Is print journalism creative?

Abstract

The idea that print journalism is creative is one that is not universally accepted: ‘making a story up’ goes against the fundamental understandings of journalism. Further to this, society’s understanding of creativity is that a producer must have no limitations to be able to create and the rules and conventions a journalist works within are seen to constrain their production of creative media texts.

However, by using a Rationalist framework, it can be argued that creative activity in print journalism is not only possible but plausible. By using Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi’s systems model of creativity to examine the creative practices of print journalists, this paper argues it is the structures a journalist works within that enables production and it is by their agency that journalists can produce creative media texts.

Interestingly, a literature review has revealed that creative and creativity have been used in both academic texts and other journalism writing to describe how the print journalist should go about their work. Yet the terms are rarely clarified. Research in other cultural domains, such as contemporary Western song writing (McIntyre 2006) and creative writing (McIntyre and McIntyre 2007), have come to the same conclusion. The application is typically based on a common-sense, person-centred view – for example, in journalism, how a journalist can be creative – without taking other factors into account. In addition to this, its usage often refers to such journalism genres as feature writing and literary journalism. This is because these genres are perceived to have less structural constraint than hard news and allow more of the individual journalist’s imagination. However, these are examples of the Romantic view of creativity, a belief deeply embedded in Western culture.

The Western understanding of creativity implies that a creative idea comes from nowhere but the imagination of the individual; it is invented from nothing. This understanding is rooted in the Romantic ideal of a lone genius, slightly mad, who must be free of any constraints to be able to Create (Becker 1992; Becker 1982; Csikszentmihalyi 1997; Isaksen 1987; Pope 2005; Sawyer 2006; Wolff 1993; Zolberg 1990). In this sense, the Romantic ideal is the antithesis of the journalist who reports facts, works in a collective environment, must write within the structure of the publication, must follow the rules of journalistic writing, and must please the hierarchy. However, it can be argued that it is the very existence of these structures, and the
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Introduction:

What is the meaning of creativity in a print journalism context and what is a creative print journalist? ‘Creative journalism’ is a term that conjures up images of reporters making up stories. Mark Fishman described his research in Manufacturing the News as looking at how print journalists created the news, but he also mentioned his reluctance to use ‘creation’ “because of its pejorative connotations and because it suggests the fabrication of news” (1980, p. 13). Journalist and academic Margaret Simons summed up the commonsense understanding of creativity in journalism: “… I think the word creative confuses people, people who are not journalists. When I’ve raised that in nonjournalistic circles they think it means that you're going to make things up” (The Media Report 2004). ‘Making things up’ goes against the fundamental understanding of what journalism is.

However, a literature review done as part of a PhD project investigating the creative practices of the print journalist in Australia has revealed that creative and creativity have been used in both academic texts and other journalism writing to describe how the print journalist should go about their work. Yet the terms are rarely clarified. Research in other cultural domains, such as contemporary Western song writing (McIntyre 2006) and creative writing (McIntyre and McIntyre 2007), have come to the same conclusion. The application is typically based on a common-sense, person-centred view – for example, in journalism, how a journalist can be creative – without taking other factors into account. In addition to this, its usage often refers to such journalism genres as feature writing and literary journalism. This is because these genres are perceived to have less structural constraint than hard news and allow more of the individual journalist’s imagination. However, these are examples of the Romantic view of creativity, a belief deeply embedded in Western culture.
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journalist’s knowledge of them, that enables the production of creative media texts.

Therefore, rather than depending on Western culture’s implicit understanding of creativity, this paper attempts to define creativity in print journalism in line with current thinking inside creativity research. Furthermore, it is a contention of this paper that all genres of print journalism have structures and practitioners of all genres can be creative within their own structures. In the domain of journalism, the assertion that hard news writing can be a creative endeavour could provide a better understanding of work processes and improve writing practices.

