

ASJMC INSIGHTS

Spring 2009

INSIDE:

August 2008 Report

Gender, Race, Ethnicity & Diversity Assessment Committee

ASJMC Faculty Diversity

Study Identifies Journalism Career Success Traits

**Use of the Eleven Professional Values
and Competencies to Evaluate Interns:
A Case Study**

**Skills are Worthless Without a Greater Context:
Balancing Theory and Practice
Throughout the Curriculum**

From the Editor

**Issue Tries to Examine Topics
from Multiple Angles**

By James L. Stewart

ASJMC **INSIGHTS**

ASJMC Insights

Editor: James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University

Layout/design and production: Kyshia Brown

The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC)

234 Outlet Pointe Boulevard, Suite A

Columbia, SC 29210-5667

803/798-0271 (phone) • 803/772-3509 (fax)

ASJMC on the Web: www.asjmc.org

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

Copyright © 2009 by ASJMC

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including electronic, mechanical, photocopying, and recording, without the prior permission of the publisher. For information on getting permission for reprints and excerpts, or ordering additional copies, contact aejmchq@aol.com.

Submit queries and manuscripts to Dr. James L. Stewart, *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.

2008/09 ASJMC Executive Committee

President, *Judy VanSlyke Turk*, Virginia Commonwealth University • **President-elect**, *Maria Marron*, Central Michigan University • **Vice-President**, *Paul Parsons*, Elon University • **Past President**, *Thomas Kunkel*, St. Norbert College • **Publication Committee Chair/ Executive Committee Representative**, *Jean Folkerts*, University of North Carolina • **Executive Committee Representatives**, *Patsy Watkins*, University of Arkansas; *Patrick Sutherland*, Bethany College • **ACEJMC Representatives Chair**, *Tim Gleason*, University of Oregon • **AEJMC President**, *Barbara Hines*, Howard University • **BCCA Representative**, *Jannette Dates*, Howard University • **Executive Director**, *Jennifer McGill*, AEJMC/ASJMC

ASJMC **INSIGHTS** SPRING 2009

contents

- 5** From the Editor
ISSUE TRIES TO EXAMINE TOPICS FROM MULTIPLE ANGLES
By James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University
- 6** **AUGUST 2008 REPORT**
GREDA: Gender, Race, Ethnicity & Diversity Assessment Committee
- 11** **ASJMC FACULTY DIVERSITY**
By Lee B. Becker and Tudor Vlad, University of Georgia
- 16** **STUDY IDENTIFIES JOURNALISM CAREER SUCCESS TRAITS**
By Bruce L. Plopper, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
- 19** **USE OF THE ELEVEN PROFESSIONAL VALUES AND COMPETENCIES TO EVALUATE INTERNS: A CASE STUDY**
By Betsy B. Alderman & Lucas Milrod, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
- 25** **SKILLS ARE WORTHLESS WITHOUT A GREATER CONTEXT: BALANCING THEORY AND PRACTICE THROUGHOUT THE CURRICULUM**
By Jim Sernoe, Midwestern State University

From the Editor

ISSUE TRIES TO EXAMINE TOPICS FROM MULTIPLE ANGLES

By James L. Stewart

Nicholls State University

When I became *Insights* editor, I thought it important that each issue have one or two themes that could be examined through multiple articles. The idea was that these issues could be studied from different angles in an effort to get a better perspective on them.

After discussions with the ASJMC Publications Committee members, I decided that diversity, particularly among faculty, would be a theme for this issue. Clearly that has long been a matter of concern for mass communication programs. Yet as suggested by the Gender, Race, Ethnicity & Diversity Assessment Committee Report – supported by the data Lee Becker and Tudor Vlads present in their article – much remains to be done to improve faculty diversity.

This problem may become even thornier in the coming years as programs struggle to deal with difficulties created by a weak economy generally, coupled with gloomy forecasts for traditional forms of mass media.

In fact, the shifting economic landscape is planned as a central theme for the spring issue.

It is a time-honored cliché that academics operate from ivory towers.

Those of us operating from within these structures know that they are almost never made of such precious and permanent materials, nor do they often stand at elevations much higher than the surrounding landscape.

And, while the actual towers of the feudal age were protected by a network of moats and impressive stone walls, our protections from outside forces are usually quite porous.

The nation's economic travails are clearly having an impact on mass communication programs. Certainly they present challenges that cannot be ignored. However, they might also present opportunities.

Some article ideas under consideration for the spring issue are: the impact of economic strain on the academic accreditation process; the possibility that convergence media could change the nature of external support for mass communication programs; the question of whether graduate school enrollments might increase as professionals are driven out of the industry; the possibility that current Ph.D.s might delay retirement; and the possibility that programs might become more reliant on adjunct instructors.

I hope that *Insights* will be able to examine these and other topics from a variety of perspectives in that issue, for we are without doubt in a critical time in the evolution of journalism education.

AUGUST 2008 REPORT

GREDA: Gender, Race, Ethnicity & Diversity Assessment Committee

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The following committee report was approved by membership at the August convention in Chicago.

The AEJMC Diversity and Equity Award

Executive Summary

GREDA proposes the implementation of the AEJMC Equity and Diversity Award for academic units in journalism and mass communication that have made significant strides over the past 3 years to increase gender, racial, ethnic and cultural diversity and equity of their faculty.

- GREDA requests that AEJMC implement the AEJMC Equity and Diversity Award as described herein, with pilot year being 2008 – 2009.
- GREDA requests that winners of this award receive a plaque, as well as some suggested in-kind enhancements as part of award. We recommend that winners receive a) a free advertisement in the convention program, and b) free exhibit space at the convention.
- It is also suggested that a cash prize be included with award. During the pilot year of the award, GREDA requests AEJMC to provide \$500 to \$1,000 depending on budgetary considerations. In subsequent years (beginning 2009 – 2010), a fundraising mechanism will be set up in order to support the cash prize and reduce AEJMC's burden of funding.
- GREDA would like to request that a line be included on "AEJMC Member Application and Renewal" form for individuals to donate money to Award. Include under "Optional Contributions" along with other awards.
- GREDA requests that an Advisory Committee be developed in order to judge awards and provide ongoing assessment of award. We recommend that this committee comprise five members and include: one member of Commission on the Status of Minorities; one member of Commission on the Status of Women; and three members of PF&R. We recommend a staggered term system; thus, the initial Advisory Committee will have one person serve for one year, two people serve for two years, and two people serve for three years. Subsequently, each member of the advisory committee will serve a two-year term.
- We propose that groups represented on the Advisory Committee (e.g., Commission on the Status of Minorities, Commission on the Status of Women, and PF&R) recommend names of AEJMC members that can serve on subsequent advisory committees, as terms are completed for current committee members.
- The pilot year's advisory committee will include current GREDA members (in alphabetical order): Caryl Cooper, Kimberly Lauffer, Anita Fleming Rife, Michael Smith, and Federico Subervi.

**GREDA: Gender, Race, Ethnicity
& Diversity Assessment Committee**
ANNUAL REPORT submitted to AEJMC
August, 2008

2007 – 2008 GREDA Membership:

Linda Aldoory, University of Maryland
Cory Armstrong, University of Florida
Chris Burnett, California State University Long Beach
Caryl Cooper, University of Alabama
Kimberly Lauffer, Towson University
Teresa Mastin, Michigan State University
Hayg Oshagan, Wayne State University
Anita Fleming Rife, Grambling State University
Bey-Ling Sha, San Diego State University
Michael Smith, Campbell University
Federico Subervi, Texas State University-San Marcos

Introduction

This report summarizes the work completed by GREDA this past year. AEJMC President Charles Self requested that this year's GREDA Committee devise an implementation plan for the award program that was proposed by last year's committee. The implementation plan that was requested would reflect the values of diversity and equity espoused by AEJMC and ASJMC.

The award program proposed here will be one small, yet positive and important piece of the vision for diversity and equity put forth by Ramona R. Rush, Carol E. Oukrop, and Pamela J. Creedon in their book, *Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Education: A 30-year Update*, (published 2004 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates). Rush et al. conducted research over a 30-year time period that revealed gender and racial inequities in faculty recruitment, salaries, and retention in journalism and mass communication academic units. Rush et al. proposed several recommendations that would alleviate inequities found, and they asked AEJMC and ASJMC to establish various improvement initiatives.

One such initiative was for academic member units of AEJMC and ASJMC to be given "praise and reward" for efforts toward "sex and race equity" (p. 125). To that end, GREDA proposes this award program—one feasible action to help illuminate the productive efforts engaged in by academic units who work to increase diversity and equity among their faculty.

I. Award Characteristics

- The award honors an academic unit of journalism or mass

communication that has made significant strides over the past 3 years to increase the diversity and equity of its faculty.

