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Abstract
Globalisation and a subsequent increasingly interdependent world are forcing an evolution of current journalism practice. It is argued that new forms of international storytelling must be underpinned by a global ethical approach that shifts the current conceptual framework of foreign correspondence from the nation-state to a new international arena. Human rights journalism is presented as a potential model to facilitate such a shift. This article illustrates the responsibility of journalism education to shape global reporters of the future and sets out a scenario-based approach to teaching and learning that empowers students to reflect both theoretically and practically on calls for a more cosmopolitan journalistic practice.

On the front line
Nationalism in Somaliland, domestic abuse in Kenya, teenage pregnancy in Colombia and rape in Algerian refugee camps – just some of the topics multimedia journalism students at Bournemouth University have explored or will explore for their final year projects. Working under curfew, interviewing traumatised victims and going undercover, are some of the issues these students have had to deal with. This may be of concern to BBC World Affairs Producer Stuart Hughes, who last year wrote of his alarm regarding young and ‘inexperienced’ journalists jetting off to ‘the most hazardous countries’ (Hughes, 2012). As he says:

For young journalists looking to become the next John Simpson or Jeremy Bowen, the first rung on the career ladder used to mean hard graft in the newsroom of a weekly provincial newspaper or local radio station…But shrinking budgets for foreign news, increasingly universal internet connectivity and relatively cheap flights to some of the world’s trouble spots have dramatically reduced barriers to entry for would-be foreign
correspondents.
Whilst Hughes makes a valid point, it is important to note that not all
students are underprepared for such an assignment, and most do not make
decisions to travel to potentially dangerous places lightly. At Bournemouth
University, we take great care in ensuring anyone who seeks to go abroad is
fully trained to do so through our co-curricular workshop programme, The
Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma¹, which is
explored in detail in later sections of this article.

Hughes blames the ‘scarcity of entry-level positions’ for students
deciding to go it alone abroad, but whilst this might be part of the story,
Hughes fails to acknowledge that many students no longer express ambition
to work for the mainstream. They feel able to cover international stories
through alternative outlets. Indeed the role of mainstream news organisations
as sole providers of world news is increasingly contested (Alejandro, 2010;
Heinrich, 2012; Sambrook, 2010). Gone are the days of relying only on John
Simpson or Jeremy Bowen for international coverage. We learn in the
classroom more and more that students get their international news from
elsewhere. Young student journalists increasingly look to the likes of Thomas
Morton or Shane Smith from Vice, or to the advocacy journalist Harry Fear in
the Gaza strip, as their inspiration for international coverage, rather than to
the veterans of the mainstream. Against this backdrop then, where those
interested in the world increasingly choose SoJo or backpack journalism career
paths, institutions have the responsibility to educate their students not only
about the potential and challenges of international reporting, but also of the
dangers. The director of the International News Safety Institute, Hannah
Storm, told Hughes, “It feels now in places like Syria there are more and more
people in their early or mid-20s with little or no experience - but with an
overriding enthusiasm which makes them want to go out there and make a
name for themselves, without taking the realities on board.” (cited in Hughes,
2012). It is therefore up to us as educators to draw attention to and prepare

¹ This is the workshop programme devised by the author.
our students for the actualities of reporting from dangerous places. Indeed in this ‘post-industrial’ (Anderson et al., 2012) context of contemporary journalism, reporters are increasingly working independently of the mainstream, alone and often in challenging environments. Therefore there are both educational and professional opportunities for journalism schools and their students, which should not be ignored. The mainstream may disregard or even frown upon so-called backpack journalism practice and its legitimate associated safety concerns, but it should not be overlooked that this new environment of ‘easy-access’ foreign reporting provides a real opportunity for higher education to nurture global aspirations. A world, which has become smaller and easier to navigate offers universities a real chance to contribute to future models of international journalism, but this smaller world of nations, which is increasingly networked (Heinrich, 2011; Castells, 1996) and interdependent also requires an international ethical outlook that can move beyond the local to the global.

Gerodimos (2012) highlights the potential and even duty that universities have to empower students not only to become global citizens, but true global mediators. This article argues that journalism education is therefore uniquely placed to shape the future of international news coverage and foster a new global journalism practice that is fit for the twenty-first century.

**Rethinking international reporting and foreign correspondence**

Ethics have long been an important feature of the journalism curriculum, but this article argues that an increasingly internationalised news climate requires an overhaul of journalism’s current code of practice. There is an urgent call to reshape and redefine dominant models of reporting, which traditionally serve local, regional or national publics, as journalism becomes more global and even more cosmopolitan. An ethic that is not global in nature is therefore no longer sufficient to adequately address the problems faced in
this contemporary era of global news media. Ward (2005) points out that with global reach, there are also global responsibilities.

