ASJMC
INSIGHTS
FALL 2007

ASJMC Insights
Editor: Robert M. Ruggles
Layout and production: Kyshia Brown

The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC)
234 Outlet Pointe Boulevard, Suite A
Columbia, SC 29210
803/798-0271
803/772-3509 (fax)

ASJMC is a non-profit educational organization.
More than 200 programs, both accredited and non-accredited, teaching journalism and mass communication at the college level are members of the association.
ASJMC on the Web: www.asjmc.org.

ASJMC Insights is a publication of the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Submit queries and manuscripts to Dr. James L. Stewart, new *Insights* Editor, Department of Mass Communication, Nicholls State University, P.O. Box 2031 Thibodaux, LA 70310. E-mail: james.stewart@nicholls.edu. Phone: 985-448-4586. Opinions expressed in *Insights* are solely those of the authors and are not those of ASJMC or its officers.

Insights **is printed and bound in the United States of America.**

From the Editor ...

This issue of *Insights* contains a rich mix of articles for your edification and, the authors and I hope, enjoyment,

First we have three after-action reports from the World Journalism Education Congress held in Singapore. This event, which has spawned the World Journalism Education Council, looks to be a major advance in internationalizing journalism education. It will be nice to know what other journalism and mass communication programs around the world there are, how they conduct their programs, and under what conditions they operate. Opportunities for the exchange of ideas, information, and faculty seem endless. It will be interesting to track the success of this effort, though there are obvious obstacles and pitfalls.

Next, we offer three more articles on assessment for accreditation purposes. It is likely that assessment will be the subject of endless discussions and debates as JMC units continue to refine their efforts to make assessment work for them in meaningful ways. All three of these articles had their genesis in pre-convention sessions at August's AEJMC convention.

Finally, we have two articles about administrators, those masochistic folks who lead JMC programs. Both articles came from surveys, and both were subjects of presentations at the same AEJMC convention.

This is my last issue of *Insights* as editor. James Stewart of Nicholls State will succeed me. I declined an offer to continue for a simple reason: I have worked since I was about 11 or 12. When I retired in 2003, I looked forward to not working. Editing *Insights* did get to seem a little too much like work as my three-year term progressed. I do have many people to thank, however, folks who helped make my work seem a little less like work. They include all the authors who spent time and effort putting together important articles; my wife, Connie, who was always within a loud voice away to solve any computer or word processing crisis; Kyshia Brown, publications guru at AEJMC/ASJMC headquarters; and, of course, Jennifer McGill, executive director of both, who on more than one occasion figuratively held my hand, as she has for so many of you in times past. Thank you one and all!

Robert M. Ruggles

World Journalism Education Congress:
Its Importance to ASJMC Administrators

JOE FOOTE, University of Oklahoma

Since 2000, the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC) has taken major steps forward into the international arena. The 2000 mid-winter meeting in Mexico City was a historic venture into another country for a separate meeting. Moving outside the United States provided American journalism administrators with one of their most stimulating meetings with extensive exposure to Mexican media and academia. Some of the administrators traveled to Cuba from Mexico City for a special visit. The following year, ASJMC went to London, where it partnered with the British Association for Journalism Education for another highly successful meeting.

At the London meeting, a Task Force on Internationalization from the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) with ASJMC membership developed the idea of bringing together as many associations as possible from around the world for a global meeting. In 2007, the World Journalism Education Congress (WJEC) met in Singapore. The joint meeting with the Asian Media Information Centre (AMIC) drew nearly 500 delegates from 44 countries.

ASJMC played a major role in the WJEC. In 2004, it became part of the planning for the conference. A special ASJMC committee planned a workshop for administrators that played to a standing-room-only audience in Singapore. American journalism administrators were one of the largest contingents of delegates to the Singapore meeting.

The day before the WJEC conference convened, 28 journalism education associations met to discuss common problems in the field. ASJMC played a significant role in this meeting as well. The 28 associations, which had met three times previously as a planning group for the Singapore meeting, passed a Declaration of Principles for Journalism Education (See *AEJMC News,* September 2007, p.11.) and decided to continue to function as a group called the World Journalism Education Council. It will meet again in 2009.

Now that ASJMC has had nearly a decade of experience in the international arena and has several accomplished internationalists among its leaders, what opportunities does the World Journalism Education Council present for administrators, and how might its projects affect the field? Two articles in this volume of Insights describe a major initiative by WJEC and report on an innovative feature at the Singapore conference that allowed administrators and faculty to gain insight into the common problems shared increasingly by educators throughout the world.

Global Census of Journalism Education

The article by Charles Self, who was a leader with Will Norton in initiating the Mexico City meeting, describes the WJEC's most ambitious project—a global census of journalism education, which is supported by a Knight Foundation grant. The three-year project conducted at the University of Oklahoma will scan the world to find academic programs teaching journalism and mass communication.

Even the preliminary census figures show clearly that journalism education programs in the United States are a minority of programs worldwide and are rapidly becoming an even smaller proportion of those programs. Most ASJMC members can remember when U.S. journalism education dominated the world. We benefited not only from having a highly developed academic structure in a prosperous country, but we had an educational system that tilted toward professional programs and experiential learning. Although we have been teaching journalism and mass communication for less than a century, it is far longer than most other nations. Even in European countries such as the United Kingdom with a highly developed higher education system, it has been only in the past 20 years that there has been universal acceptance of journalism education at the university level.

The growth of journalism education in rapidly developing countries such as China and India reflect the rise of media and the economic trends there in general. The census will provide our clearest portrait yet of this fast changing field. Already, the OU team has discovered nearly 3,000 programs. There could be 1,000 more. By the time the census is released in 2010, we should know about development in every country of the world and have more detail about the kinds of programs they offer.

The global census undoubtedly will help countries where most of the development in this field has been uncharted. It will also give American leaders insight into where the field is trending geographically. Growth in size and scope eventually will mean a greater abundance of teaching materials and research being produced. We have already seen this trend in Japan and Korea over the past 30 years. Other countries are moving into a more mature state where they will be concentrating on creative outputs and lessening their dependence on others.

For American institutions wanting to connect with specific parts of the world, the census should be an incredible road map. The first stage will show where programs are located; subsequent work will show the depth and breadth of individual programs. It is important work, and we should be proud that ASJMC members have played a major role in developing this tool.

A key advantage of international involvement by American administrators is the opportunity to forge relationships and linkages with foreign academic programs. Several members of ASJMC have already led their institutions into partnerships; some are even offering full-scale academic programs. Others have study abroad and exchange agreements. Opportunities exist to expand these opportunities to a new level by involving more ASJMC members. The world census should help U.S. institutions locate a variety of potential partners that fit their needs.

WJEC Syndicates

Robyn Goodman's article focuses on the outcomes of small group syndicates that met for three consecutive days at the World Journalism Education Congress in Singapore. All eight of the syndicates produced substantive recommendations and insights that can form the basis for future dialogue.

What are more difficult to explain are the intangibles of this experience. Just bringing colleagues from different nations together in small group experiences for three 90-minute sessions focused on a single topic produced a much more robust and stimulating environment than any of the Americans were accustomed to. For many, it was the capstone experience of the WJEC's perfect complement to the traditional panels that headlined the event.

The idea for syndicates came from Suellen Tapsall of Australia, a veteran administrator who is president of the Association for Journalism Education (Australia and New Zealand). She had participated in human resource development training where this technique had been used. Suellen thought that it would be an ideal format for WJEC where we were trying to bring several perspectives together and wanted to provide a forum where delegates from different backgrounds could express themselves.

WJEC featured three layers of programming: (1) plenary and simultaneous sessions; (2) workshops; and (3) syndicates. While the plenaries and workshops had time for questions, they were largely one directional. The syndicates, on the other hand, were all abut communal feedback. There was a convener for each group, but the participants decided the direction of the discussion. The syndicates were the forums where delegates could speak out.

These sessions were voluntary and competed with AMIC traditional programming. Participants signed up for a particular syndicate when they registered. Participation in the syndicates was strong, but Asian delegates were less inclined to join into this highly verbal free-for-all than Americans, Europeans, and Australians who comprised the majority of the participants. Fortunately, every continent was represented. Language skills could also have been a factor in who chose to participate. All of the sessions were conducted in English. For some of the delegates, it wasn't until the final session that they expressed themselves comfortably and openly.

Each syndicate session brought more respect for the opinions of colleagues from other countries and more insight into how educators from other environments would perceive a particular problem. After three consecutive days of dialogue, a special dynamic emerged among the participants; nearly every group started moving toward consensus. Goodman's article shows that the outcomes on the issues discussed were quite similar to discussions among U.S. journalism educators.

I recommend the small group syndicates format for some of our ASJMC meetings. They provide a rare sustained opportunity to discuss a topic. While we would not have the diversity of an international conference, the process could still serve us well on a variety of topics.

Infrastructure for Journalism Education Globally

What has become clear from the five-year effort to establish a global network of associations is that the association infrastructure internationally has not kept pace with the growth of individual programs. Of the 28 organizations that comprise the World Journalism Education Council, only three (AEJMC, ASJMC, and AMIC) have full-time staff. The others operate with academic volunteers organizing their conferences (if they have them) and handling all other activities. Several countries are only beginning to think about forming associations. Even India, which has many large journalism and mass communication programs, does not have a formal professional association.

In other more mature fields such as law, medicine, engineering, and business, a sizable infrastructure currently exists worldwide to support these professional disciplines. One usually finds national organizations with full-time staff in most countries of the world. There are also accrediting agencies that operate nationally and globally. For journalism education, however, this kind of support system has been slow to develop. Even in Europe where there is a long tradition of funded central infrastructure, organizations are not particularly well-developed and funded in journalism education.

An advantage of gathering so many associations together is exposing everyone to a variety of perspectives and to build trust across national lines. Some of the organizations have been meeting together for four years. Through that dialogue, there is a common knowledge of how associations operate in different parts of the world and recognition by the least developed organizations of their challenges and potential.

Naturally, the lack of infrastructure has retarded the development of the field in many areas. Things that ASJMC takes for granted—bi-annual conferences, a formal membership structure, newsletters, journal, grants, special projects, professional development, and relationships with professionals—are but dreams to many of the nascent associations.

One of the emerging goals of WJEC is to develop the infrastructure to meet the burgeoning needs of faculty and students in a variety of countries. ASJMC is in a good position to partner with targeted associations to enhance their development and to make professional development materials available for administrators. Perhaps a grant could be secured to repurpose content from ASJMC sessions for an international audience. There may also be opportunities to invite foreign administrators to the ASJMC mid-winter conferences. With a stronger economic climate in many parts of the world, more and more administrators are able to pay their own way, making bilateral and multilateral projects more realistic.

Assessment/Accreditation

Those attending the WJEC meeting learned about parallel efforts around the world focused on learning outcomes assessment. They originated from three different types of organizations on three different continents, but looked remarkably similar. One of the associations involved in WJEC, the European Journalism Training Association (EJTA), has developed its own set of learning outcomes called the Tartu Declaration which lists 10 competencies enumerated by sub points (http://www.ejta.eu/index.php/website/projects/). The Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) has developed a similar set of 11 learning outcomes that it uses in its accreditation process (http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std2). In 2007, UNESCO unveiled Criteria and Indicators for Quality Journalism Training Institutions & Identifying Potential Centres of Excellence in Journalism Training in Africa. UNESCO used three broad criteria: curriculum and institutional capacity; professional and public service, external links and recognition; and development plan, strategy and potential (http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php).

All three of these models charted a path for measuring the quality of a postsecondary education in journalism and mass communication. The Singapore meeting demonstrated how journalism educators from three continents are developing systems with far more similarities than differences. The World Journalism Education Council will track these approaches, share them with member associations, and build a stronger infrastructure globally of quality control measures that represent self-regulation in the field.

Learning outcomes assessment has been a major focus of American journalism educators for the past decade. Regional and specialized accreditors have mandated it. We, however, have developed our system within the cocoon of American culture. I do not recall consideration of any plan or system beyond U.S. borders. With much more initiative emerging globally, American administrators should be more aware of international trends in this area and benefit from the experience of other national and regional approaches.

Implications for American Journalism Education

The international focus of ASJMC can be examined from two perspectives. On the one hand, there have been more international initiatives by journalism administrators during the past seven years and more administrators engaged internationally than at any other time in the field's history. In fact, many of the most prominent leaders in our field internationally are ASJMC members. On the other hand, international focus remains a fringe activity, with much of the membership showing little interest. In fact, several members believe that there is already too much attention being paid to international priorities.

The WJEC and its related activities have shown that journalism education is beginning a century where the impact of the U.S. is diminishing and where there are increasing amounts of stimulation coming from other countries. The next generation of journalism administrators will face a much more balanced environment where ideas, human capital, texts, research, and infrastructure come from a much wider variety of sources and will cross borders more easily. We as administrators will take notice of these trends not because we are more interested in being international, but because we want to be competitive.

