefore, implies journalists' reluctance to examine details of news events, and an ill-prepared
state due to previous lack of knowledge. Consequently, it could be argued that the types of analysis or in-depth reporting have a higher possibility of providing tactical MI than the reporting of ‘news’ type. That is, tactical MI needs clear knowledge of the issue and professional value judgements. On the issue of the Health care reform, journalists should have known about policy-making procedure, medical reality, and other related aspects along with a capacity to exert value judgements on this. To sum up, generalists had too narrow a knowledge to provide tactical MI, even if they had high-ranking sources.

Even more, the lack of tactical MI provision seems to be related to the tendency of public policy news to provoke cynicism. Cappella and Jamieson (1998: 111) suggest in some detail the problems of public policy news, in dealing with the Health care reform of 1993-1994 in the U. S. A.. According their analyses, firstly journalism presented an inconsistent usage of labels for the alternative plans. This indicated that the public found it difficult to understand the details of the reform. Secondly, a conflict frame of the news narrowed public focus to two plans, minimising the viability of the others. Thirdly, at a critical point in the debate’s progression, reporters emphasised scandal rather than the substance of the Health care reform at a critical point in the debate’s progression. Fourthly, reporters focused on the strategy of the players in the debate rather than on the substance. It meant that the public were deprived of useful information about health care reform alternatives. Fifthly, news gave disproportionate coverage to the forces opposing reform. These fallacies were summarised in terms of the absence of a critical approach, and a sensationalism-oriented commercial pursuit. Conflict frames, and overemphasis on scandals would be examples. Based on these findings, it could be concluded that the structure of public policy reporting is likely to be receptive for activating public cynicism, and reducing learning about important public issues.
An analysis in the view of conflict frames would be applicable to this case study (Table 42). Both specialist and generalist reporters focused most frequently upon the events of 'doctors' interests'. 35.0% (n=48) of the generalist items dealt with this subject. The specialist reports on this was nearly half of all items (48.4%, n=15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Events</th>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Regulations</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Grievances</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors' Interests</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacists' Interests</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict with Government</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiations</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Responses</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.*

In comparison, the 'consumer grievances' issue was rated as the fourth event among the generalist reports, and the second for the specialists.
'Doctors' interests' was the direct cause of this Health care reform row. As examined above, the Health care reform assumed interest conflicts between doctors and pharmacists. Therefore, focusing reports on 'doctors' interests' inevitably focused on conflict frames between these two groups.

On the other hand, the doctors' interests-centred approach related to the reporters' elite-oriented attitude. This elitist approach was also another factor resulting in less tactical MI. Lemert (1981: 138-147) sees that the public affairs news is usually issue-centredness. He adds that public affairs news has "a concern with describing and analysing public issues than with what people can do about these issues" (1981: 138). Consequently, it seems to be highly possible that the public affairs news ignores the MI. Lemert suggests two reasons for this phenomenon: a journalist's absent-minded impracticality and the elitist concern of a journalist.

Absent-minded impracticality may be a consequence of misunderstanding the audience. In this case, journalists consider the audience as being always out there, waiting to make up their mind. It presumes that the audience will always need additional issue information because they will never quite have made up their minds. On this ground, "public affair journalists rarely ask questions that are directed at getting anything other than issue positions or defences of past practices and future polices" (Lemert, 1981: 139). This observation indicates that public affair journalism usually underestimates the audience or decides the audience's interest in an arbitrary way.

The more important problem is the elitist concern of journalists. This induces journalists to focus only on specifically targeted people such as doctors who already know a lot about the issues such, as identified in this study. For instance, it may be a decision-maker or direct beneficiary from the public policy. They are persons who try to influence on news. For them, MI would, here, be a waste of time.
The elitist concern of journalists is partly because of journalists' intervention in policy-making processes. One aspect of journalist identities in terms of the existence of policy subsystems seems to explain why journalists have an elitist concern. According to Paletz (1998: 219), policy subsystems consist of members and staff of congressional committees or subcommittees, bureaucrats in an administrative branch, interest groups, and policy experts. Paletz sees that journalists are here assumed as one part of the subsystems involving policy-making. Borquez (1993: 33) also recognises journalists as legitimate and active players in advocacy coalitions in the policy-making process. Borquez's observation indicates that public policy journalists are located inside of the policy-making system by being involved in the process. Accordingly, their interests come to focus on the policy makers rather than the consumers, which ultimately leads to limiting MI in news for consumer-participation in the issue.

In conclusion, related to the case study, the source-MI relationships suggest that the generalists found it difficult to provide MI, especially tactical MI in their stories compared with the specialists. This might be because of a lack of specialised knowledge on the Health care reform issue or a hesitation of value judgements in an effort to avoid criticism. At the same time, both types of journalists focused on the conflict aspects of events. This attitude led to limiting the audiences' focus to the two elite groups, namely, the doctors and pharmacists, and not to the consumers. It also minimised the viability of other aspects of the events. This problem could be re-identified in examination of the journalists' active concerns over the issue.

7.2.2.3 Active Approaches

Eide and Knight (1999: 525-547) hold that an active approach in journalism is one of the ways to serve audience-interests. This approach can be assumed to
provide information to facilitate action for audience interests. As examined above, it includes a rather professional-client relationship. Specialism based on specialised knowledge is assumed as relatively advantageous in providing an active approach to audience interests.

In examining the source-MI relationships in this study, the journalists, especially generalists ignored providing tactical MI. This type of MI seemed to be related to specialised knowledge and value judgements on the issue. Accordingly, it can be deduced that a lack of tactical MI results in the low level of active approach. At least at a theoretical level, tactical MI is proportionate to the extent of active approach. This study pays attention to several subjects of an active journalism to examine how the status of journalists relates to an active approach. In this study, five active approach subjects were chosen, namely: how journalists define problems; how they attribute blame on the issue; how they reveal debates of the issue; how they evaluate remedies for consumer inconvenience; and how they provide advice.

News items were, here, coded into three levels such as 'complete', 'partial', and 'nonexistent'. Instead of identifying either presence or absence of information, this approach let the study gauge, not only the existence of information, but also its comprehensiveness or detail, even if to a limited degree.