Discussions around foreign news reporting usually focus on the news industry’s bleak financial condition and the closure of foreign bureaus (Hannerz, 2012; Schiller, 2010), or the apparent dwindling interest in international coverage (Utley, 1997). Then there is the intense debate, which pits so-called parachute reporters against indigenous journalists (Reynolds, 2010; Palmer and Fontan, 2007; Erickson and Hamilton, 2006; Hamilton and Jenner, 2004). More recently, however, foreign correspondence has been examined through the lens of technological change (Heinrich, 2012), and specifically the impact this change has had on ‘the domestication’ of news, and how this has become ‘outdated’ (Heinrich, 2012: 5). That is to say that the advent of new media has generated a news exchange that is now radically ‘decentralised’ (Benkler, 2006:3), deterritorialised (Hjavard, 2001; Bergleuz, 2008) or ‘networked’ (Livingston and Asmolov, 2010; Heinrich, 2011). Journalism is therefore escaping the ‘national container’ (Beck, 2005:16) thinking that has characterised international coverage since the nineteenth-century, which precipitated the media’s complicity in the construction of nation-states or ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson, 1983).

Livingston and Asmolov (2010) characterise the tradition of foreign correspondents as ‘tied to a particular morphology of global governance, one rooted in a system of nation states’ (2010: 745). However, they argue that new ‘networked’ communication technologies have given rise to a new ‘structure of global governance’ (2010: 246), which increasingly involves non-state actors. Livingston and Asmolov demonstrate how what they call the ‘microelectronics revolution’ has altered ‘the very idea of foreign – not to mention corresponding… almost beyond recognition’ (2010: 756). If the shell in which journalism operates is changing, then it is argued in this article, that new models of reporting practice are needed to adapt to the new surroundings.
At stake in this debate is the need to deconstruct the ‘us’ and ‘them’
dichotomy that is so often applied to concepts of war reporting (Billig, 1995; 
Knightley, 1982), where the ‘interests of “people like us” are counterpoised 
against the suffering of strangers’ (Allan, 2010: 217), but this model extends 
beyond the realm of war and crisis to that of foreign or international news 
more generally. As a result, this article would advocate calls for an 
inernational coverage that breaks down the ‘culture of distance’ (Williams, 
1982) in favour of a more cosmopolitan nature of journalism, which as 
Brüggemann and Kleinen von Königslöw (2013: 362) describe, comprises of an 
aver awareness of global interconnectedness, appreciation of cultural diversity 
(Hannerz, 1990) and an openness to engage with the culturally different 
‘other’ in an open transnational dialogue (Delanty: 2009; Mihelj et al., 2011).

Berglez (2008) provides an empirical conceptualisation for this new era 
of global journalism, which he argues is derived from a ‘global outlook’ 
(Berglez, 2008, 847). Berglez, however, disassociates this ‘outlook’ from the 
notion of global ethics: ‘a global outlook is primarily a matter of 
understanding, seeking to explain complex relations across the globe, not to 
develop a universal (global) ethics’ (Berglez, 2008: 848). This article argues 
that an expansion of ‘outlook’ or change in perspective without the ethics to 
underpin and guide this new approach of reporting is unlikely to challenge 
current dominant forms of storytelling, which are too restrictive and serve 
only ‘to maintain the interests of the consumer, and not those of the 
community’ (Allan, 2010: 319).

In the absence of a development of a cosmopolitan, universal rights 
approach that could underpin an international frame of reference for 
reporters, the risk is that a ‘global outlook’ retains the potential to be narrow 
or constrained by particular ‘interwined’ (Berglez, 2012: 847) countries and 
thereby fixed on relatively small group self-interests. A global journalism 
derunderpinned by global ethics therefore becomes necessary ‘to understand the 
complexities... multiple histories and connect often paradoxical 
developments’ in the world (Hafez, 2009:331). This in turn can create the
peaceful and prosperous community of equals that Kant first envisioned with his philosophical teachings of 1795 (Shaw, 2012). There are those who contest the universality of ethics, of course. De Beer and Merrill (2004) claim that it is not possible to deduce one singular ethic as the world consists of people with radically different values. However, cosmopolitanism, in opposition to cultural relativism, is often misinterpreted by its critics as the imposition of Western, or more specifically, Western European values on the world. This article argues that cosmopolitanism in not an imperial project that ignores diversity; rather cosmopolitanism is subsequently a ‘quest for universalism’ (Chernilo, 2007) that does not deny particularities and instead ‘engages with difference’ (Brüggemann and Kleinen von Königslöw, 2013: 362). It offers a distinct alternative to parochialism, which Brüggemann and Kleinen-von Königslöw describe as ‘ignoring and rejecting other cultures’ as well as ‘the idea of belonging to communities beyond one’s own nation’ (2013: 362).

Ward (2005) has suggested that a global ethical framework is where journalists act as a global agent, to serve world citizens, and to enhance non-parochial understandings. The idea of universal human rights enshrined in international law could provide a starting point to underpin this new model of cosmopolitan reporting practice (Shaw, 2012). This is highly controversial, of course as the very idea that human rights are universal has been contested (Pollis and Schwab, 1979). This criticism is grounded in the assertion that what constitutes a human right in one community might be an anti-social notion in another, but as with the debate surrounding journalistic ethics, this cultural relativist view is increasingly redundant in a world where state and cultural borders are being removed.