The World Journalism Education Congress in Singapore was a major effort to bring this global reality to life. It was the first of many initiatives that will link us more closely to our colleagues from around the world. Fortunately, ASJMC is positioned well to make a difference in this new environment. Like our peer organizations in other fields before us, ASJMC will become an important part of this emerging global infrastructure in which the quest for excellence will extend far beyond our borders.

Joe Foote is dean of the Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Oklahoma and a past president of AEJMC.

Conducting an International Census of Journalism Education

CHARLES C. SELF, University of Oklahoma, AEJMC President

The goal was simple: conduct a census of journalism education worldwide by 2010.

Doing it has proved a bit more complicated.

The presidents of ASJMC and AEJMC have worked to internationalize both organizations for at least seven year now.

- AEJMC President Will Norton and I, as ASJMC President, took the ASJMC Administrator's Workshop and a special AEJMC international research paper competition to Mexico City in 2001.
- AEJMC President Joe Foote and ASJMC President Bill Slater took those same meetings to London the next year.
- AEJMC President Ted Glasser, supported by ASJMC, appointed a Task Force on Internationalization of AEJMC in 2003.
- Every AEJMC president, with support from ASJMC, has reappointed that task every year since that time.
- AEJMC and ASJMC obtained support from the Knight Foundation to bring journalism professors from abroad to AEJMC's annual meetings for three years.
- Loren Ghiglione of ASJMC and Wayne Wanta of AEJMC both initiated new internationalization efforts last year, including a specific outreach to Latin America.

The Task Force on Internationalization was initially headed by Dennis Davis, Otago University, New Zealand, and Kazumi Hasagawa, Maryland, Baltimore County, and later by Joe Foote and supported by both AEJMC and ASJMC. It set the goal of assembling a meeting of the officers of journalism education associations from around the world—the first such meeting ever to be held. The objective was to explore the areas of common concern for all journalism educators world wide, to examine basic approaches to teaching journalism around the world, and to issue a Declaration of Principles (See September 2007 *AEJMC News*, p.11.) upon which all journalism education organizations could agree. The meeting, called the World

Journalism Education Congress, ultimately was held in Singapore in April.

A World Journalism Education Census

The Task Force set one additional goal: to assemble the first ever census of journalism education around the world, that is, to try to identify every journalism education program that could be found and to assemble basic contact information for each program.

The initiative attracted funding from the Knight Foundation, which has sponsored a series of international efforts to improve journalism around the world. The Institute for Research and Training at the University of Oklahoma is conducting the study with Joe Foote and me leading a team of graduate students and enlisting experts from around the world in the effort. It is a three-year project that will run until 2010.

The Institute has formed partnerships with the 28 journalism education associations that participated in the World Journalism Education Congress. Each association represents a different region of the world and was part of the planning effort for the World Journalism Education Congress. They have been joined by a list of experts from around the world in vetting and expanding the list (see **Table 1** for a list of the partner associations and experts participating).

The census project set four goals:

1. To identify as many journalism education programs around the world as possible,
2. To develop basic contact information for each program and to assess basic information about how journalism is taught in each program so that comparative data can be developed for different regions of the world,
3. To assess information about international cooperation and exchange agreements among journalism programs around the world, including information on the number and types of cooperative programs,
4. To disseminate information about these programs as widely as possible, including establishing an interactive Web site with a clickable world map that can be regularly updated by the regional associations to keep the list up to date.

Attempts have been made before to assemble lists of international journalism education programs. For example, a list of 221 programs outside the United States was compiled at the instigation of AEJMC 's Committee on International Journalism Education with the help of the Voice of America's Office of International Media Training and The Freedom Forum and published in the AEJMC Directory in 1995. Kent Sidel, of the College of Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of South Carolina, led that effort. Ellen Hume, director of the Center on Media and Society at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, compiled a report and list of independent international journalism training programs for the Knight Foundation in 2004. That report and list were published by the Knight Foundation under the title "The Media Missionaries."

Table 1
Research Partners

Partner Organizations:

African Council on Communication Education (ACCE)
Arab-U.S. Association of Communication Educators (AUSACE)
Asian Media Information Centre (AMIC)
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC)
Association for Journalism Education (UK)
Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC)
Broadcast Education Association (BEA)
Canadian Committee for Education in Journalism (CCEJ)
Chinese Communication Association (U.S. based)
Chinese Journalism Education Association
European Journalism Training Association (EJTA)
Latin American Federation of Social Communication Schools (FELAFACS)
Brazilian Society of Interdisciplinary Studies in Communication – Intercom
International Association of Media and Communication Research (IAMCR)
Journalism Division, International Communication Association (ICA)
Israel Communication Association
The Japan Society for Studies in Journalism and Mass Communication (JSSJMC)
Journalism Education Association (Australia & New Zealand)
JourNet
Korean Society for Journalism and Communication Studies
Latin American Association of Communication Researchers (ALAIC)
Nigerian Association of Journalism and Mass Communication Teachers
Philippine Association of Communication Educators (PACE)
Russian Association for Education in Journalism
Russian Association for Film & Media Education
Saudi Association for Media and Communication
South African Communication Association
Trans-African Council for Communication (Tracce)

Experts:

Mira Kapil Desai, S.N.D.T. Women's University
Binod C. Agrawai, Himgiri Nabh Vishwavidyalaya (University in the Sky)
Buroshiva Dasgupta, Manipal University
David Robie, AUT University
Adnan Jasim Bu Metea, University of Bahrain
Ireneus J. Kapoli, University of Dar es Salaam
Wiphap Khanthap, Prince of Songkla, University Pattani
Pam McAllister Johnson, Western Kentucky University
Hussein Amin, The American University in Cairo
Maximiliano Dueñas Guzmán, Universidad de Puerto Rico
Isabel Rodde, Royal University of Phnom Penh
Justin Victor, Taylor's College Sdn Bhd
Violet B. Valdez, Ateneo de Manila University
Magda Abu-Fadil, American University of Beirut
Pascal Guénée, Institut Pratique de Journalisme

A number of Web sites also have provided lists and links to journalism education programs around the world. A good example is the MediaWise Trust organization (formerly PressWise Trust) operating out of Bristol, England, which focuses on issues of media ethics. The organization maintains an extensive list of international journalism training programs on its Web site. Another site, operated by the International Center for Journalism and called IJNet (International Journalists' Network), uses a clickable map to publish an extensive list of training programs operated by NGOs, international organizations, foundations, and private training centers to train journalists in more than 150 countries around the world.

Methodology

The WJEC Census project has been designed in three phases with three parts to each phase. The first phase was designed to develop preliminary results that could be reported at the World Journalism Education Congress meeting in Singapore in June of 2007. This phase had to be conducted in about six months. This first phase developed a list of programs, conducted a pilot study of the programs identified at that point, and asked experts in different regions of the world to assess the quality of the list of programs identified.

The list was drawn from three sources:

1. Published lists and academic articles about journalism education in different regions of the world;
2. Lists of programs provided by the regional association partners drawing on their member lists, conference registrations, and regional studies of journalism education; and
3. Published articles by individual scholars writing about different regions of the world and by keyword searches conducted by team members of online Web sources, including individual program Web sites.

The second phase will be conducted during the second year of the project. It will consist of an expansion of the initial list of programs; an attempt to conduct a more comprehensive survey of all programs world wide through mailings, email contact, and telephone follow-up calls by the study team and by our regional partners; and an extensive review of the program list by a panel of experts from across the world.

The third phase of the study will be conducted in the third year of the project. It will consist of sorting programs into three lists based upon the program characteristics discovered in the world survey of programs. One list will be of higher education-affiliated programs. The second list will be of practitioner and privately operated education programs whose quality can be verified. The third list will be of programs that can be vouched for but whose quality cannot be verified. These lists will be further vetted and attempts will be made to learn as much as we can about each one. A more extensive survey of program characteristics also will be conducted.

At the end of that process, the three types of programs will be listed on the interactive Web site with their contact information so that students seeking information about programs in different regions of the world and communication scholars seeking to do additional studies will be able to access the information.

Preliminary Results

The first phase of the project is complete. Preliminary results of the study were presented to the World Journalism Education Congress meeting in June in Singapore. At that point 1,859 journalism education programs had been identified worldwide.

A pilot survey instrument designed to test ways of identifying the basic characteristics of the programs was sent to that preliminary list of programs. That initiative required surveys to be returned within eight weeks for results to be presented in Singapore. Because of the short turn-around time for that portion of the study, those returning the instrument were disproportionately from the United States and Europe. However, the study provided a good indication of the kinds of information the study can produce about journalism education around the world. (See **Table 2** for a list of the kinds of information sought in Phase 1). The instrument will be revised to include additional questions before it is sent out to the expanded list of programs in the second phase of the study in the spring of 2008. A more aggressive attempt to get data from all regions of the world will be made through joint mailings and telephone calls with our partner organizations in the second phase.

Table 2
Program Characteristics

Program Size
- # Full-time Students
- # Part Time Students
- # Full Time Faculty
- # Part Time Faculty
- # Other Staff

Level of Degree Offered
- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Doctoral
- Certificate
- Technical Degree

Curriculum Emphasis (from none to extensive)
- Practical
- Theory
- Equipment
- Other

Program Funding Sources (from none to extensive)
- Tuition
- Government
- Private Donor
- Supplemental Student Fees

Areas of Study (Top Ten Shown)
- Print
- Broadcast Journalism
- Law/Ethics
- General Journalism
- Media Theory
- General Mass Communication
- Digital Media Communication
- Public Relations Studies
- Photography
- Advertising Studies

International Cooperative Programs
- Student Exchange
- Faculty Exchange
- Study Abroad
- Other

Issues of Concern (Top Eight Shown)
- New Technology
- Funding
- Faculty and Student Issues
- Academic and Teaching Issues
- Media Practices
- Journalism Ethics
- Globalization Issues
- Government Regulation

By early fall, the number of programs identified in the early weeks of phase two had been expanded to 2,487 journalism education programs world-wide and that number was still growing. (See **Table 3** for a breakdown of the number of programs by region of the world). Updated lists of these programs and their contact information will be posted to the AEJMC Web site, where the complete list is available for review. The list is still expanding as the effort to identify new programs continues in the second phase of the study.

Table 3

Programs by Region

Region	Number	Percent
Africa	108	4.3%
Asia	691	27.8%
Europe	524	21.1%
Latin America	382	15.4%
Middle East	270	10.9%
North America	463	18.6%
Oceania	49	2.0%
Total	2,487	

Discussion

It has been widely reported that the numbers of journalism education programs is rapidly expanding around the world. The preliminary findings of this study seem to confirm those reports. The number of programs in China, India, Russia, and Brazil especially seem to be growing rapidly. Difficulties in assessing the quality of these programs make it urgent that a worldwide dialogue about the principles of journalism education and basic data about how journalism is being taught be undertaken.

This project began as part of the internationalization efforts of AEJMC and ASJMC and was embraced by journalism education associations across the globe as part of the World Journalism Congress initiative. It was expanded with support of the Knight Foundation as part of its efforts to improve the practice of journalism worldwide. This initiative already has demonstrated value of such an effort. The project will continue for the next two years. The results will be reported at the next meeting of what will now be called the World Journalism Education Council of major international journalism education associations planned in two to three years' time.

A number of challenges already have been revealed by the effort—challenges of how journalism education should be defined, challenges having to do with technology change and challenges of costs, reliable contact information, varying financial support. However, developing a basic database and census of journalism education should give educators and scholars an important tool in better understanding how journalism is taught and what can be done to improve journalism education throughout the world.

Charles Self, former dean of the Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Oklahoma and now director of its Institute for Research and Training, is AEJMC president and an ASJMC past president.

WJEC Syndicate Reports:

Eight Approaches to Improving Journalism Education World Wide

ROBYN S. GOODMAN, Alfred University

When AEJMC past president Joe Foote and his International Task Force (ITF) created the World Journalism Education Congress (WJEC) to jumpstart AEJMC's re-dedication to internationalization, Foote insisted that the WJEC needed to be as innovative and participant-friendly as possible. After all, the WJEC helped bring together, for the first time, nearly 500 journalism and mass communication administrators, educators and professionals from 44 countries – an unprecedented event with unprecedented opportunities for engaging one's international counterparts.

WJEC delegate Suellen Tapsall is Journalism Education Association (Australia & New Zealand) president and director of the Australian Institute of Management-University of Western Australia (AIM-UWA) Business School Alliance. She rose to the occasion by creating the WJEC's Syndicate Team Program was based on one of her alliance's training programs that help business executives inspire group ownership among participants in their projects.

Enthusiastic feedback from syndicate participants and active final-day audience members —about 40 percent of conference participants attended the WJEC's closing session, which featured the syndicate teams' final reports—suggests the syndicate program did indeed give WJEC attendees the hoped-for opportunity to become as engaged as possible in its mission: to establish and build alliances among journalism education associations and journalism educators worldwide to help improve journalism education across the globe.

More than 20 percent of the WJEC/AMIC[1] conference-goers participated in one of eight syndicate team discussions over a three-day period. The WJEC's some 28 delegates, representatives from AEJMC and AEJMC-like organizations worldwide, developed an initial list of possible syndicate discussion topics. However, syndicate team members themselves made the final decisions on what syndicate discussions would take place.

