

Training journalists in New Zealand

The industry view of training 1979-2002

Commentary: What skills should student journalists and then working journalists be taught? This paper is an analysis of two decades of reports by editors in the New Zealand media on what they wanted to see. The reports were part of the annual Commonwealth Press Union review of the year. They show a focus by editors on the practical, craft skills of journalism, even as academics and teachers were questioning what was best. The reports cover the years 1979-2002. Many of the same issues then are still being faced; how do you ensure training is up to standard, what do young journalists need to know, how to deliver training to journalists during their careers, and how to ensure that a diverse range of people enters the industry? These questions remain today.

Keywords: Commonwealth Press Union, cadetships, critical thinking, history, inverted pyramid, journalism education, journalism methodology, journalism skills, journalism training, journalism unit standards, Journalists Training Board, Journalists Training Organisation, New Zealand, NZ Institute of Journalists, Public Interest Journalism Fund

JEREMY REES
Radio New Zealand

Introduction

MEDIA people have always argued about the best way to train journalists. Is it a profession or a craft, or both? Is it more important for a young reporter to learn the inverted pyramid or critical thinking? It is a contested question.

In 2021, I stumbled across two decades worth of writings from one point of view on the issue; it was the views of largely New Zealand newspaper editors discussing training. What follows is not a full treatise on journalism training; nor a history of media efforts to train staff. Rather it is a summary of how one group viewed what was important for training over more than two decades.

I read some 22 years' worth of annual reports from 1979 to 2001, by the then Commonwealth Press Union, which included its views on the state of training in New Zealand (Commonwealth Press Union New Zealand section reports 1979-2001). I came across this trove of reports by accident. When I left a job

at *The New Zealand Herald*, a leading New Zealand newspaper and website, I packed up my belongings in a box but, in a mix-up, picked up the wrong one; I discovered later I had saved dozens of industry reports meant to be shredded and thrown out by the *Herald* Library. They were filled with reports on how training was being organised, debates about what makes good training, and were the industry's needs being met. They also recorded the quite remarkable amount of on-the-job training that companies offered their journalists; something which has diminished significantly.

Some of the same arguments are still playing out today. New Zealand's Public Interest Journalism Fund, a fund set up by the NZ government during COVID to help journalism, has one pillar solely for industry development like cadetships and up-skilling. How best to attract young people into journalism and then train them was a topic of discussion for applicants to the fund (*New Zealand Herald*, 2022).

The CPU reports give some insights into how one group, albeit a powerful one at the centre of the media industry, viewed the needs of journalism from the late 1970s to the early 2000s. It is important to remember these are the thoughts of editors, speaking to other editors and journalists about what they expected. The views of journalism schools and students are not captured.

The reports can also be frustrating. The editors of the training board may report on one issue in depth one year and then drop it the next. But they remain a fascinating fragment of the industry, certainly before digital change engulfed journalism.

By and large, the industry group was focused on what should be taught in journalism schools—and, largely, that meant the teaching of craft skills that could be applied in the newsroom. The inverted pyramid was more important than critical thinking. And, at least until it became too onerous, training also meant a large number of on-the-job refresher courses.

The views are contained within the pages of the annual (and at times bi-annual) reports of the New Zealand section of the Commonwealth Press Union, the industry body largely representing newspapers both in Aotearoa and the countries of the Commonwealth. The Training and Education of Journalists committee would file a report for the NZCPU section. They were reporting the work of the industry's training body of the time. The body changed over the period. First, it was the Journalists Training committee, then the Journalists Training Board, and finally the Journalists Training Organisation. Newspapers made up the bulk of the members but did, at times, include magazines and broadcasters.

The historical background

Journalists in newspapers in 19th century New Zealand learned on the job in newsrooms. However, the impetus for training grew with the establishment of the New Zealand Institute of Journalists in 1891. Among its goals was raising

the professional status of journalists, by controlling entry to the industry through formal qualification tests (Elsaka, 2004).