The specialists seemed to be partly better at presenting active concerns about the Health care reform. In subjects of 'defining the problem' (Table 43), and 'attributing blame' (Table 44), the specialists showed a significant superiority to the generalists. 61.3% (n=19) of a total 31 items of the specialists included 'complete' information of 'defining the problem', while the generalist items were limited to 28.5% (n=39) out of 137 stories. The specialists pointed out in their stories that the seriousness of Health care reform lay in the structure of medical services leading hospitals' financial situations to worsen.
This was supported by evidences such as statistical data and in-depth interviews with doctors. With such evidence, the specialists could easily find out who the prime instigators were of the medical service inconveniences. On the contrary, the generalists mostly paid direct attentions to describe doctors’ revolts or consumer complaints rather than analysing the fundamental
problems. The generalists did not accommodate any single piece of information for 'defining the problem', in 41.6% of their items (n=57). In 'attributing blame', the specialists produced information coded as 'complete' in 41.9% of their stories (n=13). By contrast, the generalists' items belonged to the category of 'attributing blame' were restricted to 29.2% (n=40). In the rest of the subjects, there were not significant differences between them. These findings indicate that the specialists focused their newsgathering activities on a systematic approach by exploiting their specialised knowledge and source-relationship with doctors. The generalists, however, stressed the traditional newsgathering method of the-on-the-spot-coverage.

Other important findings were on the subjects of 'revealing debates', 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice' (Tables 45, 46, and 47). Regardless of the reporters' status, items coded as 'nonexistent' were 50.6% (n=85) in 'revealing debates', 60.7% (n=102) in 'evaluating remedies', and 82.1% (n=138) in 'providing advice'. Both types of journalists had considerable limitations in these subjects. It seemed impossible for them to provide advice for consumers to cope with the inconvenience caused by policy making chaos.

<Table 45> Journalist Status by Revealing Debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revealing Debates</th>
<th>Journalist Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexistent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Journalist</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage figures have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
 Especially the generalists’ impasses were likely to be more serious than those of the specialists. The generalists’ ‘nonexistent’ rate in revealing debate reached at 51.8% (n=71). Their ‘nonexistent’ information rate (67.2%, n=92) in ‘evaluating remedies’ was doubled by that of the specialists (32.3%, n=10). 86.9% (n=119) of generalists’ stories failed to reveal any single piece of
information on 'providing advice', compared with 61.3% (n=19) of specialists. The specialists also revealed a similar inclination to that of the generalists in these three subjects although the rate was less than that of the generalists.

These five subjects of active journalism assume, to a certain degree, a rather sequential context in relation to the level of developing news contents. 'Defining the problem' is certain to be the first step to introduce an active approach to events. Then, journalists would identify who have the main responsibility for problems by attributing blame. They can also evaluate remedies suggested by various people concerned after revealing relevant debates. Based on these contents, they are able to provide their own advice to consumers. Journalists need more confidence in their knowledge about the issue. Particularly, the last two subjects are likely to be possible solely based on their own judgements and expertise whereas the first three subjects seem to be produced simply by careful examination of existing evidence. In this sense, 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice' seems to refer to specialised knowledge as well as value judgements, which are more closely related to analysis or in-depth reporting than 'news', likewise tactical MI.

Based these results, it could be inferred that the specialists appeared to be partly better than the generalists in delivering active concerns over the Health care reform issue. However, along with the generalists, the specialists also seemed to have some significant drawbacks in terms of active journalism. They did not seem to provide enough information for 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice'. These examinations indicate that both types of journalists seemed to reveal, to a certain extent, limits of judgement and expertise on the issue of the Health care reform.

This finding regarding an active approach is likely to be consistent with that of MI research: even with a partial superiority of providing active approaches to generalists, specialists cannot be asserted to fully provide more
active journalism than generalists. That is, it is not possible to insist that specialism is always better journalism than the generalist approach.

Summary

One of the purposes of specialism is to provide better news in the end. This purpose is likely to be related to audience interests. In Chapter 6, this study identifies that both types of journalist share one feature of news selection, namely, an audience-oriented approach. The journalists interviewed suggested audience interests in terms of news quality. The main features of this are information utility and integrity. What is important here is how to deliver these qualities, that is, the manner of dealing with news stories. In Chapter 7, this study presupposes that active journalism can be one of those ways. The role of journalism to serve audiences means transforming from a passive and negative watchdog to positive and active one. The function of journalism focuses on relieving or solving their audiences' inconveniences or grievances. The notion of mobilising Information (MI) is adopted to investigate whether specialist journalism provides better news compared with a generalist approach.

Through a brief case study of news items on the Health care reform row in Korea, this study examined several relationships between both types of journalists and MI. Firstly, it founds that the status of a journalist does not influence MI. The specialists were similar to the generalists in providing MI. Even if the specialists had an advantage of broader space than the generalists, it was not connected to MI provision. According to content analysis, the news executives introduced highly generalist-centred involvement strategy. From this evidence, it could be inferred that the specialists under the desk executive seemed to be assimilated into the generalists' way of news selection.
In source-MI relation, secondly this study discovered that the specialists were in a favourable position to provide MI, especially tactical MI, in their stories against the generalists. The specialists had rather better knowledge to discern news events than the generalists. However, there were no significant differences of MI between both types of journalists, although the specialists were partly superior to the generalists. In general, both types of reporters focused on conflict aspects of events. Due to this, their news stories were limited to elite groups of doctors and pharmacists and not focused on the consumers. Consequently, this approach is linked to less MI for consumer-participation in the issue.

The outcomes of these two aspects were also identified in an active approach. The specialists were partly better in an active approach. Both journalists, nevertheless, did not provide enough information, especially for 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice'. They, to a certain extent, seemed to have a problem in providing judgement and expertise on the issue of the Health care reform. The specialists did not show a distinctively better approach to active journalism for resolving audiences' inconveniences than the generalists.

In conclusion, specialism partly provided better journalism than a generalist approach, however generally speaking it cannot be concluded that the specialists succeeded in providing better news than the generalists. This study discovers that it is partly because of the news organisations' involvement policy of specialists, and partly because of generalist-oriented beat routines.
Summary & Conclusion

CENTRALISATION vs. DEVOLUTION

In Chapters 6 and 7, this study explored specialist news selection practices by analysing their source relations and news organisational control routines. This examination sought to answer to the question of whether specialism is effective in providing better news than a generalist approach. For this purpose, this study in Chapter 6 analysed how specialists' news selection develops its own advantages in relation to the influence of news organisational routines. This study found that specialists' news selection routines are confronted by the established organisational routines in many aspects. Although specialists have the advantages of professional or expert sources, they also lack authoritative information provided by the official beat sources. Moreover it discovered that specialists could fall into the danger of bias due to over-dependence on personal sources.