- The award is AEJMC-wide that honors an academic unit rather than an individual.
- Nominations can be made by any AEJMC/ASJMC member, any faculty member of the nominated unit, or by the unit head of the nominated unit.
- Call for Nominations will be announced at annual convention and throughout the year in AEJMC publications and website.
- Deadline for nominations: February 15 each year
- GREDA requests that an Advisory Committee be developed in order to judge awards and provide ongoing assessment of award. We recommend that this committee comprise five members and include: one member of Commission on the Status of Minorities; one member of Commission on the Status of Women; and three members of PF&R. We recommend a staggered term system; thus, the initial Advisory Committee will have one person serve for one year, two people serve for two years, and two people serve for three years. Subsequently, each member of the advisory committee will serve a two-year term.
- We propose that groups represented on the Advisory Committee (e.g., Commission on the Status of Minorities, Commission on the Status of Women, and PF&R) recommend names of AEJMC members that can serve on subsequent advisory committees as terms are completed for current committee members.
- The advisory committee will be diverse in gender, race, and ethnicity in order to reflect the goals of the award it is honoring.
- The judging committee reserves the right not to present the award in any given year.
- Winners receive plaque/award, and GREDA suggests additional in-kind enhancements as part of award: a) a free advertisement in the convention program, and b) free exhibit space at the convention. It is also suggested that a cash prize be included with award. During the pilot year of the award, GREDA requests AEJMC to provide \$500 to \$1,000 depending on budgetary considerations. In subsequent years (beginning 2009 – 2010), a fundraising mechanism will be set up in order to support the cash prize and reduce AEJMC's burden of funding.

- Award funds past pilot year will be supported by funds raised by AEJMC members and any others willing to contribute. A fund will be set up to accept donations.
- Depending on number of nominations, it is feasible to have more than one award recipient or finalists. Award incentives will be distributed accordingly.
- Award winner(s) announced at annual convention as part of AEJMC business meeting, along with other AEJMC awards announced at that time. Winners will also be promoted in *AEJMC News*, in other AEJMC publications, and on website.

Pilot Year of Award: 2008-2009

The first year of the award will be its “pilot” year and will be assessed by the award’s advisory committee to see if award criteria are meaningful yet realistic, and to see if the application process is too cumbersome or too ambiguous. The pilot year’s advisory committee will include current GREDA members (in alphabetical order): Caryl Cooper, Kimberly Lauffer, Anita Fleming Rife, Michael Smith, and Federico Subervi.

II. Criteria for Award

In order to develop criteria for an award honoring diversity and equity, GREDA members wanted to first attempt some “shared understanding” about the concepts of diversity and equity. Acknowledging that no one definition can fit all notions of diversity and equity, GREDA members needed to come to some general consensus about these complex terms in order to move forward with feasible award criteria.

GREDA members researched and culled various definitions and examples of diversity and equity in higher education in order to form a wide base of criteria for this award (please see Bibliography of Resources for list of sources).

Defining Equity

- Ensuring fairness in hiring and retaining faculty from historically underrepresented groups in U.S. academia.
- Women and non-white faculty are proportionally represented within academic units when compared with their population numbers.
- Inclusion of groups of people historically subject to U.S. segregation and discrimination both by law and de facto.

Defining Diversity

- A broad representation of faculty from groups historically underrepresented in U.S. academia.
- Differences in perspective as a result of different race,

class, history, social, ability, gender and sexual orientation experience.

- Complexity of people, perspectives and beliefs in a global society.
- Racial, gender, sexual, cultural, and ethnic heterogeneity.

Tapia (2007) explained how *equity* within academic units of journalism and mass communication is a more challenging task than *diversifying* perspectives in academic units. While diversity may sometimes be achieved through the hiring of international faculty, for example, equity is achieved through other means:

Representation is both a tougher goal to meet than diversity, and a very different one... Correcting the underrepresentation of minority groups, then, has little to do with international programs. The presence of foreign scholars — even those who are black, brown, or Spanish-speaking — does little to solve the problem of our universities’ lack of success with Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and black youth from across the United States. Foreigners should not count when we are talking about underrepresentation of American groups.

Smith (2003) also helped GREDA members distinguish between relevant and what may be perceived as “superficial” measures of diversity:

Superficial initiative(s) are cosmetic actions that are ineffective in moving diversity from the margins to the core values of the institution. Cosmetic actions include events such as food fests, film festivals, Cinco de Mayo celebrations, and speakers for Black History month. Superficial initiatives also refer to symbolic actions that are intended to subdue diversity efforts rather than to deeply entrench diversity as part of the institution’s core values.

The James Irvine Foundation Campus Diversity Initiative Evaluation Project found that between 2000 and 2004, campuses that made the greatest gains in underrepresented minority core faculty had higher percentages of underrepresented minority students compared to other campuses and had greater racial/ethnic diversity among the faculty to start. Also, “factors such as institutional mission, size, wealth, and selectivity did not differentiate any of the groups” (Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, & Teraguchi, 2006, p. 8).

Four Criteria

Using the above definitions and research, GREDA devised

four areas to examine when considering diversity and equity. Progress toward diversity and equity will be awarded an academic unit that is making efforts in one or more of the following categories.

Hiring and Recruitment:

The academic unit illustrates recruiting and/or hiring qualified faculty from groups underrepresented in U.S. academia or from groups that reflect the communities that the unit serves. Examples of efforts toward recruiting and hiring might include equitable entry salaries and hiring packages, and diverse faculty representation on search committees.

Status of Current Faculty:

The academic unit illustrates equitable representation among current full-time and part-time faculty from groups underrepresented in U.S. academia or from groups that reflect the communities that the unit serves. Examples of equitable representation might include retention efforts, tenure and promotion time and rates, and faculty participation in diversity and equity activities.

Climate:

The academic unit illustrates a supportive climate for under-represented groups. The unit strives to be free of harassment and discrimination. Examples of a supportive climate might include attempts to accommodate those with disabilities, open and transparent communication with faculty, positive faculty perceptions of climate, quality of experience by faculty from underrepresented groups, and decreasing number of grievances.

Institutionally Embedded Support:

The academic unit provides formal support for diversity and equity initiatives. This support could be illustrated through developing mentorship activities, and supporting diverse graduate students—thus ensuring a pipeline for future diverse faculty. It may be helpful for some units to provide information about state legislation that has affected their diversity efforts (some states constrain universities'/colleges' efforts to be inclusive.)

III. Application Materials

1. Application to be submitted via email only.
2. Applications may be submitted by any faculty member of the nominated unit, head of the nominated unit, or any AEJMC member from outside the unit.
3. Materials required for application:

a) A cover letter or e-mailed text that includes contact person's name, phone numbers and e-mail address; title and address of nominated unit and institution; and name and title of unit's head.

b) A one-page attachment that describes the unit and that could include: numbers of faculty and students, degrees conferred, accreditation information, and proportion of gender, race, ethnicity, etc., among faculty and students.

c) An attached narrative, not to exceed 3 double-spaced pages, which describes the diversity and equity efforts of the academic unit. The narrative should include any goals, actions steps, and outcomes toward achieving a work environment that promotes diversity and equity.

d) A letter from the unit head acknowledging nomination and confirming diversity and equity efforts described.

e) Two (2) additional letters of support/recommendation.

4. Additional materials might include (but are not limited to): reference to specific institutional policies outlining diversity practices; documentation of other awards related to diversity and equity; documentation of empirical and/or anecdotal evidence of success; and/or written expressions of diverse climate.

5. Fundraising message to be included in application materials: If you would like to contribute to the award funds, please send a check made out to AEJMC with a designation for the AEJMC Diversity and Equity Award to: AEJMC, 234 Outlet Pointe Blvd., Suite A, Columbia, SC, 29210-5667.

Contact aejmcassistant@aol.com to obtain a copy of the Equity and Diversity Award call for nominations.

IV. Promotional Plan

- Ad in *AEJMC News*
- Fliers distributed at convention sessions and other gatherings.
- It is suggested that a line be included on "AEJMC Member Application and Renewal" form for individuals to donate money to The AEJMC Diversity and Equity Award. Include under "Optional Contributions" along with other awards.
- GREDA noticed that the AEJMC website has no link or

highlighted area for “AEJMC Awards.” Such a link could provide a comprehensive listing of all association-sponsored awards. This link would then include information about the AEJMC Award for Diversity and Equity.

- An article will run in *AEJMC News* about the importance

of the award and a call for funds (similar to “Help to Build the Covert Award Endowment” article in *AEJMC News*, Jan. 2008, p. 7).

- AEJMC Blog. Topics could include: Call for Nominations; commentary on importance of award; call for funds for award.

V. Bibliography of Resources

ASJMC Accrediting Standards: Standard 3 Diversity and Inclusiveness. Retrieved Nov. 7, 2007 from <http://www.aejmc.org>.

De Uriarte, M.L., Bodinger-de Uriarte, C., Benavides, J. L. (2003). *Diversity disconnects: From class room to news room*, Retrieved Nov. 7, 2007 from <http://journalism.utexas.edu/facstaff/deuriarte/index.htm>.