A Diploma of Journalism was introduced at the Canterbury University College around 1911. But the preferred place for journalism training remained the newsroom until the 1960s when ‘trade school’ courses began to appear. A year-long polytechnic programme began at Wellington Polytechnic in the mid-1960s. It was followed by a six-month programme at the then Auckland Technical Institute (ATI), led by tutor Geoff Black. Former newspaper manager and journalism trainer Ruth Thomas describes it as ‘solely influenced by the industry it served, training journalists using methods which Black brought from that industry’ (Thomas, 2008). By the 1980s and 1990s—the decades covered by my trove of training reports—there were a number of training courses available for students wishing to be journalists. They ranged from courses at Canterbury University to those at institutions which had come from polytechnic backgrounds like the now Auckland University of Technology, as well as courses that arose and then disappeared at some business schools. In-house cadetships carried on into the late 1980s in some newsrooms, but the training of reporters had largely shifted to journalism schools.

This shift in training to journalism schools raised the question of what graduates should be taught. Recently there has been a steady rise in academic studies examining this question. Researcher Nadia Elsaka (2004) in a doctoral thesis, *Beyond Consensus? New Zealand Journalists and the Appeal of ‘Professionalism’ as a Model for Occupational Reform*, examined the push for ‘professionalising’ journalism. She tracks over a century of cultural, economic, and political currents that led to a push for journalism to be seen as a profession.

To gain a legitimate place within the university and thus in society, the New Zealand Journalists’ Association (along with those journalists who aspired to the status as a ‘recognised profession’) supported the notion of journalism as a serious academic discipline, and not simply vocational training. However, journalists were also aware of the necessity of learning the practical skills required for journalistic working order to be marketable in the eyes of employers. Standing somewhere in between these two views have been the journalism teaching institutions themselves. (Elsaka, 2004)

Others have examined this area of tension between teaching ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ In her doctoral thesis, *The Making of a Journalist: The New Zealand Way* Ruth Thomas (2008) argued that the history of journalism education had been a struggle between the academy and media industry. ‘On the one hand, the media industry favour journalism students learning practical skills and support standards-based training, while on the other the academy esteems the teaching of general contextual skills and liberal arts courses’ (Thomas, 2008).

Thomas charted her journey from a community newspaper editor and member of the New Zealand Journalists Training Organisation, strongly supporting training standards in set skills for a newsroom, to a teacher increasingly steeped in very different thinking on adult education and pedagogy. Her thesis was a call to debate what should be taught to budding journalists.

Thomas' thesis was completed just a few years after my cache of CPU documents ran out. She concluded that New Zealand journalism education too much resembled 'old-style apprenticeship training' and hardly equipped students to be questioning professionals.

Unsurprisingly, the editors in the CPU disagreed. Their reports showed editors strongly in favour of a skills-based, craft, practical style of training; both within journalism schools and in on-the-job training.

At the same time, influence over what should be taught in journalism schools shifted decisively to the industry (Thomas, 2008). The *Industry Training Act 1992* established a New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) focused on unit standards to measure a student's competency. The JTO became the accrediting body.

Universities balked at the system on the grounds of eroding academic freedom. But, according to Thomas, 'while there were often heated words over the implementation of the journalism unit standards, the degree of opposition from the polytechnics never went any further' (Thomas, 2008).

You can see this play out in the CPU documents—but from the industry side. There is a distinct pivot. During the 1980s, the Journalism Training Board saw itself as liaising with Journalism Schools on pre-entry training but was also heavily involved in organising training workshops for working reporters. During the 1990s, the Journalism Training Organisation took on the role of moderating the standards of Journalism Schools. It stopped organising so many workshops; these moved in-house for media companies. Instead, it ran a diploma for working journalists who would receive tuition and mentoring at their work.