Due to this problem, the generalists in this study insisted an organisational control over specialists in the news selection process. In fact, organisational routines are inevitably instilled into a reporter's news selection. Organisational control in news selection is applied in general with the mode of 'typification'. Journalists adopt 'typification' of potential news stories for routinising unexpected events as news, as mentioned by Tuchman (1973; 1978). More concretely, this study found that this is conducted in the name of factors such as quality control, consistency of page, universal values, and beat routines. However, it also found that both types of journalists recognised that the ultimate purpose of news selection should be focused on the audience's interests.

Chapter 7 examined the reality of specialists' news selection attitude to identify how efficiently their news outcome provides better news compared with generalists in terms of active journalism and mobilising information (MI)
through a brief case study. Firstly, it identified that MI is not associated with a journalist’s status. The specialists did not reveal meaningful differences of MI comparing with the generalists. Even though this study did not recognise the reason, one possible cause could be the control over specialists exerted by desk executives. In spite of different policies in organising specialists, the specialists showed similar practices to the generalist in dealing MI.

Secondly, the examination of source-MI relationship suggested that the generalists found it more difficult than the specialists to provide MI, especially tactical MI in their stories. This seemed partly because of lack of specialised knowledge on the Health care reform issue or hesitation over value judgements in an effort to avoid criticism. This finding is observed in Chapter 6. However, this study also disclosed that both types of journalists focused on the conflict aspects of events. This attitude resulted in limiting discussions to elite groups of doctors and pharmacists rather than consumers. It minimised the viability of the other aspects of events. The journalists, regardless of their status, were likely to have elitist concerns over the Health care reform rather than address ordinary consumer interests.

From these evidences, this study identifies that it is difficult to support the third hypothesis of “Specialism develops better news in an effort to pursue audience interests”. The specialists showed, to a certain extent, relative advantages against generalists in some categories of MI. However, it cannot necessarily be insisted that this advantage always works. That is, this study did not find decisive evidence to support the presumption that specialism is effective in providing ‘better journalism’ than the established generalist-oriented newsgathering practices.

It may be no accident that the examination on MI or active journalism is related to organisational control system over specialists. As indicated by studies of Tunstall (1971) and Negrine (1996), specialism has been introduced in an effort to divide responsibility. Expectations for specialists regard ‘non-
news’, not ‘news’. Tunstall (1996: 155) expounds this responsibility in terms of ‘pages’. Specialists are given a set space. “Specialist journalism has also migrated out of the general news pages at the front of the paper into new sections and new columns” (Tunstall, 1996: 161). The news organisational policy for specialists is undoubtedly based on this division of responsibility.

Given the fact that news is the product of bureaucratically structured organisations, journalist’s work in “gathering, assembling, and selecting news is left primarily to workers who are relatively low in the hierarchy but who, in the Western industrialised countries, are considered professionals and given substantial autonomy” (Ettema et. al, 1987 in Berkowitz 1997: 37). This feature of a bureaucratically structured product accounts for the fact that journalists do their work under the control of an organisation. However, when a specialist’s responsibility is different from these normal newsgathering and writing practices, the control system over them should also be different. Specialism relates to a relatively flexible organisational control.

Flexible control is rather a devolution of control. Devolution is the extent to which the centre of an organisation delegates decision-making to units or employees lower down in the hierarchy. However, control over the specialists in this study was conducted to the contrary. There seem two features of centralisation of control rather than devolution. Firstly, the news executives highly focused news involvement on the generalists. The specialists were likely to be alienated from the main role in news production. Secondly, the news executive pagination policy for the specialists concentrated on the front page. From this, it might be concluded that the specialist responsibilities were not properly considered. The main reason seemed that the specialists were under control of the desk executive, who had a substantial power to organise pages and reporters. News executives would not delegate control in news production to specialists. The outcome of this centralised organisational
control was that there were no significant differences of active approaches between generalists and specialists.

This finding implies that an individual journalist’s attitude towards news selection is significantly restricted by the organisational control process. That is, the organisational policy forces individual journalists to admit organisational behaviour.
8.1 Implications of specialism

Influences on news or news selection can be analysed in accordance with various levels such as individual, organisational, industrial, and institutional levels. The sociology of news production could be approached at these levels of analysis. McNair (1994: 43-64) and Schudson (1996: 141-159) categorise the sociology of news as: the political economy of news, organisational approach, and cultural approach. McNair defines these as follows:

Firstly, politico-economic accounts, which explain journalism in terms of the influence upon its production of economic and political factors; secondly, organisational approaches, focusing on the professional constraints acting on journalists; and thirdly, what James Curran calls culturalist approaches, which locate the source of ‘bias’ in complex interactions between news producers and the external socio-cultural environment (1994: 43).

Of these approaches, the political economic approach refers to industrial or institutional factors impacting or deciding on news production. It pays attention especially to “the economic structure of the organisations concerned” (McNair, 1994: 43). The culturalist approach to the news product itself examines its “generalised images and stereotypes in the news media” (Schudson, 1996: 151). Contrary to these approaches, the organisational approach focuses on the process of news making and journalistic organisation in explaining output. Research issues in this approach are such as the
limitations imposed by the news form; constraints imposed on journalists' ability to gather news; and the routine professional practices of journalism (McNair, 1994: 50). Focusing on the organisational level of news highlights "the bureaucratic nature of news production, the routines and conventions by which work is accomplished, and the management of organisational conflict" (Ettema et al. 1987, in Berkowitz 1997: 37). That is, the organisational approach asserts that news is constructed. According to Schudson (1996: 151), it is especially "socially constructed, elaborated in the interaction of the newsmaking players with one another".

Journalism seems be explained more clearly with analysis on news production routines. McNair (1998) observes that "journalism is the result of a production process centred on the newroom and that the working environment of the newroom is the starting point for the individual journalist's activity defining its routines and limitation" (1998: 62). The feature of journalism in relation to the routines of the news production process also illustrates another aspect of journalism: news is an organisational response to the world.