The finalized list of eight syndicate teams, representing eight different approaches to analyzing and improving journalism education worldwide, follow:

1. Adapting Journalism Education to a Digital Age
2. Implications for Journalism Education of Reporting in the Age of Terror
3. Journalism Education in a Socio-Cultural, Politically Diverse World
4. Journalism Education's Challenge in Supporting Multiple Voices in an era of Consolidation, Syndication, and Globalization
5. Journalism Research and Journalism as Research – the Production of
6. Journalism in Universities
7. The Status of Journalism Education in the Academy
8. The Role of Journalism Education in Changing the Media
9. The Ultimate Journalism Education – What does it look like?

Syndicate Team Results

Although all syndicate teams shared the same agenda — to discuss their collective experiences and offer suggestions on how to improve journalism education world wide—they all approached this collective agenda from a wide variety of angles. These different angles resulted in a palatable richness of results that would have otherwise been lost. Accordingly, in order to offer *Insights* readers an as-detailed-as-possible review of the syndicates' findings, they are summarized and individually presented below. [2]

I. Adapting Journalism Education to a Digital Age

Convener and syndicate report writer Carol Ames, California State University, Fullerton, and team members [3]

The digital age syndicate focused on how best to prepare students for journalistic futures in light of technological advances.

In the not-too-distant future, cub reporters may be given super smart phones—with all kinds of camera, video and audio recording capabilities—and told to cover stories on their own. Small teams may soon become a thing of the past. How can we best prepare students for such challenges?

According to this syndicate group, in the new digital age future journalists will need to be highly adaptable and media literate, technology savvy, and able to conduct complex searches via a wide variety of data bases. They will also need to be able to determine if a wide variety of web sites, including blogs, are credible. And they will need to crank out stories across multiple platforms and in varying formats.

How best to prepare future journalists:

1. Don't forget the basics—keep teaching reporting, writing, story-telling skills, media law, professional practices, ethics, etc.

2. Start teaching Web 2.0 or User-Generated Content (UGC). Most students are already familiar with this way of communicating since they have posted multi-media creations on YouTube, Facebook, etc.

3. Teach students how to determine if information on-line is accurate and, if so, how to attribute on-line sources properly.

4. Students in the digital age will need to become intellectual property, communication policy, and communication law savvy. They will need to understand issues such as licensing, cybersquatting, privacy, censorship (how to circumvent and monitor it), and propaganda (how to navigate spin).

Who will drive such changes?

Mostly teachers, via hallway discussions, trying to persuade their colleagues to update their courses. Such changes will most likely take place in a piece-meal fashion via:

1. Adding new layers to existing courses.
2. Special topic courses.
3. On-line supplements to regular courses and/or adding distance learning courses, in which a wide variety of technologies can be used/practiced on-line.

How can forward-thinking administrators help?

1. Encourage faculty to abandon conventional media silos.
2. Make new alliances with other on-campus disciplines, especially computer science (for technology and programming skills—more "journalist geeks" are needed), business and math (for information about media management and business models, for profit and not-for-profit, in public and private sectors).
3. Create and maintain partnerships with private and public sectors. We want future journalists running tomorrow's Google and Yahoo, having thrust themselves into the media content business. Otherwise, those without journalism educations will continue running such sites and making decisions regarding Internet censorship that affect us all.

II. Implications for Journalism Education of Reporting in the Age of Terror

Convener and syndicate report writer Jacqui Ewart, Griffith University, Australia, and team members[4]

This syndicate discussed the many shortcomings of reporting during the current "age of terror," and it offered many suggestions on what journalism educators should work on to improve future coverage. After providing a list of some 94 key issues, coverage problems, and possible solutions, it summarized the overall situation and made the following recommendations:

The overall situation:

1. "The 'war on terror' is permeating every aspect of journalism.
2. The social impact and high public value of this reporting highlights the need for ethical, responsible, and culturally sensitive reporting.
3. The coverage of the 'war on terror' has added to journalism's lack of public credibility. The failure of journalists to question and critique public policy and politicians adequately has further eroded our credibility as we're seen as conduits or funnels of the dominant, politically-driven message rather than as analyzers and providers of context, willing to challenge authority and dominant discourses. Journalism educators need to take a leadership role on this issue."[5]

Recommendations[6]:

To improve "age of terror" journalism, administrators need to understand and support educator and media efforts to improve such coverage.

Accordingly, they should understand what journalism teachers need to consider, help journalism educators and professional journalists overcome obstacles, and support research and the WJEC.

Journalism educators need to consider:

1. "A more expansive model which considers conflict reporting and peace journalism.
2. The impact of censorship and self-censorship in relation to the 'national interest.'
3. Issues of diversity, cultural, religion, and gender—recognition of capacity for inappropriate reporting on terrorism to inflame racial tensions.
4. Deconstructing and challenging journalists' culture and group think.
5. Provid[ing] a critical context for students that permeates both practical and theoretical aspects of courses.
6. Advocating publicly on issues, laws, restrictions, surrounding these issues where and when appropriate to highlight the universal right of free speech." [7]

Help journalism educators and professional journalists:

1. "Expose problems for reporting caused by acts of government.
2. Deal with business/economics of government responses to terrorism.
3. Develop a sophisticated understanding of wartime spin, government. and terrorists and their tactics and techniques.
4. Resist pressure for self/media/national/organizational censorship.
5. [Discuss] issues … [and better understand each other via] Web forums, Web sites, etc."[8]

Give extra support for research that focuses on:

1. Collaborative cross-nation research on [the media's impact on society] positive and negative.
2. Best/better practice identification in research.
3. Comparative studies.
4. Cross-cultural research and contexts.[9]

And help the WJEC:

"Establish a mechanism for the exchange of information and facilitation of discussion for and by journalism educators, academics, journalists, and students on better practice models, curriculum, sharing of resources, teaching approaches, research, and practices in these areas.

The WJEC and individual journalism educators [should] facilitate the broadening of research around these topics to include cross-cultural perspectives."[10]

III. Journalism Education in a Socio-cultural, Politically Diverse World

Convener Kathryn Bowd, University of South Australia; syndicate report writer Jaelea Skehan, Hunter Institute of Mental Health, Australia; and team members[11]

IV. Journalism Education's Challenge in Supporting Multiple Voices in an Era of Consolidation, Syndication and Globalization

Convener Melinda B. Robins, Emerson College; syndicate report writer Tsan-Kuo Chang, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities; and team members[12]

Two syndicate groups dealt with the big elephant in the room – the mainstream media's serious lack of minority voices. In an era of consolidation, syndication, and globalization in a diverse world, how can journalism educators help bring minority viewpoints to the table? These syndicate groups came up with the following possible solutions:

What can administrators do?

1. Embed diversity into your core curriculum.
   (For example, Northwestern's Medill School of Journalism is instituting a "new way of seeing" into its journalism curriculum—required courses in areas such as race, ethnicity, gender, and religion. This new addition to its curriculum will help its students cover journalism's "seventh W — a world view," according to Medill's curriculum committee.[13])
2. Help admissions with diversity initiatives, such as mentoring programs for under-represented groups and entry requirements promoting student diversity.
3. Support and encourage exchange programs for faculty and students.
4. Mandate diversity in your faculty.
5. Develop intra- and inter-collaboration to promote diversity.
6. Encourage on-line youth forums to foster international diversity, such as AMIC's Young Communicators Network.
7. Support faculty efforts to:
   a. Bring community individuals and groups into classrooms and vice versa.
   b. Help facilitate off-campus trips to keep students engaged with their surroundings and aware of the often-missing voices in coverage.
   For example, visits to NGOs, homeless shelters, and mental wards can be especially eye opening, as is

hearing stories from ordinary (unofficial) people versus those with titles.

c. Critically analyze in the classroom who and what is missing in news coverage.
Students need to understand for every voice heard, one is not heard and the implications of this fact.

d. Develop community outreach programs to foster understanding of diversity.
Help teachers bring news executives, editors, etc., to the classroom to talk about the frequent lack of diversity in the newsroom and its relationship to its bottom line.

e. Obtain a diverse range of publications and sources as teaching tools.

f. Ensure students are exposed to a diverse range of media.

g. Emphasize core values — such as equality, justice, and freedom—and explain how they are enriched by multiple voices.

h. Prepare students to deal with multi-platforms of information from the Internet and the impact of citizen journalism on the industry.

i. Explain that globalization does not mean homogenization—students need to be aware of and understand cultural similarities and differences.

V. Journalism Research and Journalism as Research – the Production of Journalism in Universities

Convener and syndicate report writer Penny O'Donnell, University of Technology, Australia, and team members[14]

Syndicate journalism-as-research members agreed that high quality journalism research is the key to raising our stature on college campuses worldwide. What is the state of journalism education research worldwide, and what concerted effort can we make to raise its stature? This syndicate examined these issues, and its summarized conclusions follow:

Journalism educators can improve this situation by:

1. Creating clearer criteria for judging "good" journalism research.
2. Dealing with doubts about the epistemology of journalism and reinforcing meta-theory that supports it.
3. Identifying common journalism methodologies. For example, journalism research consists of more than content analyses and surveys. More research should focus on international collaborations to both explore additional research methods and to help join journalism researchers worldwide into a truly unified field.
4. Clarifying definitional issues to help get more funding for journalism research.
5. Inspiring journalism teachers without doctoral degrees to conduct research.
   For example, motivate them to work on research that helps bridge the professional/academic divide.
6. Support research demonstrating relative findings for the news industry.
7. Help build stronger relationships between journalism educators and industry —make clear how journalism research can serve industry professionals.
8. Help find ways to publish in different languages so journalism research can be more readily shared worldwide.

The team also stated that national journalism education associations should set up a digest of research findings on their Websites that could be of interest to journalism professionals. The database should be annually updated and actively promoted to: "the news industry, professional journalists, and associated organizations (self-regulatory bodies, unions, media advocacy groups). [It should] be accessible via the association homepage and promoted widely to the target audience …Rather than create more work for national journalism education associations, journalism academics can be encouraged to self-report research projects and findings, thus making the exercise as much about sharing information and building new research networks as about increasing industry awareness of research."[15]

This syndicate concluded with an official statement defining journalism research:

"Journalism research is the original investigation of all types of journalistic practice in order to gain knowledge and understanding. This research includes:

- Research of direct relevance to the news media, journalism practitioners, citizen journalists, and the public in specific political, historical and cultural contexts.
- Scholarship that leads to new or substantially improved insights about journalism.
- Reflexive practice that uses existing knowledge in the experimental development of new or improved journalism practices.
- Exemplars of journalistic practice that demonstrate research values and use systematic methods to produce new insights.

Whilst it may be inter-disciplinary, journalism is an emerging field of study working to develop its intellectual infrastructure. Research outputs in journalism may use a variety of platforms including newspapers, broadcast, and online media. The peer reviewing process may include experienced practitioners as well as journalism academics."[16]

VI. The Status of Journalism Education in the Academy

Convener Trevor Cullen, Edith Cowan University, Australia; syndicate report writer Helen Sissons, AUT University, New Zealand; and team members.[17]

This syndicate group discussed the weaknesses and strengths of today's journalism education in the academy. It then suggested a plan of action to build journalism education's status at home and worldwide.

1. Weaknesses:
Journalism education tracks and/or programs, frequently housed in broader departments, often do not offer their own degrees. Accordingly, journalism education tends to be too interdisciplinary, which waters down scholarship. As a result, few outside journalism education circles have a sense of what exactly journalism education is, let alone how it can positively influence the field. After all, if anyone can be a journalist (bloggers, etc.), what is the need for journalism education?
Even bigger programs, which offer their own degrees, have their own problems getting their universities to understand the value of a journalism education. They are often too insular — they have trouble building necessary relationships with related fields.

2. Strengths:
Journalism education is important, relevant to society. It attracts an increasing number of students, and its emphasis on engaging students and creating critical thinkers helps create smart, well-rounded graduates. In other words, journalism students receive a high quality education.

3. Action Plan: How can journalism educators help build their status in the academy?

a. Conduct and support research examining why journalism education has a less than ideal status in the academy, and what can be done about it.
b. Help universities understand the value of journalism education – how it offers a quality education by sharpening students' minds and helping them build a wide variety of skills, including critical thinking, intelligent inquiry, and the ability to express complex ideas in a clear, straight-forward manner.
c. Help journalism faculty get involved in interdisciplinary research teams so researchers can experience first-hand the value of their contributions.
d. Redefine journalism research as "scholarship."
e. Build journalism education's stature via:
    - Making it more global.
    - Moving away from the idea of journalism as a craft.
    - Maintaining and building involvement with professional journalism education associations worldwide.
f. Promote your on-campus achievements to your academy, professional associations and industry (when appropriate).
g. Form more alliances with journalists and the industry. By helping raise the status of the industry, we can help raise our own status as educators.