**Brief summary of the research**

The PhD research is using Csikszentmihalyi’s systems model of creativity (Abuhamdeh and Csikszentmihalyi 2004; Csikszentmihalyi 1988; 1990; 1997; 2003; Feldman 1994) to examine the creative practices of print journalists in Australia. Csikszentmihalyi argues that creativity can be found in the confluence of three elements: the domain of knowledge, the field, or social structure, and the individual. Each of the three elements must be present for creativity to occur and they are all of equal importance.

![Csikszentmihalyi's systems model of creativity](image)

**Figure 1 - Csikszentmihalyi’s systems model of creativity (2003, p. 315)**

The domain is defined as the “set of symbolic rules and procedures” (Csikszentmihalyi 1997, p. 27), the field as the “gatekeepers to the domain [who] decide whether a new idea or product should be included in the domain” (ibid., p. 28) and the individual as the person who “learns the rules and the content of the domain, as well as the criteria of selection, the preferences of the field” (ibid., p. 47). The individual uses the knowledge from the domain, produces a product and presents it to the field who verify it as novel and worthwhile. It is then included in the knowledge system of the domain.

Within print journalism, the domain includes such rules and procedures as the inverted pyramid, short, sharp pars, style guides, ethical and legal considerations, and news values as well as ideological rules such as the Fourth Estate, the public’s right to know, truth and objectivity. The domain also includes “all of the created products that have been accepted by the field in the past” (Sawyer 2006, p. 125). These are the cultural structures the journalist works within. The field, or social structure, is made up of editors, sub-editors, other journalists, media owners and the audience, to name a few. The individual is, of course, the journalist with their background and personal attributes and knowledge of the domain and field.

The research is using ethnographic tools – semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document and artefact analysis – as well as content analysis of newspapers to determine if a print journalist can be a creative producer of cultural texts. Up to the time of submission of this paper, 36 interviews have been conducted with members of the field – editors, journalists and cadets – from Australian newspapers and magazines. The participants were questioned about such things as their background, their knowledge of the journalistic domain, how they write an article, how members of the field affect their work processes and how they work within the rules and procedures of the domain.

However, one of the first items on the agenda was to determine if a print journalist can be a producer of creative cultural texts. It was discovered through the literature review that while *creative* and *creativity* are frequently used within a journalistic context it is rarely defined. Additionally, within the industry itself, journalism awards and the Australian journalism grading system use the terms without elaboration. All these instances expect the audience to understand what is meant and it does, but in a common-sense, person-centred way not within an academic framework.
Creativity

Arguments about the source of creativity are long-standing and have shifted along a continuum from Plato’s divinely inspired poets (Plato 1971), to the Artist as individual source, and finally, to the post-structuralist view of the audience as the creator of meaning (Barthes 1977). However, it is still common to believe in the individual as creator (Sawyer 2006) although current research is exploring theories where more than one element must be present for creativity to occur – the individual situated within the context of culture and society.

Because of the belief of the individual as creator, much research has been done on identifying characteristics of creative individuals (for a comprehensive summary of creativity and personality research see Runco 2007, pp. 279-317; Sawyer 2006, pp. 39-56) and these ideas are what drive many of the references in the journalism literature. Characteristics such as divergent thinking (Guilford 1967) – fluency of thinking, originality and flexibility in thinking – and lateral thinking (De Bono 1967) are well known. While these characteristics may be important in the creative personality, an individual and their personality is only one aspect of what constitutes creativity and it is crucial to take social and cultural contexts into consideration as well. Csikszentmihalyi (2003) argues creativity is inherently social and although the above personality traits may be necessary for the individual to produce creative products, public recognition cannot be discounted. Creativity is “a phenomenon that is constructed through an interaction between producer and audience” (2003, p. 314). He further contends that an individual must refer to an existing culture, the traditions and conventions already in place, before a difference can be produced: “‘New’ is meaningful only in reference to the ‘old’” (2003, p. 315). To summarise both points: How do we know something is creative if it is not presented to a social group for verification and how do we know something is creative if we have nothing to compare it to?

The definition for creativity in this PhD research is based on McIntyre’s: “creativity is an activity whereby products, processes and ideas are generated from antecedent conditions by the agency of someone, whose knowledge to do so comes from somewhere and the resultant novel variation is seen as a valued addition to the store of human knowledge” (McIntyre 2006, p. 202). Following this definition, print journalists can be said to produce creative texts.