From these perspectives, this research into specialism in Korean newspaper journalism may have some significant implications in terms of the organisational approach, which has changed several aspects of news production practices in Korean journalism. It creates conflict with the established bureaucratic routines and conventions of newsgathering activities. In the midst of the conflicts, news organisations exert complicated management policies to appease conflicts within the newsroom. It seems important to grasp how news organisations deal with the routines of news production for implementing specialism. This study intends to comprehend journalists' ways, especially specialists' news production practices in relation to the established news organisational culture. For this purpose, this study posits several questions and hypotheses as follows:
Q1. Why do news organisations intend to introduce specialism?
H1. Specialism is adopted for personnel management and newsgathering efficiency.

Q2. What does specialism have to do with the news organisational culture?
H2. Specialism is restricted by news organisation routines.

Q3. Is specialism effective in providing 'better journalism'?
H3. Specialism develops better news in an effort to pursue audience interests.

8.2 Summary of Research Findings

8.2.1 Specialism as Strategy

One of the important findings of this study might be the fact that specialist journalism in Korea is chosen as a problem-solving strategy. Specialism is regarded as an instant panacea to cure problems, which come from both inside and outside news organisations. One problem is the internal urgency of journalist management: journalists' job insecurity. The other is the external factor of environmental challenges: Internet impacts.

On the one hand, the crisis of job insecurity brought about by a destruction of two fundamentals of Korean newspaper journalism also needs to be solved. Firstly, the economic collapse in Korea in the late 1990s effected a critical recession in the newspaper industry. As a survival strategy, newspaper companies dramatically cut the number of journalists in an attempt of save on expenditures. This brought journalists, especially senior journalists towards significant job insecurity. Secondly, the impact of the economic recession is linked to a transformation of the traditional practices of news organisations. Seniority practices, which had by far dominated newsroom
routines, were gradually discarded. The futures of senior journalists necessarily became vague. Uncertainties of job prospects resulted in a transformation of a journalist identity. This was traditionally highly oriented and dependent on news organisations, but then it moved towards a rather individual identity. By losing trust in news organisations, journalists tend to consider freelancing work, as an extra alternative job prospect, independent of news organisation domination. Specialism is here thought to fix this dilemma. Specialism is seen as resolving the job insecurity of Korean journalists, and working as a strategic choice competing with Internet challenges.

Korean journalists, on the other hand, assume that Internet news is characterised by the speed of information transaction, volume of information, accessibility, and audience feedback. Both news contents and news production seem to be affected by these features. Activeness of the audiences has increased to the extent that their attitude towards news consumption has changed. Journalists can make their newsgathering activities more efficient when using the Internet.

Specialism has a clear ground in that it can deal with the challenges of the Internet. It gives newspapers the potential of providing news quality compared with the Internet, and it is related to a journalist-based newspaper's core competence. The journalists interviewed in this study argued that professional minded journalists are the foundation of quality news. The quality of newspaper news can be achieved by its information utility and integrity.

To sum up, the fact that specialism is a means of settling down pending problems of news organisations confirms the first research hypothesis of "Specialism is adopted for personnel management and newsgathering efficiency". Given that specialism is aimed at fixing journalists' job insecurity and their uncertainty about the future, this study clearly supports the
hypothesis of the reason of 'personnel management'. It is also likely to verify another point of the hypothesis of 'newsgathering efficiency'. The assumption that specialism is a way of developing a newspaper's competence is related to an effective aspect of specialism. The division of responsibility in specialism brings an efficiency of newsgathering activity that specialists take charge of 'non-news', while generalists deal with 'news'.

Another important finding seems that, as a means of increasing newsgathering efficiency and journalist management, specialism relates to a strategy of problem-solving. Specialism in Korea would be said to be not an evolution but a revolution. Even if discussions on need for specialism have been argued for a few decades, its implementation in Korea occurred suddenly by managerial decision. It is alike a policy rather than a culture. Comparing with British specialism, this is a peculiar feature. According to Tunstall (1971), British specialism dates back to the earlier period of the British press. In the Victorian period, specialism worked for a rather simple reason to provide more news that, otherwise, was impossible to supply. Based on this, he argues that this raises the problems of the definition of 'specialist'. British specialism has evolved over a considerable period. However, Korean specialism has been constructed purposively in order to resolve several urgent problems.

Given the urgent demand of journalists and news organisations for specialism, Korean specialism is likely to be required to take the form of a system based on institutions. This institutional aspect of Korean specialism seems to be linked to the some formality of the management of specialists. More importantly, specialism, to a certain degree, involves heterogeneous aspects that can be in discord with the existing practices of news organisations. It is an alternative to the present generalist-oriented practices. This heterogeneity could sometimes generate confrontation between specialism and the established practices.

Due to this phenomenon of strategic choice, specialism inevitably has to
prepare an institutionalised implementing system. Besides this, journalists' competition for specialist status, and the distrust for news organisations also lead to demands for an authorised, objective, and institutionalised system for managing specialism in the end. This problem is linked to the management policy of specialism such as designation, reward system, and the other personnel policies. However, it is not sure to harmonise with the existing practice of journalism. The generalist-centred practices of news production are argued to be an obstacle to develop this purpose.

8.2.2 Organising Specialists

In Chapters 4 and 5, this study discovered that the generalist-oriented newsroom practices in fact make it difficult to implement management policies for specialists including personnel policies and the routines of organising journalists. This is related to the second finding of this study that news organisations confuse what the factors are that compose specialism. News organisations have no clear resource assessment of specialism. This phenomenon appears to be related to the fact that there are two different routes for recruiting specialists: internal and external.

Firstly, several aspects of personnel policies illustrate that journalists tend to be more favourable towards specialists recruited from experts than specialists internally recruited out of senior generalists. They would like to admit preferential payment or permanent assignment to a specific field for expert-rooted specialists, but nor for internally recruited specialists. Whereas they insist that internally recruited specialists should be allowed to return to the bureaucratic ladder, but this view is not the case for expert-rooted specialists.

This may be related to two arguments. One is how to configure specialist resources. Based on this examination, it can be inferred that journalists appreciate 'expertise' more positively than journalistic 'experience'.
This is likely to be opposite to their emphasis on professional journalistic judgement mainly based on journalistic experience as a core competence of newspaper. However, this does not imply that they deny journalistic experience as a specialist qualification. In this sense, the different approach to personnel policy refers to the other argument: competition for specialist status.