Setting the standards

So, what did the editors and media managers say about this system? Looking back in 2001, the JTO executive director Bill Southworth said it put the JTO in the 'driver's seat' for all pre-entry journalism training. 'It has proved to be a great improvement from the old days when industry was relegated to being a (sometimes) grumpy back seat driver . . . Rather than on-the-job cadet training (the old way) the focus has shifted to ensuring that training is competently done by journalism schools. Overall, it is a highly cost-effective system' (CPU, 2001).

In 1997, the CPU's training committee convenor, Don Milne, explained that the JTO 'sets the national standards for training. It determines the units required and their standards, and moderates courses, in cooperation with the Qualifications Authority, to ensure that they are maintained.' This was a far better system, he

argued, than ‘the unsatisfactory confusion before the JTO and other industrial training organisations were set up’. Industry oversight He said, meant employers could be sure the graduates had reached an agreed minimum standard (CPU, 1997).

A year later, Southworth wrote that quality control was ‘no sleigh ride’ (CPU, 1998). Every year industry training providers would have their work checked to ensure the training was reaching the right standards. And as the 1990s ended, the Journalism committee congratulated itself on how ‘this control of industry over school standards has produced good results everywhere and the days when a bad school could turn in a poor performance year after year (with industry effectively impotent on the side-lines) are gone.’ Southworth explained to the industry that ‘every three years all graduates at all schools must sit exams designed by industry. The exams check that graduates are up to scratch and that their work is being marked according to national standards’ (CPU, 1998).

When a green paper in 1997 suggested changing this system, the JTO was aghast. ‘The most objectional aspect of the green paper was the suggestion that schools might be able to create their own journalism qualification without having to get them approved by the industry,’ it said (CPU, 1997).

Each annual report would summarise how the committee felt journalism training was faring; during the 1980s it also gave an overview of what it felt were the standards of each intake. In the 1980s the focus was on a handful of providers; Wellington, Auckland, and Canterbury. In 1980, it pointed out that the Auckland Technical Institute felt ‘the standard of men applicants was disappointing’ (CPU, 1980). Three years later, it pronounced the ‘demand from young folk for places in journalism is greater than ever before’ (CPU, 1983).

In 1981, the committee noted it was ‘uneasy’ at the quality of the Wellington Polytech and set up a sub-committee to draft guidelines for pre-entry courses. But in the end, it pulled back saying ‘it would be bad psychology to impose its will on teaching institutions’ (CPU, 1981). It did, however, request copies of the syllabus and timetables from course leaders each year. A year later, things had improved. It reported that several members had been ‘very active in encouraging improvements’ at Wellington Polytech; ‘the portents for a better course are most promising’ (CPU, 1982).

In 1992, when the JTO had begun moderating courses, the committee recorded that ‘the previous year Waikato failed to meet industry standards’ (CPU, 1992). A second failure would have seen the JTO applying to the qualifications authority to conduct an academic audit. Six years later, it recorded that a course at Taranaki had failed to meet ‘the required standards’ and would need to be tested again (CPU, 1998). However, generally, the reports of the 1990s explain the moderating system and note the institutions which had met the standards. Where an institution was struggling to meet them, it would spell out the steps being taken to rectify it.

The growth of communications courses and degrees was often noted darkly. In 1994, Milne complained that ‘the proliferation of so-called communications and media studies courses at universities and polytechnics (most of them taught by academics rather than experienced journalists) continues’ (CPU, 1994). There were regular complaints that institutions were becoming academic-focused and centred too much on communications courses and degrees, at the expense of the vocational teaching of journalism.

At times, the industry seems to have felt, there were far too many courses. By the late 1980s, the Journalism training committee wondered about the growth of journalism courses beyond the original institutions. Aoraki, Northland, and Southland all launched courses. So, too, did Manukau Polytech and the Auckland Business School. The committee voiced its concerns about the ‘apparently unrestricted’ growth of courses offered in small private schools, especially the starter access courses. ‘Few of these offer any prospects of employment to their graduates and the standards seem generally abysmal,’ it pronounced (CPU, 1988).