Creativity in journalism literature

Although a number of texts from the literature review state that journalists need to be creative, it is a notion that is seldom expanded. Creativity is used in a number of different ways within journalism’s academic writing: there are appeals to write creatively (Herbert 2000, p. 11); it is listed as a positive trait for a journalist (Conley and Lamble 2006, p. xiv; Sheridan Burns 2001, p. 33; Tapsall and Varley 2001, p. 4; Willis 2003, p. 66); lack of creative opportunities leading to disillusioned practitioners (Hirst and Patching 2005, p. 68; Underwood 1993, p. xx); and, conversely, the opportunity for creativity in journalism attracting “creative people to the media” although this “exerts a pull toward more interpretive news formats that let them express their creativity” (Lichter et al. 1986, p. 19).

The last point highlights the idea that feature writing is perceived as more creative than hard news (Daugherty 1999; Maskell and Perry 1999). In fact, it has been argued that there is no place in hard news for creativity; it is
formulaic or “a grey block of form” (Ricketson 2004, p. 228). The main objective of hard news is factual information, quickly found and quickly reported, whilst feature writing contains “emotion and analysis as well as information” (ibid.). Writing feature articles is seen as a more creative, less constrained, genre of journalism (Randall 1996; Schumacher et al. 1989). Sara Niblock also differentiates between hard news and feature writing and the distinctions perceived between the two forms:

While in newspapers and other hard news media, words are used simply and concisely, magazine articles are often longer and more detailed and have to paint an intricate picture for the reader. This means magazines can be a rewarding career opportunity for the journalist who wants to use language and vocabulary more creatively (1996, p. 77).

Niblock’s contention implies that hard news journalists are so constrained they cannot be creative producers and is an example of the Romantic notion that freedom from constraints equals creativity. This is an argument that is unsustainable under a Rationalist view of creativity. If the journalist uses the structures for the genre they are writing for, and produces a novel and acceptable text that is verified by the field, a creative text is not only possible but plausible.

As well as academic writings, members of the field use creativity without defining the concept. Tom Salom in Journalism: jobs that make news says that: “While dealing with facts is top priority, being creative as to how those facts can be presented is also essential for any modern day journalist” (Solly et al. 2007, p. 54). John Hartigan (Radio National 2002) believes it is his role as Chief Executive of News Limited to manage creativity and channel it into a commercial product to ultimately provide quality journalism for the audience. Paul Kelly, discussing his time as editor-in-chief of The Australian, considers how commercial and entertainment pressures affect the industry and challenge creativity (1998, p. 21). Apart from the ambiguity in the way creativity is used, these last two comments show how management

views the structures in the industry: Hartigan sees them as enablers and Kelly perceives them as constraints.

In addition, a number of awards within the journalism domain specifically call for creativity in their criteria. The Bruce Jesson Foundation in New Zealand provides funding “for critical, informed, analytical and creative journalism or writing” (Bruce Jesson Foundation 2008) and the Melbourne Press Club/Trawalla Foundation awards a scholarship “to promote excellence, creativity and originality in reporting, reviewing or critical appraisal of the visual or performing arts” (Melbourne Press Club 2008). The Australian Walkley awards overarching criteria is: “Overall judges will be looking for journalistic courage and creativity” (The Walkley Foundation 2008) although within the print section the Newspaper Feature Writing and Magazine Feature Writing category is specifically judged on creativity but the News Report category is not, again in line with the Romantic ideal.

Finally, an interesting quirk within the journalism domain is the definition of journalists’ pay grades posted by the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance (MEAA). According to this document, in a grading system that starts at cadet level and ends at Grade 10, a journalist does not need to be creative until Grade 5 is reached. Following are the instances when creativity is mentioned:

- Journalist Grade 5 – “Display a degree of creativity and innovation and independence in carrying out assignments” (MEAA 2008).
- Journalist Grade 7 Band 3 – “Their duties require the exercise of sustained high levels of professional, technical and creative skills” (ibid.).
- Journalist Grade 8 – “He or she will have mastered the advanced skills and will also be capable of displaying high creativity, originality and analytical ability in a range of assignments” and “Exercise a significant degree of creativity, originality or innovation” (ibid.).
- Journalist Grade 9 – “He or she will have mastered the advanced skills and will also be capable of displaying high creativity, originality and analytical ability in a range of assignments” (ibid.).