GREDA. (2007). Report to AEJMC Executive Committee.

Hon, L. C., Weigold, M., & Chance, S. (1999). The meaning of diversity among the professoriate. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 54(1), 51-68.

Hoover, E. (November 16, 2007). U. of Delaware abandons sessions on diversity. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(12), A1.

Jones Ross, F. G., Stroman, C. A., Callahan, L. F., Dates, J. L., Egwu, C., & Whitmore, E. (2007, Spring). Final report of a national study on diversity in journalism and mass communication education, Phase II. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 62(1), 10-26.

Moreno, J. F., Smith, D. G., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. H. (2006, April). *The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education*. Research brief from The James Irvine Foundation Campus Initiative Evaluation Project. Retrieved January 20, 2008 from: http://www.cgu.edu/PDFFiles/insight_Revolving_Door.pdf

Penn State University. (December, 2006). College of Communication's Framework to Foster Diversity 2004-2009, Mid-Point Progress Update.

Smith, D. G. (2003) Campus Diversity Initiative Evaluation Project, Impact Study Design. James Irvine Foundation.

Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 133-160.

Subervi, F., & Cantrell, T. (2007, Spring). Assessing efforts and policies related to the recruitment and retention of minority faculty at accredited and non-accredited JMC programs. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 62(1).

Tapia, R. A. (2007). True Diversity Doesn't Come From Abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(5), B34.

ASJMC FACULTY DIVERSITY

By Lee B. Becker and Tudor Vlad

University of Georgia

One of the biggest issues higher education generally and journalism and mass communication education specifically have faced is diversification of the faculty. For a whole host of reasons—including outright discrimination, slow turnover of the labor force, an inadequately diverse supply line, and recruitment and promotion procedures that are subtly biased—the professorate has remained largely white and male while the student body has shifted to female and has become racially and ethnically more diverse. The result is that the people at the front of the classroom often look rather different than the other people in the classroom. In journalism and mass communication education, which is even more attractive to female students than many other areas of study in the university, the classroom mismatch has been rather dramatic.

Over the years, we have raised questions about faculty diversification through a number of projects and reports from the *Annual Surveys of Journalism & Mass Communication*, which we direct in the Cox International Center at the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication. Included have been reports on changes in the composition of the faculty in journalism and mass communication across time (Becker, Punathambekar & Huh, 2001; Becker, Huh, Vlad & Mace, 2003), on schools that have been successful in diversifying their faculties (Becker, Punathambekar & Huh, 2001), reports on the gender, race and ethnicity of graduates of communication doctoral programs (Vogel, Wilcox, Hanisak, Becker & Vlad, 2008), and reports on the nature of the students (Becker, Vlad & McLean, 2006) in journalism and mass communication programs. We even created and pilot tested a DVD that could be used to recruit African-American students to doctoral programs (Becker, Vlad, Coffey, & Hennink-Kaminski, 2004).

What we have not done—until this report—is look at data that we have been gathering each year since 1999 as part of the ASJMC Faculty Salary Survey to examine issues of faculty diversification. ASJMC schools are a subset of the larger population of journalism and mass communication programs around the country, but they are an important subset worthy of study in their own right.

ASJMC Faculty Salary Survey

Most of the readers know the background of the ASJMC Faculty Salary Survey, since it is a member service of ASJMC. New members or other readers of this article may not, so we will provide some detail. We gather the responses to the survey, link them to data from the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*, and produce a report on salaries for ASJMC members. The ASJMC central office distributed this report early in 2008.

The survey has a long history. We assumed responsibility for the survey only in 1999, and we have data from the surveys for the eight years from 1999-2000 through 2006-2007.

The methodology has been consistent since 1999. The population is defined as the paid-up U.S. members of ASJMC, as of the autumn of each year. The design is survey census, meaning that the goal is to obtain data from all members. We contact administrators of ASJMC programs via the U.S. postal service and email.

The survey instrument used in the survey consists of two forms. Form 1 asks for budget information for the ASJMC unit. Form 2 asks administrators to provide details of individual faculty salaries in spreadsheet format. Specifically, Form 2 asks ad-

ministrators to provide the following information for each individual full-time faculty member: annual salary, appointment period, salary increase (from the previous year), faculty rank, gender and race/ethnicity, as well as other characteristics.

In the autumn of each year, we mail these two forms to the administrators of the ASJMC units using names and addresses provided us by the ASJMC central office. In October 2007, for example, we mailed the salary survey instrument to the 184 domestic ASJMC members. We also provided the forms in electronic versions on our web site and informed the members of the URL. We sent follow-up mailings to nonresponding ASJMC members in December of 2007 and again in January and March of 2008. Some ASJMC members indicated during this process that they did not wish to provide data for the ASJMC survey, and we did not contact them further. We did recontact administrators of ASJMC programs that had returned forms in 2006-2007 but not in 2007-2008 via email after the fourth mailing in a final effort to obtain data from as many ASJMC members as possible.

A total of 102 program administrators returned both forms in 2007. Five administrators returned the form providing data on the budget of the unit (Form 1) but not the individual faculty data (Form 2), and four administrators returned the individual faculty salary data (Form 2) but not the unit budgetary information (Form 1). As a result, we were able to obtain unit budgetary data for 107 (58.2%) of the 184 ASJMC programs and data on the individual faculty salaries for 106 (57.6%) of the ASJMC programs. Four ASJMC members in 2006-2007 said explicitly they did not wish to provide data. The response rates have been nearly the same each of the last eight years. In 2006, for example, the return rates were 63.1% and 64.2%. A year earlier, the return rates were 61.6% and 62.2%.

We know there are certain biases in the data, based on analyses we have done of the responses. Of the 39 ASJMC administrators at universities classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Research Universities Very High Research Activity, 82.1% returned data on individual faculty salaries in 2006-2007. Of the 63 ASJMC administrators at Research Universities High Research Activity and Doctoral Universities, 63.5% provided such data. Of the 82 ASJMC members at Master's Colleges & Universities, Baccalaureate Colleges, 41.5% returned individual faculty salary data. Administrators of programs that were accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications were more likely to return the faculty salary reports (Form 2) than were ASJMC administrators from nonaccredited programs (78.1% vs. 35.2%). Adminis-

trators from public institutions were more likely than administrators from private institutions to return Form 2 (65.7% vs. 36.0%). The data available for analysis, in sum, come from a subset of ASJMC programs and are biased in favor of Research and Doctoral Universities, programs accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, and programs at public institutions.

Since these biases in the ASJMC responses are relatively consistent year-to-year, comparisons across years in terms of the characteristics of the faculty can be informative. At a minimum, these comparisons will tell us about any change in the faculties of journalism and mass communication programs that are members of ASJMC, weighted disproportionately in favor of accredited programs at public research and doctoral universities. If ASJMC members that are unaccredited, private, master's-degree-granting and liberal arts based are different from the respondents – and that is certainly possible –, then the conclusions do not reflect the overall ASJMC membership. It is probably the case that the biases will be more in terms of the levels of the variables, that is, the characteristics of the faculty, than in the nature of change taking place.

What we know

Our previous analysis of faculty characteristics has been based on data from the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*. From 1989 to 2001, the number of full-time faculty in journalism and mass communication programs across the country grew from 4,126 to 5,252, or an increase of 27.3%. This includes programs accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, programs that were ASJMC members but not accredited by ACEJMC, and non-accredited programs that were not ASJMC members.

In 1989, women made up 28.7% of the journalism and mass communication faculty. In 2001 they were 38.8%. In raw numbers, that was a growth from 1,184 full-time female faculty members in 1989 to 2,038 in 2001, or an increase of 72.1%. In 1989, members of racial and ethnic minorities were 10.9% of the faculty, and in 2001, they were 15.4%. In raw numbers, the growth was from 450 minority faculty in 1989 to 809 in 2001, or an increase of 79.8%. In both cases, the rate of change was impressive, but the base numbers were so small that the outcome still left the field disproportionately white and male in comparison with the population as a whole and the population of journalism and mass communication students.

All of these figures are projections, based on the data provided by the administrators of the programs and a replace-

Table 1. Gender of ASJMC Faculty by Year

Gender		Year								Total
		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	
Female	N	676	783	761	824	844	835	922	892	6,537
	%	34.8%	37.4%	38.6%	40.0%	38.6%	39.6%	40.3%	41.7%	38.9%
Male	N	1,268	1,313	1,211	1,234	1,344	1,273	1,368	1,245	10,256
	%	65.2%	62.6%	61.4%	60.0%	61.4%	60.4%	59.7%	58.3%	61.1%
Total	N	1,944	2,096	1,972	2,058	2,188	2,108	2,290	2,137	16,793
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ment technique that uses characteristics of the programs to estimate missing data. Specifically, data from accredited programs that reported data were used to estimate data from accredited programs that did not report. Similarly, data from reporting ASJMC programs that were not accredited were used to estimate data from nonreporting schools that were ASJMC programs and not accredited. And data from schools not accredited and not members of ASJMC were used for those similar programs that did not report. The process for doing these replacements is time-consuming. For this reason, we have not yet been able to analyze data we have from the enrollment surveys in 2004-2005 and 2007-2008.