More practically, the committee worried whether it had the resources to measure standards in many of these new communication courses—and whether it even should. By 1990, the committee was worried everyone seemed to be running media courses of some sort—there were 220 graduates, most destined for ‘niches in the fast-growing communications industry’. But a year later, the economy had begun to solve the issue. There would be a shake-out in the number of courses largely due to ‘the moribund job market’, the committee warned (CPU, 1990).

The committee also reported assiduously on the number of Journalism School trainees who got jobs—and usually where they ended up. It was a mark of success that graduates were good enough to be employed.

Overall, what is remarkable is the extent to which the industry body was engaged in monitoring the standards of the tertiary course, first through liaison in the 1980s and then directly in monitoring standards through the 1990s and into the 2000s. No such system exists today. The Journalism Training Organisation merged in 2008 with another printing industry group to create the Communications and Media Industry Training Organisation and that in turn became part of a training provider, Competenz. In 2017, Competenz decided there was little revenue in journalism training and closed its journalism section. Today most Journalism Schools have some form of an industry liaison committee, but they are more a sounding board than an examiner of standards. These rigorous reports to the media industry on the standards of training are a reminder of the extent to which the media was once involved in the direction of journalism training, for better or worse.

On-the-job training

Perhaps as remarkable was the extent the media industry in New Zealand once

organised on-the-job training courses for its journalists, at least in the 1980s. Now training as an industry experience has largely disappeared. But in 1982, for example, the CPU Training Committee recorded that the Journalism Training Board had organised:

- A two-day Tutors and Chief Reporters seminar in Wellington
- A three-day mid-grade Photographers' course in Wellington
- A two-day media hui at Hoani Waititi Marae, West Auckland
- A two-day media hui at Hinemoa Point Marae in Rotorua
- A week-long introductory journalism course for Māori and Pacific students in Auckland
- And one in Rotorua

But that was only the first six months of the year. In the second half, it organised:

- A four-day sub-editing course in Wellington
- A two-day course on local body reporting in Auckland
- A two-day librarians' course in Wellington
- A three-day financial reporting course in Wellington
- A writing course in Hamilton
- A three-day photography course also in Hamilton
- An interviewing course in Auckland
- And another interviewing course in Wellington.

It did note that a two-day course for industrial reporters 'had to be postponed because only seven applications were received' (CPU, 1982).

It also recorded its thanks to *The New Zealand Herald* for running its annual week-long sub-editing course for staff from any newspaper; course fees were paid by the CPU.

In other years the committee recorded similar courses, but there were also workshops. They included feature writing courses (two days, 1979), an 'innovation' of a sub-editors course in the South Island (1981), a three-day course in basic news photography (1981), a three-day course in staff management for news executives (1981), three-day courses in agricultural reporting (1981), election coverage (1990), interpreting statistics (1990), media law (1998) and health reporters courses (1998, with a total of 60 attendees).

Courses were run often by journalists and photographers from within the industry who volunteered to train others.

The Journalism Training Board would regularly survey its members on what were the greatest needs for training. In 1980, the board undertook a national survey of journalists; it had 844 returns but said this was a 'little disappointing although sufficient' for analysis by the *Auckland Star's* new computer (CPU, 1980). Once it knew what was needed, it would organise courses. There were further surveys in 1986 and 1994.

The volume of courses declined after 1988. The board noted that surveys of

the industry showed managers preferred in-house programmes because of travel costs and the difficulty of releasing staff for block courses. As part of its shift, the board announced in 1992 a new National Diploma of Journalism (later a Graduate Diploma) for working journalists; it would focus on ‘the higher skills needed for them to perform better’ (CPU, 1992). Skills would be taught remotely with chief reporters on-site as tutors. Rather than industry-organised get-togethers, training would be delivered to workers at their work site. ‘Distance learning will allow editors and chief reporters to organise training according to their needs and the needs of staff, and to their own time schedules’ (CPU, 1992). By 2001, the Graduate Diploma had 100 students studying, though the board was often concerned to attract more (‘there are, after all, about 2500 journalists in New Zealand’) (CPU, 2001). Once the diploma was in place for the industry, the number of block courses steadily declined although some, like a chief reporters hui, continued.