In fact, journalistic experience is not a specific feature but common to most journalists. Due to this, they would not accept a preferential reward for 'experience' itself. They consider that specialism requires more than 'experience', even if most generalists can compete for specialist status because of this property. They argue that recruitment from senior generalists should be much stricter in order to deal properly with designation competition between generalists. The personnel management of specialists is related more closely to specialists who are recruited from senior generalists than expert-rooted specialists. In spite of the importance of such a job assessment of specialists, it seems that most news organisations find it difficult to establish a proper and effective system of specialist management.

Secondly, the other feature of resource assessment of specialists refers to how to organise specialists in the routines of news organisations. As regards routines of news production, resource assessment relates to newsgathering routines and those of organising specialists, for instance control routines. Here resource assessment discloses the problem of an inclination towards generalist-centred practices.

The beat system is one of the manifest routines of Korean journalism. Specialists seem to have double standards for it: benefit and burden. Both standards are linked with the tendency of heavy dependence on the beat. Even if specialists focus on exemption from the burden of duty of beat routines for the sake of 'non-news' responsibilities, it is unlikely that they can pursue events without access to beats. Most generalists interviewed in this study denied sharing their beats with specialists because the beat is seen as generalist
territorial property. Interestingly, they accepted the access of specialists who are former generalists. Beat routines are assumed to be applicable to generalists or specialists of former generalists, but not to former expert specialists.

This generalist-oriented principle in news organisational routines also appears to be true in organising or controlling specialists. News organisations tend to control reporters' newsgathering activities for the sake of quality control of news. Provided that desk executives have a responsibility to design pages by combining various writings of reporters, it seems that desk executives deserve to have a revisionary power. The different responsibility of specialists again relates to their demands for flexibility in the working process and autonomy in news selection. To deal with this confrontation between specialists and a news organisation, two tower control systems are proposed: desk executive control and the editor's or editing board control. The latter is thought as having less control than the former. However, most news production procedures are dependent on the desk in practice. The desk is the basic unit of news production, and in effect, specialists are hardly free from desk executive control.

Based on these analyses, the second hypothesis can be verified: "Specialism is restricted by news organisation routines". Personnel management policies are seemingly unfavourable especially for specialists who are recruited from senior generalists. The existing routines of personnel policies affect them unfavourably. Their qualification as specialist is unlikely to be admitted as sufficient even if it is indispensable. This could bring them towards an uncertainty of their status. Moreover, the former expert specialists are inhibited from accessing the beat in accordance with the existing generalist-oriented routines of the beat system. Therefore, the control system for specialists appears to be oppressive.

These problems originate from a failure to configure specialist resources.
Johnson and Scholes (1999: 446) state that resource assessment enables an organisation to identify what the resource requirements are and who will deploy those resources to create the competence needed to underpin strategies. From this discovery, it can be deduced that news organisations appear to fail to protect the unique resources that are the base of strategies.

In fact, journalist resources are outcomes learnt and accumulated over time, so utilising these resources is a method of cost efficiency. News organisations seem to imperfectly organise and mix various resources, for instance ‘journalistic experience’ and ‘expert’s expertise’. The policy of mixing resources is related in practice to a division of responsibility. So, the failure of resource assessment and the restriction of news production routines refer to problems of re-allocation of journalist resources.

8.2.3 Centralisation vs. Devolution

The third finding of this study is the fact that specialists’ news selection is assimilated to that of generalists. It is difficult to find significant differences in news selection between specialists and generalists. To a certain extent, this could be asserted that, given that they retain specialised knowledge, expertise, and professional sources, specialists have a relative advantage in providing quality news focused on an active approach in an attempt to pursue audience interests compared with generalists. However, this advantage does not always seem to work. This study does not find significant grounds that specialism is effective in providing quality news in terms of ‘information utility’ and ‘integrity’ of news compared with the established generalist-oriented newsgathering practices. It is hardly possible to support the third hypothesis of “Specialism develops better news in an effort to pursue audience interests”.

On the one hand, it seems clear that the routines of specialists’ news selection are different from the existing newsgathering practices in various
aspects, from news sources to news values. Specialists pay attention to professional or expert sources rather than official sources in an effort to develop 'non-news' responsibility. Under the practices of a restriction of the government's public information and a heavy dependence on official sources, this competence is certain to be a new possibility to develop different ways of news selection. Nevertheless, it has weaknesses in that it lacks authoritative information provided by the official sources and the danger of bias caused by an over-dependence on personal sources.

However, despite these weaknesses, specialists can use specialised knowledge to develop new value in news quality. They are able to discern events more accurately and critically than generalists. This feature of news value is highly journalist-centred. Yet it is unlikely to be free from the influence of organisational standardised guidelines. News organisations control and intervene in specialists' news values in an effort to keep page consistency and quality control. News organisations oblige journalists to follow news values oriented to organisational guidelines, while journalists, especially specialists require journalist-centred values. Standard guidelines are such as 'audience readability' as a universal value, the specific identity of news organisations, and beat routines.

So, the news selection of specialists is regulated by inter-relationships between specialists' individual ideology, news organisational control over news contents, and external influence from sources. However, the journalist-centred values of specialists and the standard guidelines of news organisations have a common purpose of audience interests. Eide and Knight (Eide, 1997: 173-182; Eide and Knight, 1999: 525-547) hold that journalism in modern society focuses on audience service as a relieving or solving their inconveniences or grievances. Mobilising Information (MI) is adopted as an indicator to measure services to audiences.
On the other hand, a brief case study of MI in the row over Health care reform in Korea also reveals that there were no significant differences of MI between both types of journalists. Though the specialists were partly better than the generalists in providing MI, the specialists also failed to accommodate enough information for audience interests. MI is not influenced by journalist status. The specialists were similar to the generalists in providing MI, in spite of their advantage of broader space than generalists. According to content analysis, desk news executives adopted a highly generalist-centred involvement strategy. From this evidence, it might be inferred that the specialists under desk executive control seemed to be absorbed into the generalists' method of news selection.

In the analysis of source-MI relations, the specialists were in favourable position to provide MI, especially tactical MI in their stories against the generalists. However, the specialists also did not provide significant differences in MI from the generalists. In general, both types of journalist paid attention to the conflict aspects of events. But this indicated that their approaches were limited to elitism rather than focusing on consumer-participation in the issue. Less MI was also identified in an 'active approach'. As in the case of tactical MI, the specialists were partly better in an active approach. Both types of journalist, nevertheless, failed to provide enough information, especially for 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice'. Despite the fact that the specialists succeeded to supply partially more information in terms of active approach, there were no distinctively better approaches to active journalism than with the generalists.