Current debates surrounding human rights do not concern the question whether human rights should be a universally applicable moral precept, but rather the various ways of perceiving equality and respecting dignity (Donnelly, 2007). There are no indisputable rights. Instead, there are some indisputable, absolute prohibitions. This is what Jack Donnelly (2007) refers to as the ‘relative universality’ of human rights. In other words, rights
are present all over the world, but it depends on the situation and conditions in the specific community as to which ones are asserted at any given time. In one place it may be protection against torture, in another place it may be the right to have children by means of state-of-the-art reproduction technology. The validity of universal or ‘relative universal’ human rights must not be reduced either because of the weakness of the United Nations and other institutions to monitor abuses or because this universality can be hijacked by politics and individual nations who seek to exploit human rights for their own improper ends. Indeed such challenges highlight the growing importance and increasing need for a value-based system that is both truly global and truly human.

Christians (2008) and Ward (2012; 2010a; 2010b; 2005) stress the concept of humanity in their work on global ethics and would argue that human rights are susceptible to hijack by relative societies. They point to certain values, which are universal to human existence and not to a society or an era, such as the sacredness of life and the protection from violence. These values are ‘pretheoretical’ or ‘fundamental presuppositions’ about what it is to be human (Ward, 2010b: 66). Christians (2008) refers to ‘protonorms’, which refers to the idea that these values lie beneath ‘the various authentic ethical languages and valuing across cultures’ (Ward, 2010b: 66).

The entire catalogue of human rights is hardly relevant all over the world at the same time, but one of the essential purposes of human rights is relevant everywhere: protecting vulnerable individuals and groups against outrages and distress. It is this philosophical framework, which can provide the underpinning for a global ethic that seeks common grounds to ‘unify rather than divide human societies’ (Tehranian, 2002: 58) and promotes a pluralism of content that reflects the true diversity and complexity of the world.

From the local and national to the global and universal: a co-existence
As Ward’s extensive work on global ethics illustrates (2012; 2010a; 2010b; 2005), international journalism remains firmly anchored to the notion of public interest (see Figure 1). However, as was discussed in detail above, a new global perspective is recontextualising and transforming the concept of publicity. Since the birth of modern journalism, ‘public’ has been tacitly understood as one’s own nation. Global journalism extends this concept, whereby ‘public’ evolves to encompass all citizens of the world to construct a ‘multi-layered structure of publicity’ (Hjavrad, 2001: 34). In this context, global journalistic practice is guided by ‘humanity’ (see Figure 1) and contemporary journalists become agents of this global public sphere, where they must therefore promote ‘non-parochial understandings’ of events (Ward, 2005).

**Figure 1: A Framework for Global Ethics (Ward, 2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIBILITY</th>
<th>JUSTIFIED CONSEQUENCE</th>
<th>HUMANITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth-seeking:</td>
<td>Minimising harm</td>
<td>Serve the public (as global citizens)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence:</td>
<td>Providing public</td>
<td>To protect civil and human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict of interest</td>
<td>benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impartiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>To act as watchdog over authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be accountable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics indicate notes added by the author.

This solicits a reformation and realignment of ethics, but it does not imply that news organisations ‘will (or should) ignore local issues or regional audiences… It does not mean that every story involves global issues or a cosmopolitan attitude’ (Ward, 2005: 16). Indeed the concepts included in the first two columns of the model above would be recognisable to most existing codes of ethics. Instead, this is about expanding editorial perspectives and changing journalists’ perceptions of their responsibilities in this new globalised world (Robinson, 2010), where stories take on increasing global implications. In other words, there is a coexistence, or a ‘multi-layered
structure of publicity’ (Hjavrad, 2001: 34), where there is an acknowledgment that we live simultaneously in two communities: ‘the local community… and a community of human aspirations’ (Ward, 2005: 15).

If these aspirations are taken to mean a cosmopolitan world of peace and equals, and if these aspirations are to become realities, then some journalism scholars would argue that without a radical overhaul of journalistic practice, these aspirations will never be achieved (Shaw, 2012; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005). Global journalism must therefore move beyond current models of practice that are for the most part ‘reactive’ in nature, in favour of a more ‘proactive’ (Shaw, 2012: 47) approach. Such a transition would not only seek ways to explain the issues arising from the new global context, but would also actively ensure ‘the promotion and protection of sustainable peace and human rights’ (Shaw, 2012: 50), which in turn breaks free from the conceptual framework of the nation-state to create a more cosmopolitan model.

Shaw’s model of human rights journalism (see Figure 2), which places the idea of attachment over detachment, empathy over sympathy and advocacy over neutrality is primarily concerned with conflict intervention (Shaw, 2012). By extension, however, Shaw’s theory can provide a basis for a normative and counter-hegemonic journalistic practice that goes well beyond the realm of conflict (Charles, 2013).