VII. Role of Journalism Education in Changing the Media

Convener Roger Patching, Bond University, Australia; syndicate report writer Kayt Davies, Edith Cowan University, Australia; and team members[18]

This syndicate group discussed whether journalism education influences the media. All agreed that journalism education has a very limited impact on the media industry. Accordingly, they spent much of their time discussing why this is the case, and possible steps for rectifying this situation.

Relationship problems

The group agreed that journalism education's limited impact on the media is largely due to the uneasy relationship between the two. While many journalism educators view their industry counterparts as folks looking for technology savvy reporters dedicated to writing quicker (often less researched) copy, journalism educators see themselves as the keeper of the flame—producing future journalists who possess not only industry-based training, but also an understanding of how the media can, and should, serve society. After all, journalism education offers much more than an apprentice-style education in which future journalists learn to act like their mentors. Journalism educators try to instill in their future reporters an appreciation of high quality journalism, hoping to inspire them to become leaders in their own right.

Back to basics

Regardless of education and industry conflicts, both groups need to work together to raise each other's, and their collective, credibility and influence. For instance, journalism educators should be helping journalism students and existing journalists keep up with technological changes, while journalists need to get back to "questioning stated truths and preconceptions instead of trying to carve new truths in stone."[19]

In addition, both journalism educators and journalism professionals need to understand that journalism no longer acts as a gatekeeper, one-way communicator, of information—it's more of a facilitator of conversations among different subgroups. And journalism educators should take advantage of this evolution by persuading industry of the urgent need for both groups to figure things out together. For example, journalism programs should experiment with potential new technologies to help improve the media's reach. Many journalism programs have easy access to such technologies, and their students are eager to learn them, so it's a win-win situation.

When collaboration attempts fail

While many journalism educators worldwide say they would be thrilled to work with industry professionals, those who have tried often report many difficulties overcoming the academic-industry divide.

U.S. representatives in this group reported many academic-industry successes, but colleagues from most other countries reported frequent extreme difficulties getting industry into a collaborative state of mind.

Breaking through the academic-industry divide

But all syndicate members agreed that the academic-industry divide needs to be dismantled, and they agreed the following actions could help:

1. **Journalism education associations could:**
   a. Take practical steps to build bridges between universities, newsrooms, publishers, journalism industry associations, and unions.
   b. Advocate the kind of assistance journalism education can give to industry.
   c. Keep facilitating skill- and idea-sharing among educators.

2. **Journalism education institutions could:**
   a. Continue offering classes for current and future journalists.
   b. Acknowledge that courses need to be adaptable.
   c. Continue offering "up-skilling" opportunities from industry and one another.
   d. Provide educators and students with industry appropriate technology.
   e. Advocate embedding media literacy in all courses to increase future audience demand for higher quality journalism.

3. **Individual journalism academics could:**
   a. Continue teaching the next generation to improve present journalism standards and practices.
   b. Conduct research with classrooms as labs to explore potential new technology to aid the field.
   c. Talk to media industry professionals about our research, and find out what they want to know – how we can best help them meet their needs.
   d. Persuade the media that we are on the same team – ready and able to help them accomplish joint goals.
   e. Participate in the media as a commentator, and explain to the public why quality journalism matters.

VIII. The Ultimate Journalism Education – What does it look like?

Convener and syndicate report writer Kerry Green, University of South Australia, and team members [20]

Since all syndicate groups worked toward one ultimate goal—to do their part to improve journalism education world wide—it makes sense to end this review of syndicate findings by examining the challenges and possible solutions presented by the "ultimate journalism education" group.

Most "ultimate journalism education" syndicate members agreed that the purpose of journalism education is to serve students and the public by making the students the strongest candidates possible for journalism careers and instilling in them a strong desire to produce and transmit ethical, socially responsible journalism.

What type of journalism education could best achieve these goals? While most syndicate members concluded that a bachelor's degree and master's degree would be ideal, they all agreed that the form in which such education takes place does not matter as much as the end result: producing journalism graduates who are passionate about the media's social responsibility function.

The group stated that the ultimate journalism education should possess the following six elements:

1. Journalists as social researchers with analytical, critical thinking skills.
2. A focus on the needs of stakeholders – students, industry, and society – that helps students get jobs and improve society.
3. Inspiration – journalism education should excite and incite. Students should be passionate about the possibilities of journalism.
4. Journalism education needs to be put in context. Practice and theory need to be explained so all will understand journalism's extremely important role in society.
5. A social responsibility model.
6. Journalism education should be a mix of theory and practice. Core skills and an understanding of journalism's scholarly body of knowledge are essential. Journalism education should include instruction on reporting (news gathering—text, sound, image, interviewing), writing (telling stories – text, sound, image, news and features, analyzing, processing, transmitting), and ethics.

The group concluded that the ultimate journalism education should:

1. Provide students with real-world experience.
2. Concentrate on developing their critical and analytical skills.
3. Foster their sense of journalism ethics and social responsibility.
4. Teach them how to transform information into knowledge.
5. Develop journalism educators as much as graduates.

Conclusion

The WJEC's Syndicate Team Program certainly offered conference-goers unprecedented access to one another—top journalism and mass communication administrators, educators, and professionals from around the globe. Together they discussed many of the greatest challenges facing journalism education worldwide, and together they developed suggestions and recommendations for overcoming them. As hoped, many of these syndicate discussions, and recommendations for action, continue today on websites and blogs worldwide.

For more information on the syndicate groups and/or to review the actual syndicate reports, check out the WJEC website: http://www.amic-wjec.org (as of publication), or contact Robyn Goodman at: fgoodman@alfred.edu.

Robyn S. Goodman is a professor and director of Alfred University's Communication Studies Program. She is a founding WJEC organizing committee member, and she was the WJEC's program chair. *She wishes to thank Joe Foote, Suellen Tapsall and all syndicate team members for helping make the WJEC a truly valuable undertaking.*

Endnotes

1. AMIC, the non-profit Asian Media Information and Communication Centre, hosted the WJEC conference. Both groups held their conferences concurrently last summer in Singapore. When conference-goers registered for either conference, they were automatically registered for both. Accordingly, the total number of conference attendees was bundled together.

2. Since syndicate groups three and four produced reports with many common characteristics, their conclusions are combined in this article.

3. Digital age syndicate members included: Andi Stein, California State University, Fullerton; Melissa Wall, California State University, Northridge; Pam McCallister Johnson, Western Kentucky University; Rebecca MacKinnon, Hong Kong University; Octavio Islas Carmona, Campus Estado de Mexico; Ellen Hume, University of Massachusetts — Boston; Kathy Hilton, London College of Communication; John Hewett, City University, UK; Pascal Guenee, Institut Pratique de Journalisme, France; Alex Gerlis, BBC College of Journalism, Great Britain; Terry Field, Mount Royal College, Canada; Guy Berger, Rhodes University, South Africa; and M. Asiuzzamen, University of Liberal Arts, Bangladesh.

4. Age of terror syndicate members included: Julie Posetti, University of Canberra, Australia; Cait McMahon, executive director Dart Centre for Journalism and Trauma – Australasia; Eric Freedman, Michigan State University; Anju Chaudhary, Howard University; Yehiel (Hilik) Limor, Ariel College, Israel; Martin Hirst, AUT University, New Zealand; Wendy Bacon, University of Technology, Australia; and Sonia Ambrosio de Nelson, National University of Singapore.

5. *Implications for Journalism Education of Reporting in the Age of Terror*, unpublished syndicate report, pp. 3-5.

6. There was not enough room to fit all of this group's recommendations in this report.

7. *Implications for Journalism Education of Reporting in the Age of Terror*, unpublished syndicate report, p. 5.

8. Ibid., p. 5.

9. Ibid., p. 5.

10. Ibid., p. 5.

11. Diverse world syndicate members included: Evangelia Papoutsaki and Chandrika de Alwis, both of Unitec, New Zealand; Richard Shafer, University of North Dakota; Lorraine Branham, University of Texas at Austin; Shirely S. Carter, University of South Carolina; Lynette Sheridan Burns, University of Western Sydney, Australia; Chief Fassy Adetokunboh Yusuf, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria; Michael Cobden, University of Kings College, Canada.

12. Multiple voice syndicate members included: Philippe Perebinossoff, California State University, Fullerton; Takao Sumi, Japan; David Burns, Zayed University, UAE; Kattia Pierre, Costa Rica; Kim Kierans, University of King's College, Canada; B.K. Kuthiala, Kurukshetra University, India.

13. See Medill's Website at www.Medill.Northwestern.edu

Journalism research syndicate members included: Takeya Mizuno, Japan; Arnold S. de Beer, Stellenbosch University, South Africa; Jeanne du Toit, Rhodes University, South Africa; John Mukela, NSJ Centre Media Training Trust, Mozambique; Matthieu Lardeau, ESSEC Business School, France; Dana Rosengard, University of Oklahoma; Anne Cooper-

Chen, Ohio University; Rachel E. Khan, U.P. College of Mass Communication, Philippines; Chris Frost, Liverpool John Moores University, UK; Mick Temple, Staffordshire University, UK; Ian Richards, University of South Australia; Stephen Stockwell, Griffith University, Australia.

15. *Journalism Research and Journalism as Research – the Production of Journalism in Universities,* unpublished syndicate report, p. 2.

16. Ibid., p. 2.

17. Journalism in the academy syndicate members included: Will Norton Jr., University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Joe Foote, University of Oklahoma; Osman B. Gazzaz, UK; Judy Vanslyke Turk, Virginia Commonwealth University; Barbara Hines, Howard University; Lee B. Becker, University of Georgia; Dane S. Claussen, Point Park University; Lee Duffield, Queensland University of Technology, Australia; John Herbert, international journalism researcher, UK; Mira K. Desai, S.N.D.T. Women's University, India.

18. Changing the media syndicate members included: Buroshiva Dasgupta, Manipal Institute of Communication, India; Charles Self, University of Oklahoma; Hideo Takeichi, Otsuma Women's University, Japan; Heather Birks, Broadcast Education Association (BEA); Teresa Styles, North Carolina Agricultural & Technical University; William Slater, Texas Christian University; Peter Karstel, University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands.

19. *Role of Journalism Education in Changing the Media*, unpublished syndicate report, p. 2.

20. The ultimate journalism syndicate members included: Michael McManus, Divine Word University, Papua New Guinea; Allen W. Palmer, Brigham Young University; Eric Loo, University of Wollongong, New South Wales; Justin Gerard Victor, academic manager, Malaysia; Norma Green, Columbia College; Lona D. Cobb, Bennett College; Leonard Ray Teel, Georgia State University; John Cokley, University of Queensland, Australia; Susanne Shaw, University of Kansas and ACE-JMC; Ellen Hume, University of Massachusetts —Boston; Julio Cesar Mateus, Catholic University, Peru; Silvia Pellegrini, Catholic University, Chile.

Gaining Faculty Buy-in for Assessment

PAUL S. VOAKES, University of Colorado-Boulder,
and PAULA I. OTTO, Virginia Commonwealth University

*as*sess*ment (n) 1. The act of assessing; appraisal. 2. An amount assessed, as for taxation.* (American Heritage Dictionary) *3. An added burden brought on by administrators in educational settings.* (Faculty)

Assessment has clearly become one of the buzzwords in education – from the federal No Child Left Behind Act to our regional college and university accrediting bodies to our own schools' requirements. In 2004, assessment was added as the ninth standard of the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC). (See **Chart** from the ACEJMC Accreditation Guidelines). The standard is simple enough: "The unit regularly assesses student learning and uses results to improve curriculum and instruction." Creating the framework for assessment and gaining faculty buy-in is not so simple.

It's not easy to sell assessment to faculty. They often feel that it's an extra burden without reward. Below are six reasons why faculty resist assessment along with suggested strategies to help overcome that resistance.

1. Our program will be judged by how well our students do on some arbitrary measure of competence, *i.e.*, if the JMC students at a certain university to the north of us scored better, then suddenly our program is devalued, which is unfair.
Response: Make sure everyone understands that the results of the direct measures will be shared with only ourselves, for the purpose of improving our curriculum and instruction. It is essentially an internal tool, not an external litmus test.

2. Certain students will be singled out for public scrutiny, which is unfair and possibly an invasion of their privacy.
Make sure everyone understands that the results of these measures are to be expressed only in the aggregate. Once a sample has been collected for the assessment, the names are deleted. Even in the case of broadcast news where anonymity is impossible, the assessments are aggregated, and the unit of analysis in the research is the cohort, not the individual.

3. The results will point fingers at certain faculty members whose students did not fare well in the assessment.
The majority of the measurements of competencies will reflect on several courses in a given sequence or department. For example, technological attitudes and skills, or the ability to combine images with words, reflect instruction and learning over several semesters. However, if, for example, the competence is First Amendment knowledge and you are the only media law instructor in the unit, then you are being held accountable for your students' levels of learning. But again, the thrust here is improvement of curriculum and instruction, and if you feel a finger pointed at you, it is an internal finger (within the unit only), and you and your colleagues should indeed work together to improve the learning in that area.

From the ACEJMC Accreditation Guidelines:

9. Assessment of Learning Outcomes

The unit regularly assesses student learning and uses results to improve curriculum and instruction.