With the case study, this study might not argue a direct causal sequence between desk executive control and a lack of specialists' active approach. However, this study finds that the specialists' news selection practices were similar to those of generalists, in spite of several advantages. Through in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, this study identifies specialist
assimilation into generalists' news selection routines. The organisational control process as a bid for quality control is one of the manifest mechanisms creating standardised guidelines of news selection. The issue of news selection is said to be a problem of centralisation or devolution of control.

Given the different and divided responsibilities of specialists, devolution of control seems to be necessary in order to enlarge the flexibility of the work process and an autonomy of news selection. However, it seems to be difficult to give away the control to specialists. The current news organisational routines force individual journalists to conform to organisational guidelines.

8.3 Discussions

Specialism in Korean journalism is regarded as a strategic choice of news organisations to deal with emerging problems such as journalist's job insecurity and Internet challenges. As a choice of news organisation's strategic behaviour, specialism is required to blend with the existing culture of a news organisation. According to Hendriks:

[Strategic behaviour] is the entrepreneurial behaviour of media firms expressed through the manoeuvring of the firms with competitive parameters and the restructuring of their operations. This strategic behaviour consists of two dimensions: internal and external coordination. Internal coordination describes the way the media companies arrange their activities internally, that is, how they structure the production process. External coordination is the way in which media firms coordinate their activities externally, for example through undertaking mergers and joint ventures, or by penetrating new markets (1995: 65).

In terms of internal coordination, strategic behaviour is aimed at optimising the achievement of organisational objectives through allocating the resources into a
unique and viable posture, anticipating a constantly changing environment. For this purpose, Henderiks pays attention to the fact that news organisations need to prepare a relevant structure in order to accommodate a production process involving new strategies. Hendriks again focuses on performance strategy, that is, an internal coordination element. He clarifies performance strategies as follows:

Performance strategies refer to the set of rules that guide media professionals. They guide the balance of power between different persons within the media organisation and provide criteria for decisions on the allocation of internal resources between different production and marketing entities (1995: 73).

In accordance with this observation, specialism is supported by a set of rules to guide specialists as well as generalists.

This study identifies that specialism is considered not only as a problem-solving strategy, but also as a challenge to the established practices of news organisations. The strategic behaviour of news organisations is not simply to set rules for guiding journalists, but also relates to culture, more specifically, to the practices of the news production process including personnel management and allocation of journalist resources. Analyses on routines of news organisations are important to understand the interrelationship between specialism and news organisational culture. However, implementing specialism is to be approached in relation to resistance within the existing organisational culture. Brown sees organisational culture in two perspectives, as "both the means to effective organisational performance through the medium of strategy, and a potential barrier inhibiting required strategic realignment which can adversely affect strategy implementation" (1995: 173). Organisational culture is the key to understanding why some companies succeed in implementing their strategies while others fail.
The routines of news organisations relate to patterned and repeated practices in which journalists do their jobs. Routines are a practical presentation of organisational culture. Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 105) see routines as a set of constraints on individual journalists. Most studies of news organisational routines pay attention to news production processes (Tuchman, 1973, 1978; Sigelman, 1978; Gans, 1979; Fishman, 1980, 1983), control over journalists (Breed, 1955; Bantz, 1985), or news sources (Sigal, 1973; Gans, 1979; Ericson et al., 1989). On the other hand, Shoemaker and Reese (1996) categorise journalism routines as routines in relation to processor (news organisation), consumer (audience), and supplier (sources).

However, this study discovers that news organisational routines also exist in personnel management. From payment system to desk circulation, the personnel management policies in Korean newspaper journalism are conducted on these routines. When specialism is introduced as a strategic choice, its implementation into news organisations necessarily involves the routines of personnel management. The routines are more than constraints on journalists. From the findings of this study, the routines also refer to defence mechanism for the existing set of rules against an impetus of change. The routines of journalism assume a feature of rigidity to support the existing rules, and are normally defensive against changes. Schein (1992: 12) states that the routines as organisational culture involve a pattern of shared basic assumptions. They function to preserve the internal integration of an organisation. New members of an organisation are taught the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to problems. On the contrary to the routines' inclination of internal integration, Korean newspaper companies introduce new personnel management policies for specialists, which cause conflict with the existing routines of personnel management. Given the above, the defiant attitude of generalists towards preferential reward systems is apparently inevitable. To sum up, the routines of news organisational culture tend to be defensive.
The rigidity of news organisational routines is a consequence of a failure of resource assessment for specialists. From the analyses, Korean newspaper journalism depends highly on the generalist-oriented practices. Negrine (1994: 125) states that specialism refers to an efficiency of news production, especially newsgathering activities. Korean specialism also aims towards efficiency. For this purpose, news organisations adopt a division of responsibility. However, news organisations have to identify and configure specialist requirements beforehand. This involves how specialists will be deployed to create the competence needed to underpin particular strategies (Johnson & Scholes, 1999: 446). News organisations in Korean newspaper companies seem to fail in a proper resource assessment of specialists. Even if they prepare delicate systems for specialism, journalists do not have confidence in them. Distrust for news organisations seems to be the most critical reason, which sometimes leads journalists to deny a specialist's speciality, especially specialists recruited from senior generalists. The lack of proper assessment over specialist resources lessens an assimilation of specialism into news organisational culture.

This problem of failure of resource assessment is linked to control over specialists. Ignorance of specialists' resources implies an enforcement of generalist-oriented news involvement in their newsgathering activities. If specialists take responsibility for 'non-news', it seems necessary to provide a devolution of control to them in newsgathering activities. Korean journalism heavily applies desk control routines to specialists in practice. It tends to depend on a centralisation of news production rather than devolution which encourages a flexibility or autonomy of specialists. This is oppressive for specialists' news selection in the end. Conflict between specialists and generalists or news organisations seems to be unavoidable.

Despite the fact that specialism has several significant conflicts with the routines of the existing news organisational practices, it should be admitted that
specialism could establish its own routines. Kung-Shankleman (2000: 16) argues that organisational culture is not static but dynamic. Organisational culture firstly focuses on how environmental developments are perceived by members of an organisation, and secondly on how members of the organisation react to the strategies designed to respond to those environmental developments. It is accumulated by a specific pattern regulating journalists' activities in relation to news production. It aims to adjust an organisation and its members into a new situation or environment. Through this process, new phenomenon can be embedded as a routine within an organisation.