What we can learn from the ASJMC salary survey data

The ASJMC Faculty Salary Survey data are easier to analyze, though, ideally, a replacement technique for the missing data also would be developed. For now, however, we'll have to rely on the data as reported, with a recognition of the biases

noted above in favor of accredited programs at public, research and doctoral institutions. In 1999-2000, 34.8% of the full-time faculty members for whom we have data from the Salary Survey were women, as Table 1 shows. That figure increased to 41.7% in 2006-2007. For the most part, change has been positive year-to-year, and the overall growth from 676 to 892 female faculty was 32.0%. In 2001, women made up 38.6% of the reporting ASJMC faculty, a figure remarkably similar to the 38.8% estimate of the percentage of women on journalism and mass communication faculties based on the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* for that year (Table 1. Gender of ASJMC Faculty by Year).

In 1999-2000, 14.7% of the ASJMC journalism and mass communication faculty were members of racial or ethnic minorities or non-U.S. citizens (Table 2. Race/Ethnicity of ASJMC Faculty by Year). By 2006-2007, that figure had increased to 18.9%. In terms of the actual count, that was growth of 4.3%. Growth has been roughly consistent year to

Table 2. Race/Ethnicity of ASJMC Faculty by Year

Race/Ethnicity		Year								Total
		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	
African-American not Hispanic	N	157	142	162	153	189	163	189	171	1,326
	%	8.4%	6.8%	8.4%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	8.3%	8.3%	8.0%
African-American Hispanic	N	6	9	8	45	2	4	7	8	89
	%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	2.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Hispanic not African-American	N	32	29	27	35	39	39	45	47	293
	%	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.7%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	2.3%	1.8%
Native American	N	12	14	16	13	13	13	15	16	112
	%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%
Asian American	N	33	51	39	41	52	54	65	65	400
	%	1.8%	2.5%	2.0%	2.0%	2.4%	2.6%	2.8%	3.2%	2.4%
Pacific Islander American	N	5	5	5	9	12	7	11	10	64
	%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%
White not Hispanic	N	1,594	1,787	1,636	1,684	1,812	1,754	1,883	1,663	13,813
	%	85.3%	86.1%	84.7%	83.6%	83.4%	83.6%	82.4%	81.1%	83.7%
Other	N	10	12	14	14	18	20	18	20	126
	%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
Not American Citizen	N	20	26	25	21	35	43	53	51	274
	%	1.1%	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%	1.6%	2.1%	2.3%	2.5%	1.7%
Total	N	1,869	2,075	1,932	2,015	2,172	2,097	2,286	2,051	16,497
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

year, and, in 2001-2002, the figure was 15.3%, or nearly identical to the 15.4% estimate from the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*.

In 1999-2000, ASJMC schools classified 157 of their faculty members as African-American, non-Hispanic. That number represented 8.4% of the faculty listed that year. In 2006-2007, ASJMC schools classified 171 of the listed faculty as African-American, non-Hispanic. That represented 8.3% of the faculty. The percentage has varied across the years, but overall only 8.0% of the faculty listed in the nine years have been African-Americans not of Hispanic ethnicity. Adding in a few African-Americans of Hispanic ethnicity does not change the picture. Only in one year – 2002-2003 – were more than 10 faculty so classified. That probably was an error on the part of the reporting schools, as fewer African-Americans of non-Hispanic origin were reported that year.

In fact, growth occurs by more than a single percentage point in only two of the racial/ethnic categories used to classify faculty in the ASJMC Faculty Hiring Survey across the eight years shown in Table 2: Asian-American, Not American Citizen. In 1999-2000, ASJMC programs classified 1.8% of their faculty as Asian-American, and that percentage was 3.2% in 2006-2007. In 1999-2000, the administrators classified 1.1% of their faculty members as Not American Citizens, and in 2006-2007, they classified 2.5% of the faculty in this way. In 1999-2000, the administrators classified 2.0% of the faculty as Hispanic, and that figure increased to 2.7% in 2006-2007.

Across the eight years for which we have data, female faculty members are considerably less likely to hold the rank of professor than are male faculty members (Table 3. Rank of ASJMC Faculty by Gender). Women are more likely to hold

Table 3. Rank of ASJMC Faculty by Gender

Faculty Rank		Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Professor	N	1,148	2,911	4,059
	%	17.6%	28.5%	24.3%
Associate Professor	N	1,926	3,017	4,943
	%	29.5%	29.6%	29.6%
Assistant Professor	N	1,994	2,490	4,484
	%	30.6%	24.4%	26.8%
Instructor	N	1,202	1,205	2,407
	%	18.4%	11.8%	14.4%
Administrator	N	248	576	824
	%	3.8%	5.6%	4.9%
Total	N	6,518	10,199	16,717
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

the rank of assistant professor and instructor than men. Movement across the eight years has been slight. Data not tabled here show that 14.4% of the female faculty members in 1999-2000 were at the professor rank, and that figure increased only to 16.0% for 2006-2007. The percentage of men who were classified as professor dropped from 32.2% in 1999-2000 to 26.5% in 2006-2007. Women also are less likely to be administrators than men.

Similarly, African-American faculty members not of Hispanic origin are less likely to hold the rank of professor than are faculty members who are white and not of Hispanic origin (Table 4. Rank of ASJMC Faculty by Race/Ethnicity). African-American faculty members are more likely to be at the assistant professor or instructor rank. The situation has not improved over time. In 1999-2000, 16.0% of the African-American, non-Hispanic faculty were at the rank of professor, and that figure was 14.1% in 2006-2007. African-Americans also are less likely to be administrators than white, non-Hispanics.

Table 4. Rank of ASJMC Faculty by Race/Ethnicity

Rank		Race/Ethnicity									Total
		African-American not Hispanic	African-American Hispanic	Hispanic not African-American	Native American	Asian American	Pacific Islander American	White not Hispanic	Other	Not American Citizen	
Professor	N	208	23	31	11	62	8	3,563	25	24	3,955
	%	15.8%	25.8%	10.8%	9.8%	15.5%	12.5%	25.9%	20.2%	8.8%	24.1%
Associate Professor	N	418	18	115	44	151	26	4,010	33	55	4,870
	%	31.7%	20.2%	39.9%	39.3%	37.8%	40.6%	29.2%	26.6%	20.1%	29.7%
Assistant Professor	N	429	31	103	33	134	20	3,483	37	153	4,423
	%	32.5%	34.8%	35.8%	29.5%	33.5%	31.3%	25.3%	29.8%	56.0%	26.9%
Instructor	N	217	15	37	20	33	10	1,981	14	32	2,359
	%	16.5%	16.9%	12.8%	17.9%	8.3%	15.6%	14.4%	11.3%	11.7%	14.4%
Administrator	N	46	2	2	4	20	0	716	15	9	814
	%	3.5%	2.2%	0.7%	3.6%	5.0%	0.0%	5.2%	12.1%	3.3%	5.0%
Total	N	1,318	89	288	112	400	64	13,753	124	273	16,421
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Conclusions

It is hard not to view the data from these analyses negatively. They show a field that is making only slow progress in terms of the gender and race/ethnicity diversification of its faculty. The analyses indicate that big differences remain between the characteristics of the people standing at the front of the classroom and those seated in the rest of the classroom. The front is overwhelmingly white and male; the rest is not.

In raw numbers, the figures are particularly striking. In 2006-2007, ASJMC schools reported that only 179 African-American faculty members, that only 55 were Hispanic, that only 16 were Native-American, that only 65 were Asian-Americans, and that only 10 Americans from the Pacific Islands were on their faculties. The ASJMC schools reported that out of 2,137 total faculty, only 892 were women.

The data are incomplete. Just fewer than six in 10 of the

ASJMC domestic members reported data on the characteristics of their faculties. For the most part, the larger programs reported, but a generous estimate would be to increase the raw numbers by two-thirds. In that case, the number of African-Americans would be about 300, the number of Hispanics would be about 90, the number of Native Americans would be about 25, the number of Asian-Americans would be about 110, and the number of Americans from the Pacific Islands would be about 15. Women would make up 1,640 of the 3,570 faculty members. These are rough estimates, and it is possible for us to develop a more complex weighting scheme given the data available to us from the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*. But even the rough numbers serve the purpose.

Diversity is not a strength of journalism and mass communication education if the characteristics of the faculty is the standard.