**Figure 2: Human Rights Journalism versus Human Wrongs Journalism. A Model for Global Ethical Journalistic Practice? (Shaw, 2012).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN RIGHTS JOURNALISM</th>
<th>HUMAN WRONGS JOURNALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-violence oriented</td>
<td>Competition oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive in preventing violence</td>
<td>Violence/drama/evocative oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposes all human wrongs</td>
<td>Talk about ‘their’ human rights violations and ignore ‘ours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People oriented, biased in favour of the vulnerable</td>
<td>Demonisation: focus on ‘them’, ‘others’, ‘enemies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic problem-solving both in the short and long-term</td>
<td>Focus on the immediate at the expense of long-term structural solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model is not without its critics, however and this approach raises a fundamental issue surrounding the notion of objectivity in journalism that divides both academics and practitioners alike. This is a debate that is perhaps best explored by the juxtaposition of two German academics. On the one hand, Kempf (2007) believes that a rejection of objective reporting will undermine trust. He presents objectivity, neutrality and detachment as a means of ensuring accuracy. On the other hand, Becker (2002) looks to journalism not only to report reality as it is, but also to create reality, set examples and call for actual change. This is what Shaw (2012: 78) calls ‘diagnostic journalism’, which aims not only to find out why something is happening, but also to provide lasting solutions. This is in opposition to what Martin Bell (1998: 15) has described as ‘bystander’s journalism’, which reinforces the status quo of the powerful and dominant voices of society. Human Rights Journalism, in contrast, is ‘a journalism that challenges’ for the ‘promotion and protection of human rights’ (Shaw, 2012: 46). It is, in other words, a ‘proactive and holistic approach, oriented towards problem-solving and interested not only in the problems of today, but also in those of tomorrow’ (Shaw, 2012: 69).

Journalism education is therefore uniquely placed to nurture this deeply contested concept of global ethics and explore the evolving nature of alternative journalistic practice. As educators, we have a duty and responsibility to prepare our students for this era of global news, which is not only re-defining practice through its new international character, but is also ‘chaotic’ (McNair, 2006), ‘networked’ (Heinrich, 2011) and deterritorialised (Hjavard, 2001; Berglez, 2008) in nature.

**International journalism in the classroom: combining theory and practice**

At Bournemouth University, international journalism is increasingly part of the curriculum for the BA(Hons) in Multi-Media Journalism. Second year units such as ‘Global Current Affairs’ and ‘News Theory’ encourage students to expand their horizons. The former aims to provide students with
an understanding of globalisation ‘in an applied, grounded way’ (Gerodimos, 2012: 76) while the latter offers the opportunity to explore theoretical alternatives to the mainstream such as peace journalism (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005) or human rights journalism (Shaw, 2012). Combined with our increased co-operation with professional organisations like One World Media, which aims to promote positive coverage of the developing world and offers travel bursaries to student journalists, it is therefore perhaps not surprising that growing numbers of final year students are expressing a desire to travel abroad, and sometimes to dangerous or even hostile environments, to complete their final year Major Multi-Media Project (MMP).

This article is therefore intended as an evaluation of the programme in place at Bournemouth University, which aims to prepare students for international assignment. The article has two dimensions: firstly, it examines a co-curricular workshop programme that has been devised to promote this global approach to journalism (actively encouraging and supporting undergraduates to pursue and prepare for trips abroad), and secondly it suggests how academics and practitioners can work with students to responsibly assess the potential risk of working in the international arena. The programme in place at Bournemouth is entitled The Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma. It is currently delivered as an optional enrichment workshop programme, which means it takes place informally and outside of the normal timetable. The aim is to fuse international journalism theory with international reporting practice. Real-life dilemmas cultivate global perspectives, which are formulated through a critical reflection of both a theoretical and practical nature.

The workshops, which take a thematic or issue-oriented approach to teaching and learning, consist of a series of scenarios and small peer-assisted group discussions around the issues of planning, risk assessment and global ethics. The workshops are divided into two sessions of two hours each, split over two consecutive days. The first session looks at assessing risk, planning
and researching potential story ideas, while the second explores going undercover, notions of responsible reporting and dealing with trauma.

The workshops intend to offer a taster of the realities and potential difficulties of international reporting using the overarching theoretical model of human rights journalism (Shaw, 2012). A scenario based approach, which places the student at the centre of the teaching and learning process provides an opportunity to fuse theory and practice within a realistic global context. This approach is intended to foster a critical reflection that can both provoke an analysis of the validity of alternative journalistic practice, and also formulate an informed contribution to the ongoing debate surrounding global ethics.

Preparing for international assignment: balancing risk with duty of care

Most international assignments undertaken by students are safe and easy to risk assess. However, as student ambition grows and a global awareness is nurtured, an increasing number travel to places that would be considered hostile environments. As educators, we have a dual responsibility to keep students safe, but also to encourage their professional ambition. Balancing these two responsibilities can be a delicate issue, but it is one we must not shy away from if we are to empower global journalists of the future.