This study discovers that the conflicts in news organisations are not problems that can be totally settled down. However, as mentioned by Bantz (1985, in Tumber 1999: 141), conflict is necessary, ordinary, valuable, and routine. Therefore, the expectation of conflict makes conflict legitimate. In line with Bantz's observation, this study also finds that news organisations try to normalise conflicts by compromising between the different norms of specialists and news organisations. The issue is how to normalise the conflicts and routinise the specialist practices of news production. However, this study finds another fact that, more importantly, specialists conform to standard guidelines in news selection and assimilate into generalist news selection patterns through this process of normalising conflicts. Specialists negotiate with news organisational routines in various points of news production in an effort to adapt their status to the established news organisational culture.

In conclusion, news organisational culture presents both constraints and opportunities for what a news organisation is able to accomplish. However, Korean specialism is more closely related to a negative aspect of news organisational culture by restricting specialism rather than a positive aspect of supporting the opportunity of specialism.

This seems hardly to support that two purposes of Korean specialism, namely, resolving journalists' job insecurity and coping with Internet
challenges, have been achieved. Journalists' job security is unlikely to be sure since the present institutionalised system and news organisational culture have not adapted effectively towards specialism, and in fact, have resulted in conflict between generalists and specialists. Generalists oppose preferential rewards towards specialists whereas specialists demand to share generalists' beat jurisdiction. This conflict is essentially linked to journalists' uncertainty about the status of specialists.

Specialists' competence regarding Internet challenges also seems doubtful. Through in-depth interviews, the journalists held that specialists' specialised knowledge can efficiently cope with Internet challenges by providing more credible information, and specialists can take advantage of exploiting the Internet for newsgathering activities. However, the results of the content analysis did not seem to support these assertions: specialists assimilated with the traditional generalist approaches in constructing news stories, instead of providing more mobilising information to serve audience inconveniences.

From these observations, specialism cannot be argued to be always better journalism than the generalist approach, in spite of its possibility of providing better news. However, this study can propose some solutions to this dilemma. Firstly, it can be suggested that specialists should prepare not only their work from their specialised knowledge or expertise, but also, more importantly, adopt critical-minded attitudes and more active approaches towards news events. As identified in the content analysis, specialists do not appear to accommodate sufficient and differentiated mobilising information compared with generalists, especially for 'evaluating remedies' and 'providing advice' due to a lack of active and critical approaches.

Secondly, news organisations need to allow specialists devolution of control and more flexibility and autonomy in their newsgathering activities. Even if this can never be achieved in a short time, this can transform the current rigid news organisational culture and allow new policies to be admitted over
the long term. Undoubtedly, this change relates to managerial decisions or news organisational control practices over journalists. More positively, this study points out that news organisational culture tries to normalise and negotiate the conflicts between specialists and generalists in an effort to establish new and changed routines.

In spite of these findings, this study has a limitation since it lacks several relevant analyses. For instance, although this study pays attention to the importance of the routines of news organisations in implementing new policies, it omits examinations on why and how the routines are constructed. While this study focuses on the relationship between news organisational routines and new impetus on it, it leaves out analysis on the routines themselves. The significance of this study's findings might be restricted by the deficiency of a holistic approach.

There are several ways of analysing the levels of news production. For instance, Dimmick and Coit (1982: 3-32) suggest nine levels such as: the supranational level (international regulation agencies or businesses); society level (government); industry level (competing media firms and their relations with advertisers); the supra-organisational level (chains or conglomerates); community level (town, local society and business); the intra-organisational formal or informal group level (departments within or an organisation); and individual journalist level. Similarly, McQuail (1987: 138-139) simplifies these levels into four: society; media institution; media organisation; mass communicator role. Ettema et al. (1987) also categorise the levels as industrial and institutional level; organisational level; and individual level.

There is no doubt that these levels are inter-related. In spite of such inter-relationship, this study mainly focuses upon the individual journalist level and the organisational level. However, the media organisation is not a self-contained unit McQuail (1987: 139). Given the various relationships among
levels related to news production, an analysis on relations between specialism and the routines or culture of news organisations can be expanded to wider levels than individual or organisational levels. This study leaves research on the other levels of analysis for further study. Especially, examination at the industrial or institutional level in view of the political economy of journalism is essential in that the identity of a news organisation is inevitably related to its political-economic status. This is because "news exhibits an identifiable and widely shared form and a content broadly consonant with the social structures and values of its political-economic context", as stated by Ettema et al. (1987: 37).
APPENDICES

1. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey questionnaire on the Digital Media Environment and Specialist Journalism

Hello, my name is Sa-Seong Kim from the University of Leicester. I am conducting a survey about the relationship between the digital media environment and specialist journalism. It would be appreciated if you can take some time to complete the questionnaire as follows. The aim of the study is to analyse how journalists understand the changing circumstances surrounding the media, and their jobs, especially specialist journalism. If you have any questions about this survey, please do not hesitate to contact me via e-mail (starius@chollian.net) and phone (+82-19-826-2796). Thank you very much.

This survey is divided into three parts such as: the relationship between newspapers and the digital media, newsgathering activities, and specialist journalism.

• Relationship between newspapers and the digital media

1. Do you think that the Internet impacts on newspaper journalism?

   Yes ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ No

2. What do you consider are the driving forces causing the decline of the newspaper business?
3. What is the core competence of newspapers compared with the Internet? Please choose every answer.

- Information variety
- Responsibility
- Agenda-setting
- Commentary
- News arrangement
- In-depth reporting
- Recordability
- Critical journalism
- Speed
- New areas

4. What do you think are new business areas for the newspaper industry in the digital media environment? Please write down them.

- Newsgathering activities

5. Are there any changes in the feedback between journalists and readers when
using the Internet?

____ Speed of feedback
____ Volume of feedback
____ Quality of feedback
____ Influence on news

6-1. What are the impacts of the Internet on newsgathering activities?

Please choose every answer.

____ Gathering news items
____ Identifying public opinion
____ Selecting news sources
____ Interviews
____ Obtaining data
____ International responses

6-2. Do you think that the Internet causes additional workload in newsgathering?

Strong workload  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
____ No more workload

6-3. Are there any changes in the rhetorical style of your reporting? Please write down them.