References

- Becker, L. B., Punathambekar, A., and Huh, J. (2001). *Evaluating the outcomes of diversification initiatives: stability and change in journalism and mass communication faculties 1989-1998*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Supplemental_Reports/SupplementalRpt_21.php
- Becker, L.B., Huh, J., Vlad, T., and Mace, N. (2003). *Monitoring change in journalism and mass communication faculties: 1989-2001*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Supplemental_Reports/Faculty_Diversification_Report_Update.pdf
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Coffey, A.J. and Hennink-Kaminski, H. (2004). *Evaluating "Making a Difference" video to increase minority doctoral enrollment*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Supplemental_Reports/EvaluationDVD.pdf
- Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., and McLean, J. D. (2006). Enrollments level off; online instruction now routine. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 62 (3), 263-288.
- Vogel, M., Wilcox, D., Hanisak, S., Becker, L.B., and Vlad, T. (2008). *Survey of doctoral programs in communication: Updated report for 2006-2007 graduates*. Retrieved September 5, 2008, from http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Doctoral_Survey/Doctoral_2007/Doctoral_Report_2007_merged.pdf

STUDY IDENTIFIES JOURNALISM CAREER SUCCESS TRAITS

By Bruce L. Plopper

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Through focus-group interviews with journalism students and through career inventory item testing processes with several subgroups, this research created a career inventory that identifies students likely to succeed as hard-news, print-media reporters. Ultimately, a set of 11 items that describe journalistic traits was found to differentiate journalism majors from non-majors, and to identify students with a high likelihood of success as professionals in the field.

What personal characteristics, values, and beliefs differentiate potentially successful, hard-news journalism students from students majoring in other fields, and can these traits be measured?

The purpose of this study was to create a career inventory that would 1) identify students very likely to succeed in a hard-news, print-media career and 2) screen out would-be journalism majors who do not exhibit traits necessary for success in this field.

Perhaps the best lists of qualities needed by successful journalists may be found in journalism textbooks and journalism career guides.¹ Collectively, authors of such publications have said reporters must be curious and have good observational powers; they must be thorough, methodical, and determined; they must pay attention to detail; they should be fair, knowledgeable, enterprising, courageous, and compassionate; and they need to read a lot to establish a base of knowledge and understand how to write.

Identifying desirable characteristics for journalists is one step toward matching students to journalism careers, but two more useful steps are to determine 1) what values and personality characteristics successful journalists actually possess, and 2) how one can predict a student's success in a media-related career.

Concerning values, several studies with roots in the 1970s attempted to describe those held most dear by journalists.² As a group, researchers first found that respondents rated public service – the chance to help people – as the most important aspect of the journalistic job. Over the next 20 years, surveys determined that respondents thought the two most important media roles were to investigate government claims and to get information to the public as quickly as possible.

Studies focusing solely on journalists' personality characteristics are almost nonexistent, but one researcher surveyed Australian journalists and compared their measures of introversion and neuroticism to similar measures obtained from members of the general public.³ Journalists were found to be significantly more extroverted than members of the public, but slightly (though not significantly) less neurotic than members of the general public.⁴

Regarding prediction of career success, during the past 80 years, psychologists and career counseling researchers have created numerous instruments to help people make wise career choices. A review of seven of the most well-known instruments' content and interpretative materials, however, shows they are mostly general in nature, regardless of whether they are aimed at identifying career interests, personality types, or job satisfaction.⁵ Not one attempts to tell a respondent if he or she would make a successful hard-news journalist.

Given that the literature showed there existed no way to predict, with a high degree of certainty, if students would be successful as hard-news, print-media reporters, creating a journalism-specific career inventory was the goal of this multi-phased research. Phase 1 involved face-to-face focus group gatherings with 39 hand-picked junior and senior journalism majors at nine universities in the author's home state. Groups were asked about the traits they possessed that would help them to be successful as hard-news journalists. Students most frequently mentioned their curiosity, work ethic, writing ability, joy of reading, and people skills; their high energy levels, determination, and idealism; their interest in communicating with and to others; and their willingness to accept criticism, admit mistakes, and accept bad schedules/low pay.

Using the results of these focus groups, a pilot career inventory consisting of 70 Likert-type items, scaled (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree, was constructed. Most items in the inventory reflected traits frequently mentioned by the focus group students, but some reflected peripheral traits mentioned by one or two focus-group students. The pilot inventory was distributed both to the 39 focus-group students and to a convenience sample of 58 juniors and seniors (who were not majors or minors in any form of mass communication) enrolled at the author's university.

An item-by-item comparison between the 23 usable journalism majors' responses and the 58 non-majors' responses was conducted. Results showed that significant mean differences existed between the two groups' responses to 11 of the 70 inventory items.

Based upon these results, and considering that this pilot study was conducted with small samples, a revised version of the instrument was created for Phase 2 of the research. This instrument included the 11 items answered differently by the two groups in the pilot study and 34 other items showing almost significantly different responses. It was administered online to a convenience sample of working journalists who were members of The Society of Professional Journalists, resulting in 171 usable responses completed by hard-news reporters.

Subsequent analysis of item ratings by these journalists and ratings of the same 45 items by the 23 student journalists (taken from their 70-item inventory) showed distinctively similar high scores for 11 items, with mean scores on those items ranging from 4.40 to 4.83. Both groups' ratings of these items were statistically identical. The professional journalists rated two other items highly enough to warrant their inclusion in Phase 3 of the research.

In that phase, a randomly ordered, 13-item version of the inventory was administered to a collection of hand-picked, successful news-editorial students from 19 colleges and universities nationwide and to a second convenience sample of students in specified non-mass communication majors and minors at the author's university. The non-majors were chosen to reflect a wide distribution on the World-of-Work Map[®] developed by ACT,⁶ with 9 of 10 career sectors requiring college being represented. Career placement on the map relates to an occupation's involvement with people, data, ideas, and things, with each map location emphasizing different involvement strengths for the four career descriptors.

With the assistance of colleagues across the country, 132 usable inventories were obtained from news-editorial journalism majors; 176 usable inventories were obtained from non-majors. Journalism majors' responses were analyzed and compared to responses obtained from both the working professionals and the non-majors.

When the responses of journalism majors and non-majors were compared on an item-by-item basis, journalism majors rated 11 of the 13 items significantly higher, with 10 of the 11 items yielding significance levels of $p < .001$; the 11th item's significance level was $p < .01$. The two items with no significant mean ratings difference were discarded in subsequent analyses of full-scale score data involving the following items:

1. I think it's important that the news media tell people about existing social problems.
2. I am curious about what goes on in my community.
3. I really like to read.
4. I ask a lot of questions.
5. I am picky about the words I use when I write.
6. I am able to construct written sentences that are easily read.
7. I like being the first to find out about what's going on.
8. I am curious about what goes on in the world.
9. I am good at using correct grammar.
10. I like communicating information to others.
11. I enjoy working with words.

The mean full-scale scores of journalism majors and non-majors for these items were 48.65 and 42.59, respectively ($t = 10.55$, $df = 306$, $p < .001$). The 171 hard-news professionals who rated these 11 items had a mean full-scale score of 50.17, which was not statistically different from the journalism majors' mean full-scale score. Also, a gender analysis of the full-scale scores showed that females scored slightly higher than did males (female $M = 49.15$, male $M = 47.95$; $t = 1.99$, $df = 130$, $p < .05$). Item-by-item and full-scale score analyses of journalism students' ratings by class (ju-

niors vs. seniors) showed no significant differences.

The final analyses concerned full-scale score relationships as related to World-of-Work Map[®] sector location. As there were sometimes few respondents classified in some of the World-of-Work sectors, the journalism majors vs. non-majors comparisons were limited to combined non-major sector samples at increasing distances from the journalism sector. Results showed an inverse relationship between full-scale scores and distance from the journalism sector. These were important findings because they showed the inventory was sensitive to the strength of different characteristics possessed by students in various majors. These relationships suggest that the inventory clearly differentiated journalism majors from non-majors.

From the standpoint of pure differentiation, the full-scale score comparisons were more important than individual item ratings. Combining the full-scale score data and the frequency distributions of full-scale scores generated by majors and non-majors, full-scale scores of 49 for males and 51 for females would be

good indicators of potential success as a hard-news journalist.

Regardless of a student's full-scale score, attention should be paid to some responses on individual items, as low scores on certain items could be important to a person's likelihood of success in the field. In fact, the two items with the best differentiation between journalism majors and non-majors were, "I enjoy working with words" (mean difference score of 1.28) and "I really like to read" (mean difference score of .85). Another caution is that in discussing journalism careers with students making high full-scale scores, advisers should mention characteristics not reflected in the inventory, such as determination, ability to accept criticism, tolerance for unenviable working conditions, and willingness to work for relatively low pay.

(This article was adapted from a paper presented at the 2007 Annual Meeting of AEJMC in Washington, D.C.; readers may obtain the *News Career Inventory Administration and Interpretation Package*[®] by e-mailing blpopper@ualr.edu, and this package may be used without charge.)