It is all too easy to refuse an assignment on the grounds of health and safety, without having properly and thoroughly considered the actual level of risk involved. This can be especially true in departments where staff may have limited experience of international reporting. It might also be the easiest way to shirk liability. It is worth noting, however, that a university’s responsibilities for students working abroad is a grey area in legal terms. As part of the new risk assessment procedures designed alongside the The Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma workshop programme, we require that students travelling abroad sign a disclaimer accepting full responsibility for their own safety. This is following specific legal advice, though it must be stressed it is not an absolute safeguard against
the university being held responsible should anything go wrong. However, this is about more than legal argument, it also places the student at the centre of the risk assessment process. The aim is to educate the students on how to weigh up the dangers involved, and to train them on how to ensure relevant and adequate control measures are in place.

It is also important to highlight that students are never ‘deployed’ on international assignment. The choice is theirs, and students obviously remain free to travel even when the university advises against it. What is important, is that we, as educators, empower our students to make an informed and responsible decision.

The disclaimer is just one part of an *International Assignment Risk Assessment Protocol* that has been devised as part of the workshop programme for both staff and students at Bournemouth University. It consists of three parts. Firstly, there is a pre-production security questionnaire (which encourages the students to take responsibility for themselves and do further research on the potential challenges their individual projects might involve). Secondly, the protocol outlines details of potential pre-requisites for travel abroad such as adequate insurance from Reporters Without Borders or perhaps the Hostile Environment and First Aid Training (HEFAT) that is also offered as a co-curricular activity. Finally, students and staff are required to complete a specific and thorough risk assessment form that in addition to the regular questions about risk, enables a student to consider other more specific hazards like kidnap, terrorism and conflict. These new procedures not only help students fully assess the real risks involved, but also help the university decide whether or not it will ‘support’ such a trip. Again, it is important to stress that the university does not offer or refuse permission to travel abroad. Instead, we use the *International Assignment Risk Assessment Protocol* to work with, advise and guide the student, and ultimately decide whether or not the student can be supported in their endeavours. We trust the university’s advice will prove to be a major influential factor in the student decision-making process.
Industry bodies that work with students and offer bursaries for overseas travel also see the risk assessment as the university’s responsibility. Derek Thorne, from One World Media, says:

Duty of care is a grey area, although our view is we are not sending anyone anywhere – they are applying to go to places of their own volition... Another thing we do is get a reference from each student’s lecturer. They have to give their approval of their project... This means that, in a way, we are passing the risk decision onto the university – ‘if it’s ok with the university, it’s ok with us.’

The pre-requisites we now have in place as part of our Protocol are flexible, however – it will depend on the nature and destination of the trip. For example, one student last year completed her assignment in Colombia. Parts of this country are considered to be a hostile environment because of the country’s armed conflict, but the student was not visiting these areas, was not covering the insurgency and so we decided the risk was moderate and did not make the HEFAT course a pre-requisite. Instead, support for her trip was conditional on a number of other factors, including adequate insurance and the agreement not to travel to areas affected by the left-wing insurgency. That is not to say that Colombia is completely safe, but the risk of being in the capital city compared to other areas of the country, which have Foreign And Commonwealth Office (FCO) travel advisories in place, was considered to be tolerable. Control measures like securing kit in the hotel, not travelling alone or at night and staying on public highways were among others that were considered sufficient for this specific trip. Another factor here is of course insurance. Any trip to an area that is under an FCO travel advisory means standard policies will not apply, but there are alternatives on offer, particularly one scheme from Reporters Without Borders (RSF), which the university usually enforces as a pre-requisite.

The risk assessment form also requires details of the student’s own safety and security protocol for when they are abroad. They are required to draw up plans of how they expect to keep people informed as to their
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2 In an interview with the author in December 2012
whereabouts. This is usually their friends and family, but sometimes this might involve university staff too. The nature of this protocol will again depend largely on the country and the activity involved, but it is important for students to realise that this is their responsibility and that people will need to know when or if to raise an alarm.

Carrying out risk assessment is also a major feature of the workshops themselves. Students complete exercises in small groups that allow them to explore the nature of risk, not just in advance of a proposed trip, but also while already in the field. Students are introduced to the concept of risk assessment as a continuous process through scenario-based learning.

Students are also given advice as part of the workshops on how to recognise Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Most journalists are trained how to spot this, but guidelines (drawn up by the BBC College of Journalism) are made available to those supervisors in the department who are not familiar with the disorder.

It is also worth noting that there is a wide range of sources available to help supervisors and students to assess risk. These range from FCO guidelines to journalistic specific security information from RSF, the Committee for the Protection of Journalists (CPJ) and the International News Safety Institute (INSI).