7. What are your criteria of selecting news? Please put them in order of importance.
8. Do you have sub-specialised areas in your field differentiated from competitive colleagues?

___ Yes
___ No
___ No opinion

9. Do you think that star journalists are needed in your news organisation?

___ Yes
___ No
___ No opinion

- Specialist journalism

10. What do you think are pre-requisite conditions of specialist journalists? Please put them in order of importance.

___ Specialised knowledge
___ Penetrative understanding
Composition technique
Analytical sense
Newsgathering technique
Web capability
News sources
Influential power

11. What are the need for specialists? Please Every answer.

Developing new readers
Meeting specified demands
Quality improvement
Using experienced journalists
Career Prospects
Personnel Management

12. Which fields are needed to introduce the system of specialist journalists? Please write down them.

13-1. Which fields are needed to recruit experts outside news organisations as specialists? Please write down them.

13-2. What are the pre-requisite conditions for introducing the system of specialism? Please write down them.

14-1. Who should be in charge of specialist control?
14-2. How much is the autonomy of specialists allowed in the process of newsgathering activities in comparison with that of generalists?

___ No difference
___ More autonomy than generalists
___ More control than generalists
___ No opinion

14-3. Do you think that the specialist promotion system should be different from that of generalists?

___ No
___ Yes
___ No opinion

14-4. Is it necessary to provide separate space in the paper for specialists?

___ Yes
___ No
___ No opinion

15-1. Why do you prefer specialist work to generalist work, if you do?

___ Specialisation of subject
___ Journalist, not management
___ Job security
___ Career prospect
___ Any other reasons

15-2. Why do you not prefer specialist work to generalist work, if you do not?

___ Preferring Management to reporting work
___ Low credibility of management policies
___ Bias against specialists
___ Job insecurity
___ Any other reasons

16. Do you think that it is easier for specialists to move to other companies rather than generalists?

Yes ____________________         No

17. Who are you?

Sex (male / female)
Age ( )
First Degree at University ( )
Ranking in news organisation ( )
Department in news organisation ( )
Experience as reporter ( years)
Experienced fields
Longest experience and the field (years)

I sincerely appreciate you answering this survey.
## Column Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Journalist Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Journalists of Chosun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Dong-Sup Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Chul-Jung Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Won-Suk Choi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Dong-Hyuk Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Min-Hyuk Lim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=Min-Bae Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7=Jung-Rok Shin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8= Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Journalists of Joongang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Seong-Sik Shin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Hyae-Kul Hong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Sung-Hee Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Jeong-Ha Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Sun-Min Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Main Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Home News</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2=Politics
3=Economics
4=Living & Science
5=Others

9  Number of Words

10 Types of Reporting
1=News
2=Commentary
3=Analysis
4=Feature
5=Interview
6=Other

11 Page Types
1=Front
2=Politics
3=Home news
4=Medicine
5=Economics
6=Others

12 News Events
1=New Regulations
2=Consumer Grievances
3=Doctors' Interests
4=Pharmacists' Interests
5=Conflict with Government
6=Negotiations
7=Government Responses
8=NGO
9=Others
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13 | Source Variety | 1=Broad  
2=Medium  
3=Narrow |
| 14 | Sort of Sources | 1=Individual  
2=Organisational  
3=Both |
| 15 | Source Importance | 1=High Ranking  
2=Middle Ranking  
3=Low Ranking |
| 16 | Professional Attributes | 1=Yes  
2=No |
| 17 | Specialised Knowledge | 1=Yes  
2=No |
| 18 | Location MI | 1=Yes  
2=No |
| 19 | Identification MI | 1=Yes  
2=No |
| 20 | Tactical MI | 1=Yes  
2=No |
| 21 | Defining Problems | 1=Complete |
22 Attributing Blame
1=Complete
2=Partial
3=Nonexistent

23 Revealing Debates
1=Complete
2=Partial
3=Nonexistent

24 Evaluating Remedies
1=Complete
2=Partial
3=Nonexistent

25 Providing Advice
1=Complete
2=Partial
3=Nonexistent
3. INTERVIEWEES

A. Junior Generalists

a. CUS Chosun Ilbo Home news Desk
b. KCH JoongAng Ilbo International Desk
c. PKI Kyunghyang Daily Home news Desk

B. Senior Generalists

a. JJH Kukmin Daily Cultural Desk
b. KDH Hankyoreh Economic Desk
c. KHJ Kyunghyang Daily Political Desk
d. KOH Hankook Ilbo Cultural Desk
e. KYM Munhwa Daily Home news Desk

C. Internally Recruited Specialists

a. JHS Hankyoreh Home news Desk Environment
b. LY Kyunghyang Daily Cultural Desk Arts

D. Externally Recruited Specialists

a. HHK JoongAng Ilbo Home news Desk Medicine
b. KCJ Chosun Ilbo Home news Desk Medicine
c. KIM Munhwa Daily Cultural Desk Music
d. KYH Kyunghyang Daily Life Style Desk Medicine
e. LJJ JoongAng Ilbo Cultural Desk Music
E. Unofficial Designation Specialists by the Editor

a. KTH  Dong-a Ilbo Daily  Economic Desk  IT
b. KYS  Munhwa Daily  Life Style Desk  Medicine
c. LDH  Hankook Ilbo  Cultural Desk  Film

F. Desk News Executives

a. HHP  Dong-a Ilbo Daily  Home news Desk
b. JJS  Hankyoreh  Special issue Desk

G. Managing Editors

a. CHU  Korea Daily News
b. CSH  Hankook Daily
c. JSH  JoongAng Ilbo
d. KYJ  Hankyoreh
e. KJB  Munhwa Daily
f. PMH  Kyunghyang Daily
4. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSANTS

A. Focus Group 1 – Labour Union Members of the Munhwa Daily

a. KJT Political Desk
b. YBK Political Desk
c. CHM International Desk
d. LJS Home news Desk
e. KSH Home news Desk
f. BSH Economic Desk
g. KKM Cultural Desk

B. Focus Group 2 – Editing Board Members of the JAK

a. LPJ JoongAng Ilbo Political Desk
b. LSK Hankyoreh Home news Desk
c. HIS Korea Daily News Cultural Desk
d. KHJ JoongAng Ilbo Cultural Desk
e. MKH Yonhap News Economic Desk
f. KYK Dong-a Ilbo Daily Economic Desk
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