Endnotes

¹See Jennie Buckner, ed., *Why Choose Journalism?: A Guide to Determining Whether A Career in Newspapers is Right for You* (Reston, VA: American Society of Newspaper Editors, 2003), inside front cover; Carole Rich, *Writing and Reporting News* (Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2004), xxi; *The Journalist's Road to Success: A Career Guide* (Princeton, NJ: Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, Inc., 2005), 7-8; Jan J. Yopp and Beth A. Haller, *An Introduction to News Reporting* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2005), 17; Melvin Mencher, *News Reporting and Writing* (NY: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 2006), 22-26; and Brian Richardson, *The Process of Writing News: From Information to Story*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2007), 13-14.

²See John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski, and William W. Bowman, *The News People* (Urbana, IL: Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, 1976), 229; David Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), 114; and David Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 1990s* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996), 136.

³John Henningham, "The Journalist's Personality: An Exploratory Study," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 74 (Autumn 1997): 615-624.

⁴Henningham, "The Journalist's Personality: An Exploratory Study," 619.

⁵The seven instruments that were deconstructed as part of this research were the Strong Interest Inventory[®] (introduced in 1927), the Kudor Career Search[®] (introduced in 1939), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator[®] (introduced in 1942), the Holland Self-Directed Search[®] (introduced in 1970), the Career Maturity Inventory[®] (introduced in 1973), the Career Ability Placement Survey[®] (introduced in 1976), and ACT's DISCOVER[®] program (introduced in 1982).

⁶ACT, "World-of-Work Map," 1982, <<http://www.act.org/wwm/index.html>> (7 December 2005).

USE OF THE ELEVEN PROFESSIONAL VALUES AND COMPETENCIES TO EVALUATE INTERNS: A CASE STUDY

By Betsy B. Alderman & Lucas Milrod

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Since 2000, accredited schools have had ACEJMC's "Professional Values and Competencies" to assess academic programs. These principles identify professional core values and competencies that all graduates should "be aware of" and "be able to" do.¹

In 2003, Williams G. Christ wrote that the expectation of the accrediting council is that programs will demonstrate students are learning these values and competencies.² T.D. Erwin offered six characteristics for successful assessment programs. Among these is "other groups are involved in the process. The department goals and objectives were shared with and critiqued by ... and professional, non-academics."³ And Grady writes that internship programs give academic institutions the opportunity to assess how their students perform in an external professional setting.⁴

Graham and others asserted that internships provide a significant opportunity to assess what, if any, distance exists between the academic and professional arenas.⁵ Thus, it seems logical to have professionals to evaluate interns from accredited programs using the professional values and competencies.

The use of such evaluation data brings forth several research questions:

R1

How will supervisors in professional fields rate interns' work skills and personal work habits as compared to the interns' ability to meet the eleven professional values and competencies?

R2

Are there any differences in how interns are evaluated based on the type of work setting or gender?

Methodology

The data from final internship evaluations completed on 140 students from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga's accredited Communication Department were used in this study. The evaluations in the study cover four academic years and include interns working each term between fall 2004 and fall 2008. Students were enrolled in a required internship course and each completed 150 hours of documented professional experience. Supervisors evaluated interns on a form provided by the faculty internship director at the end of the internship.

The evaluation form includes eleven professional skills and personal work habits to rate the intern using a Likert-type scale of one to five, with five being the highest score. The categories are: accuracy, appearance, communication skills, creativity, dependability, initiative, interpersonal skills, pride in work, professional skills, self-confidence and speed. There is also a score for overall performance.

In addition, the form uses the eleven professional values and competencies that are evaluated using a Likert-type scale. Profes-

sionals rate the intern from one to five, with five being the highest. Professionals may also rate the intern in any categories with Not Applicable (NA).

Professionals also answer several open-ended questions on the final evaluation including:

- In your opinion, what is the promise for success in the communication professions for this intern?
- Hypothetically, if your firm had an opening for a person with the background, aptitude, attitude, and ability of this student, would you hire him or her? Why?

Professionals suggest a letter grade of A, B, C, D or F for the intern.

Results

Of the 140 student subjects in the database, 96 were female and 44 were male. The final grade of 113 students or 80.7 percent was an A, followed by 20 students (14 percent) who received a B. The other 7 students (5 percent) earned a final grade of C.

Categories of types of internships included: non-profit public relations (46.5 percent); profit public relations/marketing (12.1 percent); newspapers (5 percent); television news (4.3 percent); television production (12.9 percent); radio production (8.6 percent); advertising (1.4 percent); web production (1.4 percent); sales (5.7 percent); and magazines (2.1 percent). For the purpose of this study, the internship type was assigned based on the primary duties that the intern undertook during his/her internship.

Results from the first part of the evaluation show the mean scores on interns in the professional skills and work habits

ratings. See TABLE 1 listing these skills or habits and their mean ratings.

Mean scores with such little variance indicate a positive rating bias and a possible ceiling effect. That is, supervisors had a tendency to rate interns toward the more positive end of the scale. In addition, this could be an indication that the observed variables are multiple components of a single variable or a few variables.

Because of the small amount of variance in the means, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to test whether each professional skill/work habit is a unique factor or simply one of many components of a factor. This analysis yielded only two factors with Eigen values greater than one (Factor 1=5.898, Factor 2=1.080), indicating the existence of only two factors being evaluated rather than the discrete eleven factors. A closer examination shows that there is a measurement of internal qualities that includes dependability, initiative, pride in work, speed, and accuracy; and a measure of external qualities that includes creativity, appearance, self-confidence, communication skills, interpersonal skills, and professional skills. This means that although interns are being evaluated on eleven discrete professional skills/work habits, these are merely components of only two factors, the internal qualities and external qualities. In addition, these two factors are highly negatively correlated, $r=-.638$, indicating that a person with more internal type skills will have less external type skills.

The mean scores of interns on the professional skills and work habits as described above related closely with their mean scores on the eleven professional values and competencies. See TABLE 2 listing these values and competencies and their mean ratings.

While these scores also do not reflect much variance in mean and are highly correlated, they do more clearly show slight differences in students' abilities in some of the competency areas. For example, the mean for knowledge of the history and role is 3.99, while ability to apply tools and technologies has a mean of 4.49. Knowledge of the history and role was the one most frequently to be rated NA by the supervisors (44). Though there is no statistically significant difference in these means, within the context of the overall similarity of all means, these differences are informative. Also, the second-lowest mean on a competency, "Understands laws, regulations, issues of the work environment," had the third highest number of NA answers by supervisors (24).

To test whether each of the eleven professional value and competencies is a unique factor, or simply one of many com-

TABLE 1

Professional skills/work habits ratings	
With scores assigned using the scale: 5 = outstanding; 4 = very good; 3 = average; 2 = mediocre; 1 = poor.	
Categories	Mean score assigned by professionals
Accuracy	4.27
Appearance	4.51
Communication skills	4.33
Creativity	4.11
Dependability	4.51
Initiative	4.27
Interpersonal skills	4.34
Pride in work	4.50
Professional skills	4.30
Self-confidence	4.28
Speed	4.31

TABLE 2

Professional values and competencies as defined by ACEJMC	
With scores assigned using the scale: 5 = outstanding; 4 = very good; 3 = average; 2 = mediocre; 1 = poor; NA = Not applicable.	
Category	Mean score assigned by professionals
Understands laws, regulations, issues of the work environment	4.09
Has knowledge of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communication	3.99
Shows awareness of diversity in the workplace and in the creation of communication content	4.34
Understands theoretical concepts related to the presentation of images and information (such as composition of images, influence of message on audience)	4.32
Demonstrates the ability to work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity	4.53
Demonstrates the ability to think critically, creatively and independently	4.30
Demonstrates the ability to conduct research and evaluate information	4.37
Demonstrates the ability to write correctly and clearly in form and style appropriate for the audience	4.29
Demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate own work and that of others	4.16
Demonstrates the ability to apply basic numeric concepts	4.40
Demonstrates the ability to apply tools and technologies appropriate for the profession	4.49

ponents of a factor, exploratory factor analysis was conducted. This analysis clearly shows the existence of only one factor (eigenvalue=6.856). This indicates that the professional values and competencies are not measuring eleven distinct concepts, but are part of one overarching concept.

eleven professional skills/work habits and the eleven professional values and competencies. These analyses demonstrate a high level of correlation among all professional values and competencies. (See TABLE 3)

Two-tailed correlations were conducted, comparing all of the

(See TABLE 4) One of the most significant correlations among this data is between Gender and Appearance. Females

TABLE 3

Correlations among the Professional Skills and Work Habits and among the Professional Values and Competencies