Some may question if universities can prepare students to the same standard as industry. Each institution will of course vary on the amount of resources and curriculum it can devote to this area, but we feel at Bournemouth we are developing procedures and courses that simultaneously empower students to decide for themselves, whilst allowing staff to guide the process responsibly. The university is satisfied that the protocols and pre-requisites we have in place are adequate, and also balance our duty of care with our desire to foster and support global ambition.

From problem-based to scenario-based learning: creating real ethical dilemmas in the classroom
Problem-based learning (PBL) has long been considered as an effective approach to education, mainly because of the emphasis it places on students as active participants in the teaching and learning process (Bridges, 1992; Boud and Feletti, 1997; Gilbert and Foster, 1998; Savin-Baden, 2000; Savin-Baden and Wilke, 2004). The PBL approach has been widely adopted in fields like medicine and electrical engineering for some time and is slowly being recognised as a useful method to fuse theory and practice in journalism education (Sheridan Burns, 1997 and 2004; Meadows, 1997; Cameron, 2001; Robie, 2002; Wright, 2012).

PBL is, however, a multi-faceted concept with various possibilities for the classroom. It can be just another method in a lecturer’s toolkit for a particular class, or it can offer a more radical approach to structuring a whole unit or curriculum. Wright (2012) differentiates the specific approaches to PBL within journalism education. The first model empowers students to consider ‘what they do and why they do it’ (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 7). The second provides a context that reflects professional practice (Robie, 2002) and the third recreates realistic simulations of the news world (Burns, 1997; Cameron, 2001; Meadows, 1997) (Wright, 2012: 12). The Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma necessitates a fusion of these approaches and has therefore adopted a ‘scenario-based learning’ (SBL) method (Errington, 2010; Thomson, et al, 2010).

PBL creates opportunities that ideally spread over time and are usually methods for delivering entire modules (Meadows, 1997; Thomsen et al, 2010; Wright, 2012). SBL, which is arguably acknowledged as a more precise and distinct form of PBL, is seen conversely as an ‘integrated part of the entire course structure’ (Thomsen et al, 2010) and is therefore more suited to activities that are constrained by time, like the workshop programme. Furthermore, Thomson et al. (2010) offer a more nuanced conceptualisation of the various approaches to inquiry-based learning and suggest that PBL has a predetermined outcome (Thomsen et al, 2010). Conversely, SBL is much more open in the way it encourages students to explore issues and potential
resolutions. SBL requires that students engage in a ‘discussion task’ or ‘action tasks’ (Gilbert and Foster, 1998: 245). Problems can be quite abstract in nature, whereas scenarios on the other hand are much more real and develop a ‘lived’ experience (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 5). Thomsen et al (2010) highlight two characteristics of SBL: firstly, that they require the students to draw upon previous experience and knowledge, and secondly that the scenario places students in a realistic situation (Thomsen et al, 2010). Such an approach consequently creates opportunities for an enhanced reflective practice (Errington, 2003; Errington, 2010; Thomsen et al 2010; Kolb, 1984), which in turn engenders a potential for a much ‘deeper’ (Entwistle, 1981) understanding and learning process. Students are expected to reflect before, during and after scenario engagement. This ‘reflection in action’ (Schön, 1987) draws on a student’s theoretical and practical knowledge, which inspires a real-world response based on the interrelation of these two elements and can foster a life-long attitude to learning. Indeed SBL is much more experiential in nature than other forms of PBL. The fusion of theory and practice required by SBL dictates a ‘sink or swim’ approach (Cameron, 2001: 144) thus reflecting ‘the real way in which knowledge is generated in the world’ (Meadows, 1997: 98).

Research in the medical field has found that SBL can result in real cognitive academic achievements (Moust et al, 1989). The wider PBL approach is usually tied to notions of constructivism, but the enhanced experiential potential of SBL also has strong cognitivist elements. Sheridan Burns outlines how critical reflection is the ‘cognitive bridge between journalism theory and professional practice’ (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 6). Furthermore, in a highly charged situation that is dealing with kidnap or other elements of trauma, SBL has certain roots in situated cognition theory (Hung, 2002) and by implication can additionally develop a learner’s awareness of meta-cognition (Richardson, 2003) thereby enhancing a student’s ‘self-efficacy’ (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 6). Ethical dilemmas can be quite personal and emotive in nature and how a student reacts to particular
scenarios will depend largely on their worldview. Sheridan-Burns employs a ‘blocking the exits’ strategy that encourages students to face up to and deal with difficult questions (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 13). She notes that students sometimes exhibit a tendency to avoid complexities, especially when there is no single correct answer. SBL in small groups prevents this, however, and necessitates a solution, thus ‘blocking the exits’ (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 13). Students discuss and reach solutions through their own individual reflection and cognitive abilities, but also by reflecting on the experiences of their peers. This draws on Vygotsky’s (1978) constructivist notion that engagement with others improves thinking. Students through small group discussion have the opportunity to stretch each other.