From this the following questions can be asked: Up to Level 5, is the journalist supposed to produce uncreative work? and How are the different degrees of creativity defined? If McIntyre’s definition of creativity is used,
journalists from cadet level through to the highest grade can produce creative work.

Structures as constraints?

The structures that govern the print journalist’s writing are frequently seen as constraints to production (Berkowitz 1997; Machin and Niblock 2006; Ricketson 2001; Sigal 1973; Stocking and Gross 1989). In each element of the systems model, structures can be found: in the individual, in the field, and in the rules and procedures of the domain. However, it is important to note that in any creative production the structures worked within should not only be seen as constraints. They are also enablers (Boden 2004; Giddens 1984; Wolff 1993). It is how the journalist, as agent, learns and uses these structures that lead to creative texts. Tony Harcup sums this up:

Within the study of journalism, agency means the extent to which individual journalists can make a difference to media practices and content … To say that journalists have agency is not to deny that journalists operate in a world of constraints, but to argue that structural forces do not totally determine individuals’ actions (Harcup 2004, p. 6, emphasis in original).

In fact, Herbert Gans (1980) argues that learning and knowing these structures allow a journalist to get on with what he [sic] does best; he does not have to think about what he [sic] is doing. It is this tacit knowledge that enables a journalist to ‘do without thinking’. Donald Schön calls this “knowing-in-action” (1987, p. 37). Pierre Bourdieu’s (1977) habitus also corresponds with these theses: a journalist is predisposed to act because of these structures although, as Johnson argues in line with Harcup, habitus “does not negate the possibility of strategic calculation on the part of agents” (1993, p. 5). In other words, the individual uses their habitus to make creative choices.

Within the first element, the individual, a journalist’s background and personal qualities have an effect on the writing. Influences such as family, education, social class and cultural background (nurture) all contribute to a journalist’s view of the world as does talent, genetic predisposition and personality traits (nature). This is the individual structure a journalist works in: “Newworkers also influence news production unconsciously because, like all humans, the ‘lenses’ of their personal histories and self-interest shape news” (McManus 1994, p. 26). Working within the domain and with the field also means these structures are constantly changing.

Within the field, or social structure, newsroom influences are seen as a limitation (McNair 1998; Sheridan Burns 2001) particularly with the hierarchy in the newsroom changing a journalist’s article (Carlyon 1982; Sigal 1973). Henningham claims that: “The group nature of journalistic production is itself a major constraint on individual control” (1989, p. 27) and it would seem that if edited how can the print journalist be considered a creative producer? However, Sawyer, discussing fiction writing, poetry and scriptwriting, lists three ‘lessons’ that relate to writing: it is hard work, it is conscious and directed, and it is collaborative and embedded in the social (Sawyer 2006, pp. 206-210, my emphasis). Sawyer cites well-known poets and authors, including T.S. Eliott and Raymond Carver, whose work, in a similar fashion to journalists’, was heavily edited by the field before publication.

Other influences from the field include media owners (Harcup 2004; Henningham 1989; Machin and Niblock 2006) and the audience (Berkowitz 1997; Machin and Niblock 2006). Hesmondhalgh, talking about cultural production in general, made the following observation:

Conflicts between independence and external control should not be understood as zero-sum games, where, for example, greater constraint by owners and managers automatically leads to less creativity on the part of film-makers, journalists and musicians: in some situations, political or economic constraints can produce probing journalism and innovative entertainment” (2006, p. 51).