Indicators:

(a) The unit defines the goals for learning that students must achieve, including the "Professional Values and Competencies" of this Council. (See 2. Curriculum and Instruction .)
(b) The unit has a written assessment plan that uses multiple direct and indirect measures to assess student learning.
(c) The unit maintains contact with its alumni to assess their experiences in the professions and to gain feedback for improving curriculum and instruction.
(d) The unit includes members of journalism and mass communication professions in its assessment process.
(e) The unit collects and reports data from its assessment activities and uses the data to improve curriculum and instruction.

Evidence:

A written statement on competencies
A written assessment plan
Alumni newsletters, surveys, reunions and other activities
Records on information collected from multiple measures of assessment and on the application of this information to course development and improvement of teaching

For units requesting evaluation of a professional graduate program:
Outcomes appropriate to a professional graduate program could include: a professional project, thesis or comprehensive exam that demonstrates that graduate students have developed analytical and critical thinking abilities appropriate to the profession.

4. This is just another thing we're made to do for accreditation and is, therefore, make-work/busy-work.
Again, the accrediting council wants to see what you're using to assess your students and then how you're improving your curriculum and instruction after you digest the assessment. They're not interested in how well your students did according to any national standards of competence. They just want to see that you're making use of assessment right there in your building. And if you don't want to improve your school's curriculum and instruction, then shame on you!

Many universities are requiring their departments to do assessments to meet regional accrediting guidelines or state requirements. At VCU, the university requires all departments to report assessment through its WEAVE system:

- **W** – Write expected outcomes/objectives
- **E** – Establish criteria for success
- **A** – Assess performance against criteria
- **V** – View assessment results
- **E** – Effect improvements through actions

This is a good model for the process because it takes it full circle.

5. Assessment will require lots of extra work for each faculty member, with no corresponding extra compensation. I'm too busy already.
At Colorado, we've tried to devise measures that don't tie down the professor. Only one of our sequences has adopted a long-term portfolio scheme, because they believe the students (in advertising) need to work toward a "book" by the time they graduate. In the other sequences we involve master's and doctoral students, who appreciate the experience in this aspect of collegiate teaching, and we involve our professional advisory board, our adjunct instructors, and other local friends from the media professions. We spread the work around so that faculty members need only to administer the instrument if it's to be part of a class or just turn in the student work to our assessment committee. For example, sometimes we'll assess a set of student-reported feature stories, and we'll need copies of them before the instructor puts any red ink on the papers. So she has to be reminded to make a set of copies before she starts grading. That's not a lot to ask.

At VCU, we've created assessment grids for faculty to fill out at the end of each semester. Some faculty include those grids as part of their syllabus to let students see in a very visual way what the course expectations and objectives are. Tabulating and reporting the results is done administratively so the faculty's time commitment is minimal. But the bottom line is that assessment isn't easy. Acknowledge that and reward those who work on assessment in any way that you can—through a small stipend, a course reduction, or travel monies.

6. We already do assessment; it's called "faculty grading their students." Why do we need any more assessment than that?
This is a tough one, but basically the answer is: Assignment grades and course grades are predicated on your own unique set of variables, which may range from a deduction for handing it in late to a huge improvement with the second draft, to a deduction for poor class participation. Those are all justifiable factors in grading a student, but none of those relates directly to the demonstration of a certain competence.

The premise of assessment is not unlike the premise of the audit. You may say your bookkeeping is in order, but we'd like to have someone else come in, from time to time, to verify that your bookkeeping is in order. We'd like to invite others who know the field but who did NOT nurture these particular students in the classroom to verify that real learning has taken place.

Here's one overriding positive in assessment: This is a little research challenge that can actually be fun. Present each direct measure as a research project, but one that requires no lit review and no waiting for a peer review. We have a concept, expressed in the ACEJMC's Values and Competencies. The challenge to the faculty (as the assessment committee) is to operationalize the measurement of that concept. What does it mean to think ethically? How do you know independent thinking or statistical awareness when you see it? How do you measure a student's ability to do those things? The faculty start dreaming up operational plans.

We're all new at this, so there is no single best practice. There is lots of room for experimenting and coming up with the next best practice. We've found that there are always a few faculty who appreciate the need for assessment and embrace the process and the possibilities for improvement. Find and nurture those faculty, and you'll have taken the first step toward faculty buy-in.

Paula Otto is an associate professor of broadcast journalism and serves as the associate director of the Virginia Commonwealth University School of Mass Communications. She chaired the faculty committee that created the School's initial assessment plan and oversees the current assessment process. Paul Voakes is dean of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Colorado- Boulder.

Portfolios and Programmatic Assessment

WILLIAM G. CHRIST, Trinity University; PAM CREEDON, University of Iowa;
and MARIA MARRON, Central Michigan University

As the direct measure of student learning outcomes becomes a requirement for ACEJMC accreditation and other regional accrediting bodies, schools are scrambling to try to figure out which direct measures (e.g., tests, portfolios, capstone classes) make sense for their programs. Portfolios can be particularly appealing as many units already require their students to build professional portfolios as part of job application preparation. This article will explain portfolios, what is in them, their advantages and disadvantages, how they contribute to assessment (strengths and weaknesses), and how portfolios can be used for a direct measure of student learning outcomes. This general discussion includes examples of how portfolio assessment is used in three different programs. Clearly, one size does not fit all.

What is a portfolio?

Over the past 20 years, portfolios have been used in broad areas like teacher education, nursing, and counseling and in specific areas like English as a Second Language (ESL), modern language, English, history, and, of course, art. Portfolios are seen as a type of authentic performance assessment that can give a more complex and nuanced picture of student learning, programmatic success, and potential employability.

Though portfolios mean different things to people, for this article, portfolios will be defined as a file containing evidence of the evolution and development of student learning, which meets learning standards or showcases entry-level job skills and abilities.

Advantages and disadvantages of portfolio assessment

There are at least four advantages to using portfolios for individual and ultimately programmatic assessment: First, portfolios contain material (e.g., news stories, advertising and public relations campaigns, etc.) that reflect professional expectations and, therefore, are perceived as more authentic, more like real life, than tests and quizzes. The projects that are produced and enclosed are close to what students would be expected to do in their work life. Second, portfolios are dynamic and can show changes in learning over time. This allows students and teachers to monitor student and class improvement. Third, through their self-reflection on their work, students can become more aware of their own strengths, weaknesses and career development. Ultimately, students need to be independent workers not dependent on having teachers telling them what is right and wrong. Self-reflection is considered an important part of portfolio assessment. Fourth, portfolios can be used in a number of ways, including showing individual creativity. Through outside evaluations and faculty involvement, portfolios demonstrate whether programmatic objectives have been met. They can be used for both formative and summative evaluation of both students and programs.

There are at least five disadvantages of portfolio assessment. First, a great deal of work is required to explain them to students, teachers, and outside evaluators. Second, a great deal of time is required to read and comment on them if they are used for summative evaluation of programs. Third, authenticity can be a problem. But, if the work comes from various classes and is reviewed by faculty in those classes, then authenticity issues should not be a problem. Fourth, part-time instructors, including TAs, are not always kept in the loop about assessment and the important part they play in the total education of students. Fifth, portfolios are “difficult to standardize.” Also, it is “difficult to get consistent data over time and adequate coder reliability,” and “norms and cutting points are difficult to establish” (Alschuler, A. S., 1996, Internet). Standardization means, for example, that all journalism news students probably would have a news story in their portfolio so that when evaluators look at the portfolios there is a critical mass of stories to evaluate. Coder reliability means that evaluators should look for the same things when they evaluate. This usually is accomplished through the use of rubrics and training.

What is in portfolios?

Determining what should be in a portfolio starts with determining its purpose and audience.

Purpose. At two ends of a continuum, portfolios are used to document the process of student learning (this would be used as formative evaluation and might include rough drafts or papers/projects demonstrating learning over time) and/or showcase student outcomes (this would be used for summative evaluation and would include items associated with professional portfolios used for job interviews.)

Audience. Typically, the audience for a portfolio can be three-fold: the student, an adviser or teacher(s), and outside reviewers. When used as part of summative, programmatic assessment, the outside reviewers become a primary audience.

Contents. Portfolios contain evidence produced in classes (artifacts), materials produced outside the classroom (reproductions), reactions by teachers and others (attestations), and items prepared just for the portfolio, including self-evaluations (productions) (Barton and Collins, 1997). Specifically, portfolios that will be used for programmatic assessment might include: 1) a table of contents; 2) evidence of learning linked directly to key learning objectives or competencies (e.g., select papers and projects); 3) copies of rubrics used for self, teacher, and professional evaluation; 4) student self-reflections/evaluations of each piece of evidence and/or the whole "body of work" and how the student felt the work fulfilled the stated learning objectives.

Portfolio Approaches

More than 100 journalism and mass communication programs are accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, described on its Website as "the agency responsible for the evaluation of professional journalism and mass communications programs in colleges and universities" (ACEJMC Website, Sept. 24, 2007). Since 1945, the Council has established educational requirements and standards and implemented a process of voluntary program review by a team of professionals and academicians once every six years. Programs meeting the Council's standards are awarded accredited status. Program accreditation is voluntary and is based on a liberal education model. Unlike other accreditation programs that provide a minimum number of required hours in the discipline, the Council limits students to the number of semester hours in journalism and mass communication courses. For example, in a 124-semester credit hour degree program, students may take a maximum of 44 hours in JMC coursework and must take 80 hours outside of the major of which 65 hours must be in the liberal arts and sciences. The underlying premise is that students benefit from exposure to varying viewpoints and exposure to a breadth of coursework in the liberal arts (http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/GENINFO.SHTML#MSN).

Specific to the ACEJMC accreditation process is a set of standards, irrespective of a student's specialization. The ACEJMC Website states: "all graduates should be aware of certain core values and competencies and be able to:

1. understand and apply the principles and laws of freedom of speech and press, including the right to dissent, to monitor and criticize power, and to assemble and petition for redress of grievances;
2. demonstrate an understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communications;
3. demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications;
4. understand concepts and apply theories in the use and presentation of images and information;
5. demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness, and diversity;
6. think critically, creatively, and independently;
7. conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communications professions in which they work;
8. write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communications professions, audiences and purposes they serve;
9. critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style, and grammatical correctness;
10. apply basic numerical and statistical concepts; and
11. apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work."

Each accredited program has the task of defining how these standards will be met so that the program can retain accreditation. The University of Iowa School of Journalism and Mass Communication has developed specific ways to implement these standards and make students aware of the values, competencies, and skills. Iowa students in the beginning writing class learn of "The Iowa Dozen," which is a list of 12 values, competencies and proficiencies upon which each student will be assessed by a faculty member, a professional, and a personal response to a questionnaire placed in the portfolio. The Iowa Dozen is based specifically on accreditation requirements. Majors begin a Learning Portfolio in this initial writing course—and receive a T-shirt listing "The Iowa Dozen" on it (http://www.uiowa.edu/jmc/iowa-dozen.html). All faculty members either put the entire Iowa Dozen or a list relevant to their class content on their syllabi. It is at this point that students begin building a Learning Portfolio, which continues to be used throughout the curriculum.

(http://www.uiowa.edu/jmc/undergrad/portfolio.html).

In the Department of Journalism at Central Michigan University, one of the two ACEJMC-accredited programs in Michigan, the competencies and proficiencies used as part of assessment also are based specifically on accreditation requirements. Exit-level assessment is conducted via a senior essay and portfolio in JRN 500: Current Issues in Mass Communication, the unit's capstone course for students in all concentrations – news-editorial, advertising, public relations, and photojournalism.

Course learning objectives are clearly stated on each syllabus with the expectation that students can demonstrate a synthesis of their learning in the capstone JRN 500. In that course, used as direct evidence of assessment, students make oral presentations on professional issues, write a senior essay designed to present them with a real-world problem for which they will have to demonstrate their learning in all of the program's outcomes, which mirror those of ACEJMC, and compile a portfolio. Students must prepare a portfolio suitable for presentation as part of an application for a position in their field. The portfolio includes a cover letter, a resume with references, work samples, and their senior essay. The cover letter must be addressed to a real person and aimed at a real organization.

The Department of Communication at Trinity University, which has chosen not to be accredited by ACEJMC, uses portfolios as one of its indirect measures. When students declare a major, they meet with the chair of the department who explains that students are expected to keep key papers, projects, and tests from all the classes in the major in what is called a capstone file. These papers, etc., are identified on each class's syllabus as well. In the capstone class, students are asked to go back over their portfolio and reflect on their program (indirect measure) about what they felt worked and did not work based on their interests. It is also suggested that they use the portfolio to come up with ideas for their capstone project/paper.

Who evaluates the portfolio?

Research has shown that three or more raters are needed for acceptable levels of reliability in evaluations [Bowers, 2005; Johnson, McDaniel, and Willeke (2000)]. Ideally, portfolio evaluators should not be the faculty who taught the courses that provided evidence in the portfolio.