Savin-Boden and Major (2004) highlight four distinct groups associated with PBL: ‘tutor-guided’, ‘collaborative’, ‘reflexive’, ‘co-operative’ and ‘action’ (Savin-Boden and Major, 2004: 71). The SBL approach encompasses elements of each of these. Indeed this article would argue for a synthesis of approach to group work under the umbrella of SBL if students are to be encouraged to think both creatively and critically.

**Peer-assisted scenario-based learning**

Peer-tutors are employed to lead the small group discussions as part of *The Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma*. The tutors are students returning from international assignment, which means they can share their own personal experiences with their peers. Theoretically-speaking, peer-tutoring is firmly grounded in the social constructivist approach to learning. Supported or ‘scaffolded’ interaction within the tutee’s ‘zone of proximal development’ remains a cornerstone of this concept (Vygotsky, 1978). The primary concern in an SBL setting is the recognition that peer-assisted learning is a bi-directional process, which can ultimately lead to a ‘deeper’ learning experience (Entwistle, 1981) for all students.
Learners tend to be inspired by the experience of their peers (Topping, 1996) and cognitively, it provides a further opportunity for the tutors themselves to fully reflect on their own experiences (Bruner, 1963; Gartner, Kophler and Reissman, 1971 in Goodlad and Hirst, 1989). These latter two reasons – like many arguments in favour of peer-tutoring – have been developed from Gestalt theories of psychology. Bruner (1963) showed that tutors can struggle to make their knowledge meaningful to the tutee, and thereby have the opportunity to reflect on their own learning process, the so-called ‘learning by teaching’ approach (Topping, 1996). Furthermore, peer-tutors can develop their sense of personal adequacy and reinforce their existing knowledge (Goodlad and Hirst, 1989).

Conversely, tutees can be more easily ‘reached’ by their peers (Goodlad and Hirst, 1989). In other words, peers may be better equipped than professional lecturers to both appreciate the tutee’s difficulties (De Volder et al 1985; Goodlad and Hirst, 1989), but also to explain issues in a context that can be more easily understood.

Peer-tutoring can be problematic if being applied across a whole unit or curriculum. It can be difficult to monitor and assess, especially if there are large numbers of students involved, but for the purposes of the workshops, which do not assess the participants, it is a valid and effective technique and has been much appreciated by those involved – both tutors and tutees.

Reflecting on the workshops: implementation and evaluation

The pedagogical approach explored above is intentionally student-centred. The aim is to empower students to feel able to undertake an international assignment whilst simultaneously encouraging them to adopt a more global, cosmopolitan approach to their ethics and storytelling.

The workshop format enhances interactivity, especially with the involvement of peer-facilitation (Preszler, 2009). Workshops that include peer-discussion can therefore increase student engagement and learning. The sessions are also informal and held in the university screening room to avoid
a traditional lecture or seminar setting. Food and drink are also provided. Students feel relaxed and as a result are able to move around and interject freely. The objective is to treat them as young professionals and provide an inclusive learning environment that matches the sincerity and authenticity of the material they are engaging with.

The sessions start with the peer-tutors (current third year students) showcasing the work they have already filmed abroad and are in the process of completing for their Major Multimedia Project (MMP). This has an obvious impact in social constructivist terms (as outlined above) and students can realise their potential. As one student wrote in their feedback, ‘This shows we are good enough to do this type of reporting.’ The screenings are followed by semi-structured whole-group Q and A sessions. This is a delicate balance between allowing students the freedom to ask and explore anything they want with ensuring that key concepts of theory and practice are introduced. It is important to brief peer-tutors beforehand about the relevant themes from their own personal experiences that they are expected to explore with the tutees. That way, they can maintain a relevant focus during discussion. For example, each peer-tutor has individual experiences that are matched to particular themes like problems with kit, or dealing with difficult interviewees, for example. The semi-structured discussion is therefore student-led, but the member of staff must be prepared to facilitate and redirect discussions around key areas. Those used to didactic teaching methods can struggle with SBL (both staff and students), but as Wright (2012) and Tan (2004) have suggested, guided ‘scaffolding’ (Vygotsky, 1978) can be introduced through ‘manageable chunks’ (Wright, 2012: 13) to offer the students (and staff) some structure. Indeed the workshop programme at Bournemouth University has been devised with this in mind. The experience of the sessions shows the necessity of structure or semi-structure to the learning process. For example, students may raise legitimate queries that have not been included in the programme content. It is a delicate balance between allowing the discussion to develop ‘freestyle’ and ensuring key material is
covered. Lecturers may find this approach difficult. It is very much hands-off, but it is important to remember that the lecturer is there to guide and ‘facilitate’ the learning process in an SBL environment and not dictate it (Sheridan Burns, 2004: 11).

This environment can be particularly conducive to discussions around ethics, which are usually subjective and contextual in nature. Using the human rights journalism framework (Shaw, 2012), students are able to engage with key theoretical debates and apply these to practice. For example, those returning from abroad spoke of difficulty in being neutral or detached when confronted with victims of violence or trauma. They were challenged by those in the group (who interestingly had not yet been abroad) about credibility in this situation. One student equated taking sides or a journalism of attachment (Bell, 1998) with irresponsibility, for example.