Over time, the board produced books and materials on better journalism. The number increased steadily through the 1990s to fit in with the courses and unit standards of the Graduate Diploma.

One early milestone was the production of five videos in 1979 on the law of newsgathering and publishing. ‘It is claimed that no more effective and valuable teaching aid in this field has ever been produced,’ wrote industry training convenor Allan Cole. ‘The industry is indebted to Mr Brian Priestley and Professor John Burrows, both of Canterbury University, who conceived the idea, prepared the scripts and enacted the series in front of South Pacific Television’s cameras’ (CPU, 1979).

The board sent copies of the video cassettes around the country, along with printed notes. Media outlets could buy their own set for NZ\$550 (around \$3400 in today’s dollar, according to NZ Treasury calculators). Later, the board noted that 300 people in Auckland had been to the *Auckland Star* to watch the tapes using playback equipment provided by *The New Zealand Herald*. There were problems, though. The board struggled to find a ‘regular operator’ to run the tapes and ‘competent journalists’ to chair the sessions and take questions, it noted. Further, the tapes had been recorded on Sony Umatic ¾ inch colour cassettes; most media companies only had ½ inch tape players. But, on the whole, the board believed the industry had benefited immensely.

It also set out to produce books for reporters. In 1980, it asked Professor Burrows to produce a ‘ready reckoner’ on law, based on a publication it had seen for *Yorkshire Post* staff. It became the ubiquitous *A Journalist’s Guide to the Law*, a staple in every New Zealand newsroom. It went through several editions; in 1990 it was updated due to changes in defamation laws. A year later, the training board produced a compilation of political election reporting essays from some of the most senior Press Gallery reporters including Ian Templeton, Colin James, Warren Page, Neale McMillan, and Bruce Morris. Seven years later,

it announced *Business Reporting* by Allan Lee from AUT, and *Digging Deeper, A Guide to Investigative Reporting* by Amanda Cropp. ‘As a sign of the times, *Business Reporting* was sponsored by Brierley Investments and *Digging Deeper* by Merck Sharp and Dohme,’ one report notes.

In the mid-1990s the JTO even began to publish its own bimonthly magazine with a circulation of 2,500 carrying book reviews, training opportunities, and articles. In 1998, it published a 540-page textbook *Intro* with chapters on journalism skills; it was labelled the single biggest commitment of industry funds that year (CPU, 1998). As well, the JTO produced a book on financial reporting, *Reporting Economics*, and a *New Zealand Journalist’s Guide to Asia*. An MMP handbook edited by Colin James ‘proved a best seller’, the committee noted (CPU, 1999). And there was a handbook by historian and journalist Michael King, *Kawe Korero—A Guide to Reporting Māori Activities*. This was followed in 2007 by *Pou Kōrero: A journalists’ guide to Māori and Current Affairs*, by Carol Archie.

All these materials, courses, and organisation cost money. In the 1980s, journalism’s training body employed an executive training officer; later the JTO had an executive director. The training committee’s annual reports sometimes detail where the money came from. An industry levy was one source. In 1982, it noted it received \$6145 from the industry of its total income of \$32,205 (CPU, 1982). The largest stream was government money, but the sources changed over time depending on which government department oversaw industry training—and its importance. In 1982, the Journalists Training Board received from the government’s Vocational Training Council, a grant of up to 90 percent of its operating costs. It also received one-off grants. In 1992, it received a \$48,950 Education and Training Support Agency grant to carry out a proper analysis of needs. The board also received sponsorship money. Businesses sponsored some of the publications; for example, in 1996 the Hong Kong Bank gave a grant to a *Journalist’s Handbook on Asia* (CPU, 1996).