Whoever is chosen, the criteria, standards, or benchmarks for a successful project should be clear to everyone (i.e., teacher, student, and evaluator). Since the Learning Portfolio at Iowa is used during advising sessions with faculty, numerous faculty have the opportunity to evaluate the student's progress in various areas. Moreover, the Professional Advisory Board, which meets twice a year, spends several hours interviewing students and reviewing portfolios. Further, professional visitors also have several hours of portfolio review time set aside and students can bring assessment data from internship supervisors into the portfolio.

Although some programs have been successful involving alumni, advisory boards, guest visitors, and other professionals, this involves commitment on the part of the unit, and can be costly and time consuming. Program size is another factor in administering the process.

At CMU, the instructors teaching JRN 500 exclusively evaluated portfolios this past semester. Usually, the portfolios are evaluated internally and also externally, but budgetary limitations and inadequate planning for end-of-the-semester portfolio evaluation caused a hiatus in the outside evaluations. Further, the relative dearth of professionals in the Mount Pleasant, Mich., market available to evaluate the portfolios, and the already-extensive calls on those professionals—many of whom are CMU alumni—to participate in various departmental activities made it difficult to continue. In the recent past, one of the challenges the unit's assessment coordinator faced was to draft an instructional sheet for the external evaluators, outlining precisely what they needed to assess and what the criteria were as they evaluated the portfolios. The most notable observation from external evaluators was that the topic of the senior essay, part of the portfolio, be aligned specifically with the students' areas of concentration, i.e., that photojournalism students specifically address a photo-related topic, advertising students address an advertising-related topic, etc.

Where to start?

First, programs need to identify their learning outcomes based on their mission and the mission of their university. For those seeking accreditation, ACEJMC has indicated that "irrespective of their particular specialization, all graduates should be aware of certain core values and competencies and be able to" perform (through both understanding and demonstration) satisfactorily in 11 knowledge and skill areas (ACEJMC, 2004). Objectives can be developed from these competencies (see Christ, 2006).

Second, programs need to decide which of the objectives can be best assessed using portfolios. For example, Competency 4 ("understand concepts and apply theories in the use and presentation of images and information"), Competency 6 ("think critically, creatively, and independently"), Competency 7 ("conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communications professions in which they work"), Competency 8 ("write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communications professions, audiences, and purposes they serve"), Competency 9 ("critically evaluate their own work and that of others for accuracy and fairness, clarity, appropriate style, and grammatical correctness"), and Competency 11 (apply tools and technologies appropriate for the communications professions in which they work") might particularly lend themselves to portfolio assessment. Some would argue that all accreditation standards can be evaluated via the portfolio process if one works with various concepts that can provide appropriate data. In addition, some programs have discrete internship and assessment coordinators, who provide extremely valuable support for the faculty.

Third, programs need to decide what is successful attainment of the objective. This can be done with the development of rubrics. For ACEJMC accreditation, the rubrics outlined above are based on the requirement that students demonstrate awareness (knowledge), understanding (comprehension), and application. These rubrics should be clear and transparent to students, teachers, and outside evaluators.

Fourth, there should be agreement on what should be in the portfolio (How is it selected? Who does the selection? What does the evidence represent—formative and/or summative projects?). For programmatic assessment, it is important that each selection in the portfolio be linked to one or more objectives. For example, a news story, public service announcement, press release, television script and/or commercial might be included as evidence of the ACEJMC Competency 8 ("write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communications professions, audiences and purposes they serve"). The ability of units to decide for themselves what should be in the portfolio as evidence reflects the long-standing, underlying assumption of the ACEJMC accreditation process that units control their own programs.

Fifth, the evaluation team needs to be selected and enough time given for the actual evaluations. As mentioned earlier, one of the disadvantages of using the portfolio for programmatic assessment is the amount of time it takes to review each portfolio. Evaluation teams need to be "taught" what to expect in the portfolios and the time it will take.

However, the process does not need to culminate in graduation-linked exit assessment but could be an ongoing activity. At Iowa, for example, the evaluation process is ongoing and continual. Faculty, alumni, professionals, and students are involved throughout the education to ensure that changes in direction are considered and reviewed. The Internship and Assessment Coordinator receives the final portfolio and certifies that the student is authorized to graduate. Following the certification, students are asked to fill out a survey so some quantitative data can be gathered—to ensure concerns that the Learning Portfolios may not meet all ACEJMC required criteria are addressed.

As part of the Iowa portfolio process, students are asked to complete a survey to further assess learning of the ACEJMC objectives during their coursework. The Iowa portfolio process appears to be working well after three years, but the School graduates only about 180 undergraduates a year. It may not work for larger programs.

At CMU, in-class assessment of seniors' portfolios has been found to benefit graduating seniors as the professor provides rapid feedback. Portfolio assessment by external evaluators has been found primarily to benefit students in lower class ranks rather than the graduating seniors who do not receive assessment feedback.

Sixth, the results need to be usable in the feedback for the program. Donald (2006) indicated that when his programs used portfolios "faculty … can more easily evaluate the results of the courses that build on each other." He added that "identifying uniform weaknesses among graduating seniors prompts faculty to alter course content or create new curriculum or requirements" (p. 431).

As a requirement for ACEJMC accreditation, the direct measure of student learning has been in effect for less than two years. However, the use of portfolios for systematic programmatic assessment has been successfully used for at least two decades in other disciplines. And, whether a unit is ACEJMC-accredited or not, regional and national accrediting agencies are putting additional pressure on all colleges and universities to implement strategies for the direct measure of student learning. Portfolios can be one approach that helps the nearly 400 colleges and universities that offer some form of journalism and mass communication education.

William G. Christ is chair, Department of Communication, at Trinity University. Pam Creedon is director of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Iowa. Maria Marron is chair, Department of Journalism, at Central Michigan University.

References

Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. (2007). Retrieved August 30, 2007, from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std2.

Alschuler, A. S. (1996). The portfolio emperor has no clothes: He should stay naked. *Counselor Education &*

Supervision, *36*(2), 133-138.
Barton, J., & Collins, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Portfolio assessment: A handbook for educators*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
Bowers, S. P. (2005). The portfolio process: Questions for implementation and practice. *College Student Journal*, *39*(4), 754-758.
Christ, W. G. (Ed.). (2006). *Assessing media education: A resource handbook for educators and administrators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
Donald, R. (2006). Direct measures: Portfolios. In W. G. Christ (Ed.), *Assessing media education* (pp. 421-438). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
Johnson, R.., McDaniel, F., Willeke, M. J. (2000). Using portfolios in program evaluation: An investigation of interrater reliability. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *21*(1), 65-08.

Portfolio Assessment:
Shaping and Storing Your Efforts

STACEY IRWIN, Millersville University

One of the first things any group of faculty can do to enhance assessment is to build an authentic culture of assessment. One of the best conversation starters about cultivating an assessment culture comes from the Higher Learning Commission's[1] workbook *Assessment of Student Academic Achievement: Assessment Culture Matrix.*[2] This document articulates and provides measurement materials for the collective values of the variety of assessment stakeholders at a university and pinpoints resources and structures that ensure the best assessment program. Many higher education institutions have created faculty committees and university assessment offices, but the push toward continuous institutional improvement encourages the use of newer technologies to enhance data collection and assessment implementation.

Once all levels of a university embrace a culture of assessment, tools like infrastructure and resources for portfolio assessment plans can be more seriously considered.[3] The crux of the increasingly popular choice to assess student portfolios involves the systematic collection of student work and professor observations over time. Portfolios can consist of a wide variety of materials like writing samples, audio and video production samples, student self-reflections, and projects. The best portfolio efforts span years of a student's academic career, from the introductory class to encompassing direct and indirect measures like internships and capstone courses. The ability to collect and store and assess these materials can be made much easier if they are converted to a digital format called an electronic portfolio or a digital portfolio.

Storing and retrieving these portfolios and housing them on a server have become easier, more reliable, and less costly in recent years.[4] Today's technology allows audio and video materials to be saved on MP3s and a variety of other codec for easier storage and play. The process of using rubrics and rating sheets for assessment stays the same for digital portfolios, but the sheer volume of student work is stored in a centrally located place on a server faculty can access. Universities have been using a variety of these electronically stored portfolios for close to a decade, but the move to digitize on a large scale has been slow.

The lack of popularity may be due to a decreased culture of assessment. Fewer resources go to a program that seems to be working. But the benefits of assessing digital portfolios far outweighs the negative aspects. As an assessment program moves along the continuum to become mature in scope, digital portfolios become a good option for collecting a large number of learning materials over time. Digital portfolios do not need to be made public or accessible to students to be effective. But the process does require university technology departments and assessment offices to join to create digital containers that enhance the ease of assessment and decrease the extra paperwork and volume of material that needs to be stored for paperbound assessment efforts. A variety of e-portfolio vendors and open source systems are available, but some university IT departments create their own container spaces for storage and access.

One way to enhance assessment practices for an academic department and students is to join efforts to develop a digital portfolio. Students in fields associated with journalism and mass communication are encouraged to collect work for a portfolio. The collected materials could be saved at a centralized location for faculty to access for the next assessment cycle but could also be available for students to download, correct, and access for future employers. Many students have server space through their e-mail accounts. These spaces are often used to save academic papers and projects. If a portion of this space were partitioned and accessed by both students and faculty as a portfolio-saving space, several goals could be achieved at once. It seems to make sense that aligning student efforts and assessment efforts can go far to benefit the very foundation of assessment, to measure student learning over time. When university departments work together to foster a culture of assessment, resource allocation and collaboration lead to an idea that benefits the university, faculty, and students.

Stacey Irwin is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication and Theatre at Millersville University.

Endnotes

1. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is an independent corporation of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) in the North Central region of the United States including Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, New Mexico, South Dakota, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Their website is http://www.ncahigherlearningcommission.org/

2. This 2003 document is at www.ncahlc.org/download/AssessMatrix03.pdf

3. Middle State's Commission on Higher Education's 2007 2nd edition publication *Student Learning Assessment: Options and Resources* suggests a variety of questions for consideration when choosing to create assessment portfolios. The document is available at http://www.msche.org/publications_view.asp?idPublicationType=5&txtPublicationType=Guidelines+for+Institutional+Improvement

4. Ralph Donald, "Direct Measures: Portfolios," in William Christ's *Assessing Media Education: A Resource for Educators and Administrators*, (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum associates, 2005) 421-438.

Survey of Administrators

Confused? You're Not Alone!

THOMAS KUNKEL, University of Maryland, ASJMC President

Administrators in the media-related disciplines can be forgiven if they wear a look of perpetual confusion these days.

The media doomsayers have never been gloomier. Consider a piece by the media critic Michael Wolff in October's *Vanity Fair*. Wolff, who is intentionally provocative on his sunniest days, offered a prognosis for the traditional news industry that was so dim you could almost hear the funeral bell tolling.

"[I]n its various current forms, the news—as a habituating, slightly fetishistic, more or less entertaining experience that defines a broad common interest—is ending," he wrote, adding, "The view among newspeople is that this is a chronic condition: for 40 years there's been a falling off of the news audience, something on the order of 1 percent a year. Not good, but we in news can make it to retirement. In the last three years, however, that gradual decline has turned into a mudslide. It's suddenly almost 10 percent a year and growing. We won't make it."

But only days later I heard the savvy Susan Clark-Johnson, president of Gannett's newspaper division, holding forth at the Knight-Batten Awards for Innovations in Journalism, administered by J-Lab: The Institute for Interactive Journalism. Clark-Johnson is overseeing Gannett's full-court advance into multimedia, and she was considerably more upbeat about her industry's future.

"We are learning that one of the greatest opportunities for audience and revenue growth is with the development of digital lifestyle niches that incorporate social networking capability," she said, pointing out by way of example the "mom.com" sites first launched in Indianapolis and Cincinnati. She said Gannett now has produced 37 such sites that have brought in 5.6 million page views, over 300,000 unique users and $3 million in revenue.

She believes strongly that applying such micro-market focus to the core business is how Gannett and other traditional companies—admittedly by figuring out how to think *untraditionally*—can weather, and profit from, the digital transition.

But who's right? Who knows?

It's against this confusing, shifting backdrop that JMC administrators across the country are trying to adapt their curricula to a brave new media world. After all, we have a bottom-line stake in this, too: not profit, like our industry partners, but the responsibility to our students to prepare them adequately, come what may.

Both the perplexity and the activity were evident in results of a recent survey of ASJMC deans, directors, and department heads, one I conducted this spring in advance of becoming president of the organization.

I put together the survey because I wanted to get a stronger sense of who today's JMC leaders are as a cohort and to explore a bit the issues we are all confronting. Not least of these issues is the question of putting more multimedia into our curricula.

Indeed, more than 90 percent of the respondents indicated that they are "actively reviewing" their curricula with an eye toward doing more with new media and digital developments. And half the respondents indicated that their programs would be putting into place for the fall semester, now nearly ended, at least one new digital-related or multimedia course.