One of the biggest issues of SBL can be the authenticity of the problems or scenarios themselves (Hoffman and Ritchie, 1997; Cameron, 2001). For SBL to be effective, the scenarios must be authentic. The Search for Global Ethics: International Journalism, Crisis and Trauma uses a combination of multi-media resources for the scenarios, including those prepared in the teaching resources available from One World Media, and some designed from the author’s own professional experience. The student response to this real-life element, which is the most important factor of SBL, is overwhelmingly positive: “The scenarios offered clear examples and allowed us to follow through things step-by-step. It made the content in-depth and real,” said one student in their feedback. “It was great to see real-life experiences and talk through real life dilemmas. The videos made it real,” said another. This authenticity could not have been achieved as effectively without the use of audio and video. Both Cameron (2001) and Hoffman and Ritchie (1997) advocate the use of multi-media in the search for authenticity and argue that audio and video have a stronger and deeper cognitive effect on the student, which would be supported by the above feedback.

This authenticity also generates an emotional aspect. Some students
find the dilemmas genuinely distressing and their feedback shows the metacognitive powers of SBL. The workshops clearly force the students to question their own character and personalities. The feedback response ranged from: “I want to go abroad, but I’m not sure I’m the right person for this work now,” to “I now realise I can expose injustices to the world through my reporting,” and “This is my first insight into life-changing journalism, in the practical sense and now I am inspired to do more.” However, students are also realistic and very mature about reporting abroad in difficult circumstances: “This gave me an insight into the social and emotional responsibilities of journalism. Now I can make an informed decision about going abroad.”

The authenticity of SBL allowed students to emerge themselves in the particular dilemmas presented. In their feedback, many claimed to have been ‘lost’ in the moment, but this provoked ‘raw’ discussion, according to one participant. Students were able to formulate their own views on ethical dilemmas, and while many agreed some mainstream journalism could be described as being too closely associated with national identity (Nossek, 2004; McNair, 2006), many also had difficulty with the thought of detaching themselves from the notion of objectivity. Whilst there appeared to be general agreement about a greater need to understand the world in its new globalised context (Gerodimos, 2012; Christians, 2008; Ward, 2005), and how the role of journalism might be perceived as central to this (Shaw, 2012; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005), there was an overall reluctance and hesitancy to accept that journalism is potentially not only responsible for fostering social change, but also actually able to do so. As one student explained, “The way we do journalism is so ingrained that to think of alternative ways is difficult”. Another wrote, “I’m leaving this workshop with so much to think about. I’m not only questioning what journalism means, but also how I really see the world.” Only a handful of participants seemed more determined: “Journalism is in crisis. We need to change the way we do things, and now we know how.”

The workshops contain an ambitious amount of material to explore, especially within the allotted timeframe, but the results have been extremely
rewarding. A sustained and whole unit based approach to SBL and international journalism would undoubtedly be an enriched and charged educational experience that could also provide the opportunity for further research.

The scenarios used in the Bournemouth University programme (although authentic) are also classroom based. For an even more ‘action’ approach (Gilbert and Foster, 1998), it might be better to consider the real-time use of role plays which involve professional actors, like the ones used by the DART Centre with their trauma training programme. If being used to formulate a whole unit on international reporting, SBL could be spread over time and students could produce material for assessment. This would require a great deal of planning, however, and throw up a whole set of separate issues. It would place a great deal of strain on staff and the university may also lack the resources required, but it would undoubtedly have both a ‘deep’ (Entwistle, 1981) and ‘authentic’ (Cameron, 2001; Hoffman and Ritchie, 1997) impact on all those involved.

**Conclusion**

This article has set out to highlight the responsibility of journalism education to actively endorse and cultivate a more global outlook in the classroom. Globalisation and a subsequent increasingly interdependent world are forcing an evolution of current journalism practice. It is argued that new forms of international storytelling must be underpinned by a global ethical approach that redraws the notion of ‘public interest’ and redefines the concept of publicity by extending it from the nation-state premise to include all citizens of the world on an equal basis. It suggests that a more cosmopolitan journalistic practice grounded in the universality, or ‘relative universality’ (Donnelly, 2007) of human rights, like that constructed and advocated by Shaw (2012), could be a starting point for student journalists (and professionals alike) as they engage in debate surrounding the formulation of global ethics.
The application of a real-life scenario-based learning approach that is both active and reflective in nature immerses students in a simulation of professional experience and allows them to engage in a fusion or synthesis of theory and practice, which also nurtures a life-long attitude to their learning. The recognition of interdependence between theoretical and practical perspectives inspires a critical analysis of what journalism should be, but also of what it can be. Consequently, students are able to engage in debates surrounding the call for global ethics, but are also able to contribute to a potential formulation of alternative journalistic practice.
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