		Depend	Create	Initia	Appear	Self Con	InterSk	Comm Sk	Pro Sk	Pride	Speed	Accura
Depend	Correlation	1	.393(**)	.556(**)	.430(**)	.333(**)	.361(**)	.438(**)	.536(**)	.512(**)	.411(**)	.441(**)
	Sig		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Create	Correlation	.393(**)	1	.620(**)	.420(**)	.542(**)	.531(**)	.538(**)	.421(**)	.575(**)	.416(**)	.434(**)
	Sig	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Initia	Correlation	.556(**)	.620(**)	1	.393(**)	.515(**)	.395(**)	.374(**)	.510(**)	.595(**)	.475(**)	.531(**)
	Sig	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Appear	Correlation	.430(**)	.420(**)	.393(**)	1	.549(**)	.551(**)	.490(**)	.462(**)	.446(**)	.419(**)	.398(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
SelfCon	Correlation	.333(**)	.542(**)	.515(**)	.549(**)	1	.636(**)	.546(**)	.474(**)	.458(**)	.334(**)	.381(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
InterSk	Correlation	.361(**)	.531(**)	.395(**)	.551(**)	.636(**)	1	.741(**)	.515(**)	.479(**)	.454(**)	.466(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
CommSk	Correlation	.438(**)	.538(**)	.374(**)	.490(**)	.546(**)	.741(**)	1	.553(**)	.515(**)	.437(**)	.501(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
ProSk	Correlation	.536(**)	.421(**)	.510(**)	.462(**)	.474(**)	.515(**)	.553(**)	1	.526(**)	.385(**)	.506(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
Pride	Correlation	.512(**)	.575(**)	.595(**)	.446(**)	.458(**)	.479(**)	.515(**)	.526(**)	1	.597(**)	.681(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Speed	Correlation	.411(**)	.416(**)	.475(**)	.419(**)	.334(**)	.454(**)	.437(**)	.385(**)	.597(**)	1	.679(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Accura	Correlation	.441(**)	.434(**)	.531(**)	.398(**)	.381(**)	.466(**)	.501(**)	.506(**)	.681(**)	.679(**)	1
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
LawsRegs	Correlation	.405(**)	.423(**)	.377(**)	.341(**)	.378(**)	.427(**)	.350(**)	.434(**)	.329(**)	.390(**)	.366(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
HistRole	Correlation	.382(**)	.589(**)	.311(**)	.483(**)	.508(**)	.626(**)	.518(**)	.415(**)	.344(**)	.412(**)	.402(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000
Diversity	Correlation	.352(**)	.556(**)	.351(**)	.504(**)	.478(**)	.588(**)	.641(**)	.363(**)	.461(**)	.499(**)	.498(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Images	Correlation	.483(**)	.636(**)	.403(**)	.582(**)	.531(**)	.601(**)	.550(**)	.485(**)	.456(**)	.450(**)	.468(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Ethics	Correlation	.431(**)	.525(**)	.451(**)	.472(**)	.366(**)	.488(**)	.585(**)	.447(**)	.506(**)	.429(**)	.466(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Think	Correlation	.521(**)	.641(**)	.590(**)	.418(**)	.436(**)	.478(**)	.523(**)	.409(**)	.534(**)	.544(**)	.519(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Research	Correlation	.388(**)	.491(**)	.412(**)	.376(**)	.290(**)	.406(**)	.475(**)	.343(**)	.460(**)	.483(**)	.524(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Write	Correlation	.370(**)	.482(**)	.450(**)	.417(**)	.461(**)	.465(**)	.497(**)	.553(**)	.514(**)	.467(**)	.466(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Evaluate	Correlation	.362(**)	.629(**)	.412(**)	.357(**)	.479(**)	.506(**)	.648(**)	.373(**)	.451(**)	.410(**)	.430(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Numeric	Correlation	.517(**)	.510(**)	.387(**)	.567(**)	.464(**)	.565(**)	.585(**)	.477(**)	.454(**)	.482(**)	.494(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Technol	Correlation	.459(**)	.579(**)	.470(**)	.480(**)	.452(**)	.508(**)	.455(**)	.391(**)	.479(**)	.596(**)	.506(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

TABLE 4

Correlations among the Professional Skills and Work Habits and among the Professional Values and Competencies

		Laws Regs	Hist Role	Diver sity	Images	Ethics	Think	Res earch	Write	Eval uate	Num eric	Tech nol
Depend	Correlation	.405(**)	.382(**)	.352(**)	.483(**)	.431(**)	.521(**)	.388(**)	.370(**)	.362(**)	.517(**)	.459(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Create	Correlation	.423(**)	.589(**)	.556(**)	.636(**)	.525(**)	.641(**)	.491(**)	.482(**)	.629(**)	.510(**)	.579(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Initia	Correlation	.377(**)	.311(**)	.351(**)	.403(**)	.451(**)	.590(**)	.412(**)	.450(**)	.412(**)	.387(**)	.470(**)
	Sig	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Appear	Correlation	.341(**)	.483(**)	.504(**)	.582(**)	.472(**)	.418(**)	.376(**)	.417(**)	.357(**)	.567(**)	.480(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
SelfCon	Correlation	.378(**)	.508(**)	.478(**)	.531(**)	.366(**)	.436(**)	.290(**)	.461(**)	.479(**)	.464(**)	.452(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
InterSk	Correlation	.427(**)	.626(**)	.588(**)	.601(**)	.488(**)	.478(**)	.406(**)	.465(**)	.506(**)	.565(**)	.508(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
CommSk	Correlation	.350(**)	.518(**)	.641(**)	.550(**)	.585(**)	.523(**)	.475(**)	.497(**)	.648(**)	.585(**)	.455(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
ProSk	Correlation	.434(**)	.415(**)	.363(**)	.485(**)	.447(**)	.409(**)	.343(**)	.553(**)	.373(**)	.477(**)	.391(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Pride	Correlation	.329(**)	.344(**)	.461(**)	.456(**)	.506(**)	.534(**)	.460(**)	.514(**)	.451(**)	.454(**)	.479(**)
	Sig	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Speed	Correlation	.390(**)	.412(**)	.499(**)	.450(**)	.429(**)	.544(**)	.483(**)	.467(**)	.410(**)	.482(**)	.596(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Accura	Correlation	.366(**)	.402(**)	.498(**)	.468(**)	.466(**)	.519(**)	.524(**)	.466(**)	.430(**)	.494(**)	.506(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
LawsRegs	Correlation	1	.641(**)	.462(**)	.537(**)	.514(**)	.434(**)	.403(**)	.555(**)	.460(**)	.433(**)	.454(**)
	Sig		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
HistRole	Correlation	.641(**)	1	.647(**)	.702(**)	.548(**)	.473(**)	.565(**)	.566(**)	.595(**)	.617(**)	.555(**)
	Sig	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Diversity	Correlation	.462(**)	.647(**)	1	.591(**)	.631(**)	.537(**)	.431(**)	.436(**)	.418(**)	.538(**)	.498(**)
	Sig	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Images	Correlation	.537(**)	.702(**)	.591(**)	1	.689(**)	.562(**)	.530(**)	.645(**)	.653(**)	.671(**)	.596(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Ethics	Correlation	.514(**)	.548(**)	.631(**)	.689(**)	1	.508(**)	.516(**)	.494(**)	.507(**)	.674(**)	.482(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Think	Correlation	.434(**)	.473(**)	.537(**)	.562(**)	.508(**)	1	.563(**)	.423(**)	.486(**)	.503(**)	.667(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Research	Correlation	.403(**)	.565(**)	.431(**)	.530(**)	.516(**)	.563(**)	1	.509(**)	.452(**)	.533(**)	.482(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
Write	Correlation	.555(**)	.566(**)	.436(**)	.645(**)	.494(**)	.423(**)	.509(**)	1	.559(**)	.517(**)	.484(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
Evaluate	Correlation	.460(**)	.595(**)	.418(**)	.653(**)	.507(**)	.486(**)	.452(**)	.559(**)	1	.545(**)	.395(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Numeric	Correlation	.433(**)	.617(**)	.538(**)	.671(**)	.674(**)	.503(**)	.533(**)	.517(**)	.545(**)	1	.566(**)
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Technol	Correlation	.454(**)	.555(**)	.498(**)	.596(**)	.482(**)	.667(**)	.482(**)	.484(**)	.395(**)	.566(**)	1
	Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

were more likely to be scored more highly in the “appearance” category than male student interns ($p < .05$). However, it is important to note that there was no significance in the relationship between gender and the final grade as suggested by the professional internship supervisor ($p = .653$). Also, the final grade was not significantly correlated with internship or any other extraneous variables. It was only correlated with the

professional skills/work habits such as communication skills and accuracy.

Discussion

The data demonstrate that the final internship evaluation form used in this study is a reliable measure of both the stu-

dents' professional skills and personal work habits and their ability to meet the criteria set forth in the eleven professional values and competencies. High correlations between the final grade and the 22 indicators, in addition to the absence of significant relationships between gender or other extraneous variable with grade, support this idea.

In addition, the high number of students receiving a letter grade of A (80 percent) at the end of the internship seems to support the fact that interns were also scored highly in the professional skills/personal work habits and in the professional values and competencies.