Some programs are creating entire multimedia sequences, others are building new and innovative digital-based courses, still others are inserting digital "modules" into traditional courses. And everyone clearly is wrestling with the question of what new skills—online design, videography, audio collection, working with "citizen journalists," to name just a few—should be required of students to prepare them for tomorrow's media environment, about which the only certainty is that it won't look like today's media environment.

For instance, almost half—48 percent—reported that they actively incorporate blogs into courses today, and 60 percent "require new-media skills of all students."

What is 'multimedia'?

When asked specifically to describe "multimedia," their responses were intriguingly broad.

A few examples:

- "Work done across different platforms and digital delivery systems that cannot adequately be described using older distinctions (newspaper, broadcast, magazine)."
- "Traditional media, social networking media, and online journalism."
- "The panorama of technologies and distribution platforms employed by communication functions (and the general public) to disseminate news and information."
- "We don't [talk about multimedia]. We talk about using digital tools for storytelling…. We encourage students to focus on the requirements of the story—not channels of distribution. The students get this—it is faculty who keep returning to old ways of dividing up the world. But that, too, is changing."
- "Whatever manufacturers convince state legislators it is. In our case, online versions of traditional message dissemination."

This multiplicity of ideas and approaches is reflected in the kinds of courses we are teaching, adapting, and inventing. Some the respondents volunteered: Podcasting; Digital Activism/Interactive Storytelling; New and Interactive Media; Online News Writing; Online Magazines; Gaming.

Of course, when administrators are not fiddling with the future, there are plenty of other pressures to occupy them.

Other headlines from the survey:

- We are spending much more time raising money—one-third or more of our working day, on average. Nearly 80 percent of respondents said fundraising pressures had "increased" or "increased significantly" in the past five years. Having said that, 57 percent also indicated that they value or enjoy that kind of work.
- We continue to wrestle with what should constitute scholarly or creative work and research, particularly where journalism faculty are concerned. Two-thirds reported that, for promotion and tenure purposes, their universities consider "substantive journalism" (e.g., journalistic books, major newspaper and magazine articles, documentary films, media criticism) the equal of traditional peer-reviewed journal research. However, though the digital world is providing more and more alternatives for professional and scholarly creativity, 73 percent reported their universities would hold faculty work published only online in less esteem than work published in traditional venues.
- We are under growing pressure to hire Ph.D. holders exclusively for faculty openings, despite the pressing need for more skills practitioners. Nearly 70 percent say their universities "always" or "almost always" expect them to fill a faculty position with someone holding a Ph.D. They add that, like fund-raising, that pressure too has risen markedly in the past five years.

But perhaps the most interesting, and certainly the most distressing, findings in the survey arise from the basic demographics of the respondents, as I have written about elsewhere.

What administrative diversity?

In a nutshell, JMC administrators are 90 percent white and almost two-thirds male.

The findings also show that our average age is 55, almost three-fourths (73.5 percent) hold doctoral degrees, and nearly half (48 percent) cite journalism as their area of experience or expertise.

I should say that it appears the responses tended to oversample the larger colleges and schools and thus under-represent smaller JMC programs, such as at HBCUs. That means a true nose-count likely would have reduced somewhat the percentage of whites and perhaps males, and it likely would have dropped a bit the percentage who come from journalism. But it's unlikely the percentages would have shifted dramatically.

The diversity discrepancies are especially concerning. That's for lots of self-evident reasons, but a major one is that about two-thirds of JMC heads are male at a time when about two-thirds of our students are female.

This puts a premium on ASJMC's ongoing efforts to cultivate more women and people of color for leadership positions, as well as improving diversity generally in hiring and recruiting processes at every institution.

(The online survey was distributed to 165 ASJMC administrators, and 89 responded. The survey was underwritten by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. The report can be found at www.journalism.umd.edu, under Latest News.)

Thomas Kunkel is dean of the University of Maryland's Philip Merrill College of Journalism and current ASJMC president.

Managing the Mass Communications Department:

Do Department Chairs Think They're Doing a Good Job?

ANDREA W. DILWORTH and DONNA LANDER, Jackson State University

Though the past decade has seen more changes in how news is gathered, produced, and distributed than in the last 40 years, some journalism programs have failed to keep up with the pace of the industry. Smillie labels the departments "cash cows" because one-third to one-fourth of America's college students take journalism courses, making the degree among the most sought after in the country. Nonetheless, the bulk of the roughly 500 university-based journalism and mass communications departments are the stepchildren of their institutions, Smillie asserts, because " . . . few journalism schools are central to the life of their own campuses."[1]

Challenges of the Chair

In an effort to determine a chair's responsibilities, Gmelch and Miskin formulated the administrator's four main roles: (a) faculty developer, (b) manager, (c) leader, and (d) scholar.[2]

One of the most stressful aspects of the chair's role is that of balancing responsibilities. As a faculty member, the job description is clear: teaching, research, and service. But as leader of the department, the chair's obligations are not as clearly defined. The transition is often replete with risks because of a dramatic, immediate change in work styles. According to Achterberg, there are 10 issues that present "stumbling blocks" in the transition: 1) working hours, 2) public accountability, 3) frequency of surprises, 4) pressure points, 5) multitasking, 6) working with staff, 7) reporting lines, 8) voice changes, 9) information management, and 10) strategic and pragmatic thinking.[3]

On-the-job training

A chair's loyalties are split among faculty members, deans, and students. The result presents immediate challenges because most learn what it means to be department chair on the job, through trial-and-error. The reality is that many of the 80,000 academic department chairs across the country lack any real leadership training, while nearly 80% of all administrative decisions at colleges and universities are made in the department.[4]

Academic leaders are therefore pushing for more organized training. Gmelch and Miskin declare: "The time of 'amateur administration' where professors temporarily step into the administrative role of department chair has lost its effectiveness. The call for leadership is real."[5]

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent journalism and mass communications chairpersons in the Southeast believe they are effective at leading their departments, thereby preparing future journalists and developing faculty.

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference between leadership practices of journalism/mass communications chairs in private and public universities/colleges?
2. Is there a difference between leadership practices of journalism/mass communications chairs who applied for the positions and those asked to serve?
3. Is there a difference between leadership practices of permanent and interim journalism/mass communications chairs?
4. Is there a difference between leadership practices of journalism/mass communications chairs serving as chair for the first time and those with prior experience?
5. Is there a difference in leadership practices of journalism/mass communications chairs related to the years of chair experience?
6. How effective do journalism/mass communications chairs believe they are at performing the five leadership practices?

Methodology

Participants

Forty-eight chairpersons of journalism and mass communications departments at four-year public and private colleges and universities in five southeastern states were invited to participate in the study. Of the 48 chairs, 33 participated in the study. The response rate was 69%.

Instrument

Kouzes and Posner developed *The Leadership Practices Inventory* –SELF as a survey tool for leaders to identify their practices and evaluate themselves. After analyzing thousands of personal-best cases from managers in both the private and public sectors, Kouzes and Posner identified The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership:

1. *Model the way*. Good leaders consistently lead by example.
2. *Inspire a shared vision.* The leader's passion compels others to want to follow suit.
3. *Challenge the process*. True leaders are zealous about experimenting.
4. *Enable others to act.* Effective leaders allow others to excel.
5. *Encourage the heart*. Good leaders show appreciation for the work of others, creating a celebratory atmosphere and team spirit.[6]

The LPI-SELF, a quantitative instrument, measures to what extent leaders engage in the five practices, which Kouzes and Posner assert are characteristic of all successful leaders. The LPI was developed "through a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research methods and studies." The authors, and other researchers, have conducted validation studies on the instrument for more than 15 years that have consistently confirmed its reliability and validity. The LPI has been widely applied on both the academic level and the practitioner level.

The tool consists of 30 behavioral statements, 6 for each of the 5 practices. The survey uses a 10-point Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from 1 (almost never) to 10 (almost always).

Demographic information was also requested including age, gender, source of institutional support, previous administrative experience, and years as a faculty member.

Data Collection & Analysis

Surveys were mailed during the fall semester of the 2006 academic year. The data were tabulated and entered into Kouzes and Posner's LPI Scoring Software. Data analysis included *t*-tests, One-way Anova, Pearson *r*, Univariate Analysis of Variance, Cronbach's Alpha, and descriptive statistics.

Results

The survey's response rate was 69%. Alabama had the highest return rate, with 90% of chairs responding, followed by Louisiana, 71%; Mississippi, 70%; and Georgia, 62%. The state with the lowest return rate, 50%, was Tennessee.

The majority of the participants, noted in **Table 1**, were employed by predominately white institutions, which were also overwhelmingly public and sectarian. The historically black institutions, in contrast, represent a more equal distribution of religious and sectarian. No such disparity existed in relation to the sources of institutional funding.

TABLE 1

Institutional Affiliation

Affiliation	N	P
Historically Black	11	33.3%
Religious	5	45.5%
Sectarian	6	54.5%
Public	7	63.6%
Private	4	36.4%
Historically White	22	66.7%
Religious	3	13.6%
Sectarian	9	86.4%
Public	16	72.7%
Private	6	27.3%

Table 2 (page 33) contains a profile of the participants. More than one-fourth were functioning as interim chairs, and fewer than one-third applied for the position. Nearly half the chairs had five years' experience or less, and most were serving as department head for the first time.

Effective Leadership Practices

The LPI scoring range is 0 to 60. Participants rated themselves highest in the practice *Enabling Others to Act*. The

TABLE 2

Participant Profile

Variable	*N*	*P*
Years Experience as Chair		
0 – 5 Years	16	48.5%
6 – 10 Years	9	27.3%
11 – 20 Years	5	15.1%
21 or more Years	3	9.1%
Position Status		
Interim	9	27.3%
Permanent	24	72.7%
Origin		
Applied for position	10	30%
Asked to serve by administration	23	70%
Previous Experience as Chair		
No	10	30.3%
Yes	23	69.7%
Years Experience as Practicing Journalist		
0 – 5	23	71.9%
6 – 10	2	6.2%
11 – 20	4	12.5%
21 or more Years	3	9.4%
Years Teaching Experience		
0 – 5	0	0 %
6 – 10	1	3%
11 – 20	15	45.5%
21 or more Years	17	51.5%
Doctorate Degree		
Yes	32	97%
No	1	3%
Gender		
Male	22	68.8%
Female	10	31.2%
Age		
Under 40	1	3%
40 – 49	7	21.2%
50 – 59	17	51.5%
60 or older	8	24.2%

mean for the group was 53. The practice *Encouraging the Heart* rated second highest, (*M* =51). *Modeling the Way* and *Inspiring a Shared Vision* were the two in which participants rated most closely, (*M* = 49 and 48, respectively). Chairs rated themselves lowest at *Challenging the Process*, (*M* = 46).

Comparison to published psychometric results

According to Kouzes and Posner's published results, which include the cumulative means for leaders to whom they have administered the LPI survey over 15 years, *Enabling*, (M = 48.7), is the strongest perceived leadership trait of those respondents. In this study, journalism/mass communication department chairs, who also scored themselves highest at *Enabling* (M=53), clearly believe themselves to be considerably more effective at the practice. In fact, these participants consistently report higher mean scores than the cumulative means of the Kouzes and Posner respondents on each leadership practice. The second highest trait reported in Kouzes and Posner's average mean is *Modeling,* (M = 47), compared to 49 for this survey's respondents. The published cumulative mean scores drop substantially for the next two practices, *Challenging* (M=43.9) and *Encouraging* (M=43.8), compared to mean scores of 46 and 51, respectively, for Southeastern journalism and mass communications chairs. *Inspiring*, M= 40.6, was the weakest perceived leadership trait based on the cumulative results, in contrast to a mean score of 48 for respondents to this survey.[7]

LPI Behaviors

Table 3 presents the five leadership practices and the 30 corresponding behavioral statements, six for each practice, that participants responded to on the LPI survey. The survey tool mailed to participants did not refer to the five practices, nor were the 30 behavioral statements grouped together so as not to skew the results.

TABLE 3

LPI-SELF Practices and Corresponding Survey Behavioral Statements

Leadership Practice	Survey Behavioral Statements
Model the Way	▪ I set a personal example of what I expect from others. ▪ I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on. ▪ I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make. ▪ I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance. ▪ I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization. ▪ I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.
Inspire a Shared Vision	▪ I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done. ▪ I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like. ▪ I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future. ▪ I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision. ▪ I paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish. ▪ I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.
Challenge the Process	▪ I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities. ▪ I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work. ▪ I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do. ▪ I ask "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected. ▪ I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects that we work on. ▪ I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.
Enable Others To Act	▪ I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with. ▪ I actively listen to diverse points of view. ▪ I treat others with dignity and respect. ▪ I support the decisions that people make on their own. ▪ I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work. ▪ I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.
Encourage The Heart	▪ I praise people for a job well done. ▪ I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities. ▪ I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects. ▪ I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values. ▪ I find ways to celebrate accomplishments. ▪ I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Comparison of Responses

The mean scores of the five leadership practices were compared based upon demographic variables using independent *t* tests. The results suggest, with a few exceptions, homogeneity among the chairs. There was, in general, a convergence of ideas among respondents, suggesting similar leadership practices, across demographic characteristics. A statistically significant difference was found in the following three areas.