In regards to the audience, the adherence of print publications to a specific format gives the impression of routine and unoriginality. However, it can be argued that it is an audience’s need for familiarity or ontological security (Giddens 1984) that promotes this perceived constraint: the audience expects particular styles in both writing and format from particular publications (Chandler 1995; Newman 1989). Hall notes that if journalists, “constantly broke the codes, people outside wouldn't understand them at all. So they need
to be operating within a certain set of discourses, but adapting that to the particular stories that they are trying to tell” (2002, p.3).

Within the domain, it is the rules and procedures that can constrain journalists. However, rather than calling them constraints it is more pertinent to call them conventions, keeping in mind the earlier argument of the importance of learning the traditions and conventions, or rules, of the domain. Examples within journalism include the style of publication (Harcup 2004) – is it a broadsheet or tabloid. As Ian Ward has said: “Each medium has a distinctive news format and imposes quite distinctive rules and work practices upon journalists working within its confines” (1995, p105). Other rules are the conventions of newswriting (Herbert 2000): the shape of the story e.g. the inverted triangle approach in hard news; the basic questions of who, what, why, when, where and how (Harcup 2004; Lamble 2006; Perry 2005); and, the application of news values (Conley and Lamble 2006; Perry 2005; Sheridan Burns 2002; White 2005). There is also a style guide the publication uses to guide the journalist (Cameron 1996).

The media organisation worked for is also seen to limit agency (Altheide 1974; Berkowitz 1997; Fishman 1980) due, in part, to economic considerations (Fishman 1980; McNair 1998; Ward 1995), which is also related to competition (Machin and Niblock 2006; Manning 2001; McNair 1998). Further to this, legal and ethical implications need to be allowed for (Cunningham 2006; Harcup 2004; Henningham 1990; Machin and Niblock 2006).

However, one of the largest conventions a journalist is subjected to is the deadline (Fishman 1980; Gardner et al. 2001; Harcup 2004; Machin and Niblock 2006; Manning 2001; McNair 1998; Sheridan Burns 2001; Tapsall and Varley 2001; Tiffen 2006). As Manning notes:

> It is the cycle of news deadlines that drives the journalists’ routine within a news organisation … it is this, more than anything else, which shapes how each news worker goes about her or his work, and which determines both the constraints and opportunities of the job. In other words, most news journalists and news workers have to meet deadlines as a matter of routine, and they will develop a number of techniques and organisational practices in order to accommodate this imperative (2001, p. 54).
This conditioned agency is as valid for a hard news journalist as it is for a feature writer, an opinion piece writer, a review writer, a magazine writer, etc. Furthermore, the phrase can be adapted to be an appropriate comment for any writing domain.

**Conclusion**

This paper asserts that print journalists are creative when they understand the rules and procedures from the domain, understand the preferences of the field and use this knowledge to produce an article that is novel and appropriate. A print journalist cannot be considered creative within the common-sense, Romantic view but by placing the journalist, as individual, within Csikszentmihalyi’s systemic Rationalist approach and viewing the social and cultural contexts as of equal importance within the creative process, all genres of journalism can be seen to be able to produce creative cultural texts. Rather than using a narrow, person-centred view of creativity, encouraging a broader understanding could lead to better journalistic practices.

In the PhD thesis, *Was there much blood kid?: cadet journalists in Australian media*, Mandy Oakham made the following observation:

If senior journalists are incorporated as part of the method [of inculcating cadets] then it has to be asked what are the implications for innovation if what has gone before is always presented as best practice? Where indeed when one trainer explicitly states, ‘we are trying to create journalists in our own image, it is a chance to shape people’ and further, ‘we try to influence them culturally’. The constant emphasis on replication would seem to leave little ideological space for the notions of innovation and change (2004, p. 140).

I would answer that question by saying that it is important for a journalist to learn the traditions, the existing structures of the domain and the preferences of the field before they can introduce innovation and expand the domain. I say this because of the understanding in the creativity research domain that creative producers must learn the rules, or structures, and traditions of the domain before they can become a “skilful bender of rules” (Evans and Deehan 1988, p. 33). Creativity researchers such as Bailin (1988), Csikszentmihalyi (2003), Boden (2004) and Sawyer (2006) stress the importance of domain acquisition before a creative contribution can be made.
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