All of this activity did require buy-in from the industry; it was not always forthcoming. There were occasional grumbles at the disinterest in some newsrooms. The standard of on-the-job tutoring was variable. And the training board sometimes worried people in the industry did not seem to understand what it was doing. Or were not sufficiently interested. In 1981, training chair Allan Cole chaired a panel on training journalists at the 14th Commonwealth Press Union conference in Melbourne. He ended up fielding orders from around the world for the legal videotapes. He added tartly, ‘I gained the distinct impression that the thirst for training was keener in these places (developing parts of the Commonwealth) than it is in some newspaper offices’. Interestingly, he noted that a resolution to do more training for developing countries dropped the term ‘journalist’ because it was felt that news managers need as much training as reporters (CPU, 1981). In 1980, the committee noted that in-office training was

not being carried out well in some newspapers and said that local tutors did not have sufficient ‘status, incentives and time’ to conduct effective training. Instead, it would investigate hiring travelling tutors (CPU, 1980).

What is remarkable in all this activity is its scale; in the 1980s the board organised a large amount of training for working journalists across media companies, with some government funding. When the role of the JTO shifted to supporting training rather than running it, the organisation produced a plethora of books. Today, there is very little pan-industry training in the New Zealand media. Individual companies do internal training for staff, but industry-wide courses are largely absent and there is no industry training body in existence.

A pipeline for journalists

New Zealand journalism is currently involved in a debate on how to get people from different backgrounds into newsrooms. Is journalism, which has seen jobs decline over the last decade due to digital disruption, attracting good people to become reporters? Further, is it able to attract Māori, Pasifika, and Asian people into newsrooms so that the media reflects the ethnic diversity of the country? These questions have formed part of the discussions between the media industry and the government funding agency, NZ on Air through its Public Interest Journalism Fund. (*New Zealand Herald*, 2022) One of its three funding pillars is industry development, including cross-industry cadetships and upskilling reporters.

It is interesting to look back at the 1980s and 1990s to see a similar discussion. The industry was involved in discussions to encourage people from diverse backgrounds into journalism training. Especially, throughout the 1980s it reported on the gender breakdown of trainees—usually more women than men were entering courses. It occasionally commented on the ‘disappointing’ standard of male applicants.

The training board produced several brochures for schools encouraging students to take up journalism and explaining how a career in the media might unfold. (It also produced a pamphlet for mid-career journalists setting out career steps). In the mid-90s it drew up unit standards for school journalism courses in the hope that journalism would be approved as a bursary subject. The aim, it reported, was to improve the standing of journalism as a career.

But, perhaps most notably, the committee was involved in ongoing discussions on attracting more Māori and Polynesian young people into newsrooms. This was a real focus for the committee after it hired Gary Wilson as executive training officer in 1979. He had taught English at St Stephens, been a journalist at the *Auckland Star* and *New Zealand Herald*, and later a tutor at the then Auckland Training Institute. He was made an Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit in 2019 for his services to Māori and Pacific journalism. A year after his appointment, the training committee recorded his first success; it noted that the Department of Māori Affairs was keen to look at ways to interest more Polynesian young people

in journalism. It would finance a special introductory course for senior high school students with ‘apparent aptitude’ (CPU, 1980). A year later, the committee notes that he had gone to Fiji for the Pacific Island News Association conference to advise the Commonwealth Press Union on what might be done to help train journalists in the Pacific. His advice was to send good journalists to work with Pacific journalists ‘on their home ground’ (CPU, 1981). One example was an annual course run in various parts of the Pacific by *The Herald’s* Bob Pearce on sub-editing. For several years, the committee would record Wilson’s ‘major role’ in organising pre-entry courses for Pasifika. At the end of 1981, it noted that a good number of the ‘young folk’ at the introductory courses had gone on to take journalism courses. Wilson left the role in 1988.