Source of institutional funding. Department chairs at public institutions believe they are more effective at the Challenge practice (*M* = 47.7, *SD* = 6.43) than do their private institution counterparts (*M* = 42.9, *SD* = 4.79), (*p* = .043). The independent *t* test also showed that public institution chairs scored significantly higher in the Inspire practice (*M* = 50.09, *SD* = 6.74) than those at private institutions (*M* = 43.3, *SD* = 8.67), (*p* = .021).

Origin of appointment. Chairs who applied for the position believe they are more effective at Challenging the process (*M* = 50.1, *SD* = 4.89) than do chairs asked to serve (*M* = 44.56, *SD* = 6.21), (*p* = .012). They also had a stronger perception of their ability to inspire (*M* = 51.4, *SD* = 4.7) than their counterparts (*M* = 46.56, *SD* = 8.62), (*p* = .047).

Level of experience. Chairs with no prior experience believe they are more effective at Inspiring others (M = 52, *SD* = 4.8) than do chairs with previous administrative experience (*M* = 46.54, *SD* = 8.39), (*p* = .028).

Analysis of Other Demographic Variables

Years of chairs' experience. The one-way ANOVA determined that the number of years' experience did affect how chairs believe they lead in three practices.

Table 4 illustrates that the effect of years experience was statistically significant for the practice *Inspire*, F (4, 28) = 6.677, p= .001, moderate effect size, *h*2 = .488. Post hoc tests were attempted, but because of the number of cases, unsuccessful. However, a comparison of the individual means revealed that chairs with the least experience (0-5

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance for Years Experience as Chair

Source	*Df*	*F*	η^2	*P*
		Between Groups		
Encourage	4	1.088	.135	.381
Challenge	4	3.636	.342	.017*
Inspire	4	6.677	.488	.001**
Enable	4	2.940	.296	.038*
Model	4	2.480	.262	.067

**p* <.05 ***p* <.01

years) had the highest perception of their ability to inspire others (*M* = 52.19, *SD* = 6.058) than any other group, the most significant difference between those with the second least amount of experience (6-10 years) (*M* = 42.89, *SD* = 6.6039), *p*= .001. Conversely, the group of chairs with the most experience (21+ years) had the second highest mean score (*M* = 50, *SD* = 7.00) as it relates to what extent they believe they lead by inspiring others.

The effect of years' experience was also statistically significant for the *Challenge* practice F(4, 28) = 3.64, moderate effect size, *h*2 = .342. Again, post hoc tests were unsuccessful. However, further analysis revealed that the chairs with the least amount of experience (0-5 years) believed most strongly that they are effective at challenging others (*M* = 49.19, SD = 6.1884) than any other group, the most significant difference between those with 6-10 years experience (*M* = 42.33, SD = 4.0620), p= .006. As with the Inspire practice, chairs with the most experience (21+ years) were the group with the second highest score (*M* = 48.67, SD = 6.6583) as it relates to how effectively they believe they lead through challenging others.

Also, the effect of years' experience was statistically significant for the *Enable* practice F(4, 28) = 2.94, moderate effect size, *h*2 = .296. Additional analysis indicated that the veteran chairs (21+ years) believe most strongly that they are effective at enabling others (*M* = 57.33, *SD* = 1.5275) than any other group, the most significant difference between those with 11-15 years experience (*M* = 48.75, *SD* = 5.3774), *p*= .007. Chairs with the least amount of experience had the second highest perceptions of their ability to lead through enabling others.

Correlation Among Constructs. To further augment the contention that homogeneity exists among the department chairs' leadership behaviors, the Pearson r test was conducted, as shown in **Table 5** (page 34). The test confirmed that all five constructs are highly correlated at the .01 level. The intercorrelation range is .79 to .43. The strongest correlation exists between the *Inspire* and *Challenge* constructs, at .79. There is also moderate to high correlation, at .70, between the *Model* and *Encourage* constructs.

Validation

The final statistical test used was Cronbach's Alpha, which found the internal reliability of the study to be .8883, slighter stronger than, but consistent with, Kouzes and Posner's internal reliabilities on the LPI-SELF, which range from .75-.87 for the five practices.

Open-ended responses

When chairpersons were asked open-ended questions about job satisfaction, they shared common responses. Because chairs asked to take the job generally have lower perceptions of their leadership behaviors than those who apply for the

TABLE 5

Intercorrelations Between Leadership Behaviors

Behavior	1	2	3	4	5
		Participants (r = 33)			
(1) Encourage	-	.62	.65	.64	.70
(2) Challenge	.62	-	.79	.43	.63
(3) Inspire	.65	.79	-	.53	.67
(4) Enable	.64	.43	.52	-	.63
(5) Model	.70	.63	.67	.63	-

position, the two groups were compared again in relation to their open-ended responses. Chairs cited paperwork/reports as the aspect of the job they enjoy least, with 37.5% of chairs who applied for the job, and 32% of those who were asked to serve. Evaluating personnel was the factor listed as the second least enjoyable aspect of the job for those who were asked to serve (27%), followed by dealing with budget/finances (23%). Chairs who applied for the job, in contrast, tied with their responses for second least enjoyable aspect of the job, with 25% each citing bureaucracy and meetings.

When chairs were asked to name the aspect of the job they enjoy most, both groups again listed common responses: working with students, with 41% of chairs who were asked to serve, and 62.5% of chairs who applied for the job citing that response. As was the case earlier, similarities ended after the most frequent response. Chairs who were asked to serve named planning/development their second most enjoyable (27%), followed by helping faculty/others achieve their potential (22.5%). In contrast, chairs who applied listed achieving goals and working with others as their top choices. Three chairs stood alone in their choices, with one each writing that curriculum, challenge, and making budget decisions were what they enjoyed most about the job.

The last open-ended question asked, "What training should chairs receive before their first day on the job?" The responses mirror the frustrations of the job. The responses cited most, "Shadow previous/sitting chair," and "Budget, personnel issues," both garnered 19%. Others responses included "Orientation workshops," 13%, "Higher education/Leadership training," 10%, "Organizational communication training," 6%, "National chairs' workshops," 6%, "Mentoring," 3%, "Heading committees," 3%, "How to make skin thick," 3%, "Extensive," 3%, "Kindergarten management," 3%, and "Knowledge/competency in area," 3%.

Findings, Discussion, and Implications

According to the LPI-SELF survey results, chairpersons of journalism and mass communications departments in the five Southeastern states believe they are most successful at *Enabling Others to Act*. Chairs rated themselves second highest at *Encouraging the Heart*, followed by *Modeling the Way*, and *Inspiring a Shared Vision*. Chairs perceive themselves least effective at *Challenging the Process*.

Findings

Independent *t* tests indicated significant differences ($p<.05$) in the extent to which the source of institutional funding impacted chairs' perceived behavior within two leadership practices. Chairpersons at public institutions have considerably higher perceptions of their ability to *Challenge* and *Inspire* others, rating themselves, on average, twice as high on the behavioral statements as their private institution counterparts.

Similarly, independent *t* tests illuminated significant differences ($p<.05$) in the extent to which the origin of a chairperson's appointment affected perceived behavior within the practice. Chairpersons who applied for the position had a stronger perception of their ability to *Challenge* and *Inspire* others than did those who were asked by administrators to assume the role. Further, many of the chairs who were asked to serve indicated that they were interim in status, not permanent, suggesting that they had no desire to serve as leaders beyond the temporary appointment.

A final independent *t* test found significant differences in the extent to which level of prior experience impacted chairs' perceived behavior in one practice. Those who had no prior experience as chair have a significantly higher perception of their ability to *Inspire* than do chairs hired with previous experience. It is important to note that participants serving in their first chair role are not necessarily inexperienced chairs. One 'first-time' chair had served at the same university for more than 21 years; yet, because that participant had not served as department head anywhere else, the position qualified as the first chair role. In contrast, more than one chairperson with the least amount of experience (0-5 years) indicated they were not serving in their first chair position.

One-way ANOVAs indicated significant differences in the extent to which years of experience impacted perceived leadership behavior. Surprisingly, chairs with the least experience (0-5 years) perceived themselves to be more effective than did their more experienced counterparts in two practices: *Challenge* and *Inspire*. This finding is particularly compelling because though one would expect a higher level of confidence from a veteran leader, a chair with the least experience is perhaps most likely to believe the energy and drive that he or she brings to the job will motivate others to be more productive. It is possible, in contrast, that more experienced chairs have become frustrated with bureaucracy and/or apathetic colleagues to the extent that they do not believe they have the power to influence others to dream of the future and take risks.

Interestingly, the one-way ANOVA also found significant difference in the practice *Enable*. However, it is the veteran chairpersons (21+ years) who believed, by a high margin, that they were most effective at the practice. At this stage in their careers, those with more than 20 years experience are likely grooming their younger colleagues to lead the department into the future, as the *Enabling* practice relates to collaboration and strengthening others. Also, the veteran chairpersons certainly should understand the importance of shared governance and motivation through collaboration.

Open-ended questions on the demographic survey also yielded interesting themes. The most illuminating responses resulted from the question: "What training should chairs receive before their first day on the job?" That so many believe chairs should shadow the previous/sitting chair for as long as a semester indicates they were ill-prepared for the rigors of the job and trust they would have been better off with some guidance. The following responses also suggest additional challenges of the chair's duties: "how to make skin thick," "extensive," and "kindergarten management."

Implications and recommendations

The demographics indicate the majority of mass communications and journalism chairpersons do not apply for their jobs; instead, they are typically asked to assume the post by upper administration. Often the appointment is interim, until a permanent chair is hired. In some instances, the search for the replacement may span years, meaning the interim head must sacrifice his or her other pursuits, including research and teaching goals, while selflessly managing a department in transition. Meanwhile, the interim chair has had no training, nor, as is too often the case, desire to lead the department. These extended interim appointments present a problem when the chair in question does not wish to lead. The research overwhelmingly indicates that those asked to serve believe themselves to be less effective at leading than do those who applied for the jobs. However, if chairs who did not apply for their jobs were required to undergo extensive chair training both at the institution and at organized national workshops, they would likely develop a stronger desire and higher perception of their ability to lead.

Organized training for all department heads, interim and permanent, should be mandated by the institutions' governing boards and should include (a) shadowing existing chairs, (b) handling budget and personnel issues and (c) orientation workshops that cover in detail the expectations and requirements of the position, as well as training of 'how to' carry out such divergent responsibilities.

Inspire a Shared Vision and *Challenge the Process*, the two practices in which chairs, overall, were less confident in their leadership behaviors, also are recurring themes throughout the study's findings. Nearly every statistical test that found significance did so within the two practices. The rationale may be that chairs engage in behaviors indicative of the two practices less often because they assign a higher priority to behaviors in the other practices: *Model*, *Encourage* and *Enable*. The reality is that because chairpersons are so consumed with issues that require their immediate attention, there is little time to dedicate to taking risks and seeking out challenging opportunities.

That the chairs have such high perceptions of their abilities to *Enable Others to Act* is certainly advantageous to the departments they serve, since that practice relates directly to collaboration and shared governance, essential to the success of any education entity.

The chairs' strong perceptions of the extent to which they *Model the Way* and *Encourage the Heart* are also positively indicative of the relationships they share with those whom they lead. If chairs merely enable their faculty and staff to act, but do not encourage them through praise and rewards, their efforts would prove futile, and likely counterproductive. Similarly, it is essential that the chairs demonstrate through their own actions their expectations of others. Their responses suggest that their philosophies of leadership are clearly articulated and they follow through on promises to colleagues.

Topics for future research

Additional studies are needed that would allow faculty and students opportunities to provide their perceptions of chairs' leadership behaviors. The chairs' self-perceptions would then be compared to the observers' perceptions.

Future research should also allow for qualitative interviews of chairs and those whom they lead, giving the participants an opportunity to provide an explanation of their ratings, thereby creating a better understanding of how to improve behavior.

Andrea Wright Dilworth is instructor/coordinator of advisement in the Department of Mass Communications at Jackson State University. She has worked as a magazine and newspaper reporter, and continues to freelance. Donna Lander is an assistant professor in the Department of Education Leadership at Jackson State University who plans to retire in December after more than 40 years in education.

Endnotes

1. D. Smillie, "Journalists in the making," *World & I*, 2002, 64-70.
2. W.H. Gmelch and V.D. Miskin, *Leadership skills for department chairs* (Boston, MA: Anker Publishing, 2003).
3. C. Achterberg, "Look before you leap: transitions from faculty to administration," *Academic Leader*, 2004, 7.
4. W.H. Gmelch and V.D. Miskin, "Leadership skills for department chairs."
5. W.H. Gmelch and V.D. Miskin, "Leadership skills for department chairs."
6. J.M. Kouzes and B.Z. Posner, The Leadership Challenge (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993).
7. J.M. Kouzes and B.Z. Posner, "Development and Validation of the Leadership Practices Inventory," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1998, 483-496.