This may have been the peak of trying to change the pipeline of journalist recruits. There seems to have been a resurgence of interest in pre-enrolment courses after the closure of a course at Manukau Polytech which had been aimed at Māori and Pasifika. In 1995, the committee noted that the task of training was beyond that of one tutor. But it did note that local graduates had made a mark in the industry and overseas graduates had found jobs across the Pacific. Because of the closure, the JTO turned again to the idea of starter courses to help. ‘Convinced there is still a need for Pacific Islanders in New Zealand journalism, the JTO backed an initiative by two leading practitioners to organise induction courses, aimed at preparing able students for mainstream courses,’ it reported (CPU, 1995). The next year it noted it had run a 14-week Pacific Island introduction to journalism course in Wellington with ten students and aimed for a further two courses the next year (CPU, 1996). After that, the discussion fades away.

The committee did take regular note of two courses aimed at Pasifika and Māori; Waiariki and Manukau Polytechs. In 1991, it reported approvingly that Waiariki would run a special course to train Māori for iwi radio stations, ‘where there is an increasing demand for journalism and other skills’ (CPU, 1991). There have been further initiatives to foster Māori and Pacific journalism, such as AUT’s Pacific Media Centre, established in 2007. But these fall outside the scope of my trove of documents, 1979-2002, and their planning was not mentioned.

Summary

These reports, spanning two-and-a-bit decades, give some insight into how at least part of the industry viewed journalism training. What stands out is the energy of those setting up the training then, their achievements, and the ideas they were working with. Backed by some government money for vocational training and levies on members, they produced an array of industry-wide training. During the 1980s there was roughly one course a month for people in the industry. They produced brochures for schools. Under Gary Wilson, they set up training schemes to encourage Māori and Pacific students to take up journalism. The committee

did discuss expanding the pipeline of people into journalism. During the 1990s, the industry took on the role of moderating journalism courses to ensure they met national standards. It also set up a graduate diploma for working journalists who would do unit standards remotely and receive tutoring from their chief reporter. Much of that infrastructure has now gone. Training and mentoring are carried out within companies. The Journalism Training Organisation was wound up after its role was absorbed by a training provider, Competenz. The News Publishers Association, a successor to the Newspaper Publishers Association and a distant relative to the Commonwealth Press Union, does not appear to mention training on its website. But many of the same issues are still being faced; how do you ensure training is up to standard, what do young journalists need to know, how to deliver training to journalists during their careers, and how to ensure that a diverse range of people enters the industry? These questions remain today.

References

- Commonwealth Press Union New Zealand Section (1979-1996). *Chairman's report and annual accounts*.
- Commonwealth Press Union New Zealand Section (1997-2001). *Annual report and accounts*.
- Elsaka, N. (2004). *Beyond consensus? New Zealand journalists and the appeal of 'professionalism' as a model for occupational reform*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Canterbury. <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/1787>
- Krishnamurthi, S. (2021, October 20). Perceptions of NZ's public interest journalism fund—saint or sinner? *Asia Pacific Report*. <https://asiapacificreport.nz/2021/10/20/perceptions-over-nzs-public-interest-journalism-project-saint-or-sinner/>
- Hannis, G. (2017). Journalism education in New Zealand: Its history, current challenges and possible futures. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 27(2), 233-248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1326365X17728823>
- Hollings, J., Lealand, G., Samson, A., & Tilley, E. (2007). The big NZ journalism survey: Underpaid, under-trained, under-resourced, unsure about the future—but still idealistic. *Pacific Journalism Review: Te Koako*, 13(2), 175-197. <https://doi.org/10.24135/pjr.v13i2.908>
- Te Rito Journalism Cadetship: Groundbreaking media initiative draws in close to 100 applicants. (2022, January 12). *The New Zealand Herald*. <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/kahu/te-rito-journalism-cadetship-groundbreaking-media-initiative-draws-in-close-to-100-applicants/SC45ECYEXFQX6XBIPYQNA2I32E/>
- Thomas, R. (2008). *The making of a journalist: The New Zealand way*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Auckland University of Technology. <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/466>

Jeremy Rees is executive editor at Radio New Zealand. He is a former member of the New Zealand Journalism Training Organisation (NZJTO).

Jeremy.Rees@rnz.co.nz