With such small variances in the means on all 22 variables, exploratory factor analysis is useful in indicating how many unique variables are actually being observed. The analysis shows that although internship supervisors rate students in eleven professional skills/work habits, there seems to be just two areas of evaluation, internal and external qualities. The same holds true for the eleven professional values and competencies; although interns are scored in eleven discrete areas, there seems to be just one overarching component being evaluated in this portion of the form.

Although exploratory factor analysis reveals these overarching

categories of evaluation, this does not imply the need to abandon all of the variables. What it does show is that the eleven professional skills/work habits are an extension of two over-arching concepts. And that the eleven professional values and competencies comprise one overarching concept.

Also, the answers of the open-ended questions were, for the most part, quite positive on the majority of interns. Many supervisors responded that they would hire this intern if there were an opening. And indeed many interns were either hired at the internship site, or they made connections from the internship that resulted in them getting hired in another place.

In addition, data show that although females were rated more highly on appearance than males, there was no relationship between gender and the final grade as suggested by the professional supervisor.

Other results could point to the conclusion that at least some internship supervisors do not see some of the professional values and competencies as separate variables, perhaps because they do not recognize how these values or competencies may be relevant in a particular field. And indeed in some fields, some of the individual professional values and competencies may not be as important as they are in others.

Endnotes

¹ Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications Committee on Standards and Assessment, "New Standards," 2002, 20 July 2003.

² Williams G. Christ, "We Cannot Not Teach," *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* (Autumn 2003): 222-7.

³ T.D. Erwin, *Assessing Student Learning and Development* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991).

⁴ D. A. Grady, "Indirect measures: Internships, careers, and competitions" in *Assessing Media Education: A resource handbook for educators and administrators*. Ed. William G. Christ (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum).

⁵ Beverley Graham, Pamela G. Bourland, Hal W. Fulmer, "Using the Internship as a Tool for Assessment: A Case Study" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the AEJMC, Washington, D.C, 1995).

SKILLS ARE WORTHLESS WITHOUT A GREATER CONTEXT: BALANCING THEORY AND PRACTICE THROUGHOUT THE CURRICULUM

By Jim Sernoe

Midwestern State University

“Why do I have to take Mass Communication History? All I want to do is be the next Katie Couric, and I should be in the studio learning the skills I’ll need to be the best TV reporter this country has ever seen.”

So began advising battle No. 618, one very similar to the previous 617 battles. It involved explaining and/or defending the curriculum to a bright, ambitious undergraduate who thought college was all about learning a narrow skill set necessary for a specific profession and climbing to the top.

Having repeatedly participated in the debate between the value of skills courses and worth of conceptual/theory courses, I was ready with my response. The basic message: students need both.

“Can you be a great reporter if you have no understanding of how the media have functioned within our society over the years?”

“How do you plan to become the next Katie Couric when you have no understanding of the struggles women like her have had before climbing to the top? Do you even understand that TV reporters do more than speak well and look great?”

“What if you end up in a field that has nothing to do with broadcasting, and all you have are skills that don’t match your altered career goals?”

This struggle to find a balance between skill and theory is not limited to ideological clashes between advisers and students. It is an issue with which mass communication programs themselves must constantly grapple.

As journalism and mass communication programs across the country adapt their curricula for an evolving environment – some to incorporate digital media, others to meet the requirements of accreditation – the same questions come up regardless of the program’s size:

Are we simply training future media professionals?

Do we have a broader responsibility, such as preparing college graduates who are able to understand the world and think logically?

The answers to these questions and a host of related sub-questions lead educators back to the tensions our predecessors have wrestled with for the past 100 years.

Some of our ancestors in mass communication education believed it all came down to skills. Most of our predecessors in the professions insisted that only skills mattered, that a college degree was a waste of time, and that a good editor could turn Junior into a good reporter only if we threw him into the newsroom and let him learn by fire for six months.

We're long past that now, at least according to the anecdotal research completed for this article.

Web sites for 50 programs – including journalism, mass communication, advertising, broadcasting, digital media and public relations – were examined. The range of programs included very small (50 majors) to very large (1,500 majors); public and private institutions; free-standing programs as well as those within other departments, such as English; liberal arts colleges to Carnegie I research universities; ACEMJC-accredited and non-accredited programs; and locations all over the country.

The philosophy of most of these programs seems to be that a balance between skills and theory is needed. Almost all of the programs come close to an even split or at most a 60-40 balance in one direction or the other. Only two programs require more than 60 percent of the major coursework in skills-related classes.

In addition, about half of the programs allow no more than one-third of a student's total credit hours to come from the major.

Almost all require an introductory mass communication class and/or a course addressing mass communication/society as well as media law. Most include theory and/or research courses along with media history, and several require at least one course in political science or history beyond the institution's core requirement. Several degree plans in advertising require outside coursework in business or marketing.

At the same time, most programs include considerable coursework in basic skills, including news writing, editing, audio/video production, copy writing, advertising/public relations campaigns, layout/design and digital production as well as public speaking.

"Skills are worthless without a greater context," Peggy Kuhr, dean of the University of Montana School of Journalism, said. "You can't set things up as an either/or – skills or theory. You need a mix."

Students at University of Montana are required to take at least half of their total credits in the liberal arts, which Kuhr

noted plays into accreditation concerns, but is also good educational policy. "What role do media play in our society? The students need to know more than 'this is how you do it,' but also 'this is why you do it.'"

"Even freshman year, we want them to be doing some journalism but also something else."

At the same time, the program emphasizes basic skills. After completing a pre-professional sequence that includes Introduction to Mass Media, Reporting and several liberal arts requirements, students apply for admission to one of the school's professional programs: print, photo, radio-TV production or broadcast news. Once admitted, students focus on the skills needed for each area, although courses such as Law of Mass Communication are also included.

The School of Journalism has about 500 undergraduates total, including 200 who have been admitted to the professional program.

Kuhr said the faculty has been fairly unified in supporting the overall philosophy, noting that while most of the faculty come from the ranks of professionals who have at least 10 years in the field, they also see the value of non-skills courses.

"We talk about it a lot," she said, especially in this age of media convergence. "You need the skills, but you also need a sense of ethics and an idea of 'the bigger picture.'"

Tim Gleason, dean of the University of Oregon School of Journalism and Mass Communication, has a similar view: "We see theory and practice as being wholly integrated."

While he cautioned that the curriculum is being revised, he said the general philosophy is not likely to change.

Similar to Montana's program, Oregon has a pre-major or what is called the lower-division core.

Students must complete five courses, including a "generic" media and society course as well as J202–Information Gathering or what Gleason called "information hell," an intense course that requires interviewing, research and a lengthy annotated bibliography. He also pointed out that the class was once medium-specific but now covers several platforms.

When applying for full-major status, students choose a sequence from among advertising, public relations, communication studies and journalism (the latter of which combined formerly separate sequences in electronic media, magazine and news/editorial).

Once admitted, students must complete the upper-division breadth requirement that includes – among other courses – law, history, ethics, media management/economics, communication theory/criticism, international communication and advertising/society.

In addition, students complete a sequence that, with the exception of communication studies, is heavy on skills courses. For example, students in the public relations sequence are required to take courses in public relations principles, writing, planning and campaigns.

The program has about 1,500 majors and pre-majors.

Gleason said the School of Journalism and Mass Communication has been structured for many years without separate departments, which makes for less division and smoother integration within the curriculum. While students tend to be focused on their career choices, many don't question the necessity of the breadth requirement.

"Some don't even notice the difference," he said. "Some ask the relevance of some of the [non-skills] courses, but things are seamless. Teaching applied courses is not like teaching skills courses, but you try to make the relevance apparent in courses like communication law and communication ethics. Students usually understand the why of those courses."

Gleason said the faculty at Oregon, similar to that at Montana, has been mostly unified in what they think the underlying philosophy of the program should be.

Other administrators have not been as fortunate, with one department chair saying the divisions among his colleagues were clear, with one group of former journalists arguing that skills should be emphasized and younger faculty with less professional experience advocating a balance between skills and theory.

"I'm going to sound like a true number-cruncher when I say there was a direct correlation between the faculty member's age and his or her view," he said. "The older you are, the more you believe it comes down to skills and 'these kids can't write.' The younger faculty, while acknowledging the need for skills instruction and sometimes even echoing the 'these kids can't write' sentiment, still argued that theory was needed, especially ethics.

"It got more than a little ugly sometimes at faculty meetings when we were discussing revamping the degree requirements."

At Susquehanna University, communications majors choose

from eight emphases, including broadcasting, communication studies, corporate communications, journalism, mass communication, public relations, speech communication and teacher certification.

While students do not have to complete any pre-professional courses to gain admission to major status, they are required to take a core of courses regardless of the emphasis, Larry Augustine, chair of the department, said. Students are required to have at least a 2.0 grade point average in the major courses in order to graduate. If a student earns less than a C- in a major course, he or she must repeat the course or obtain permission to take another course and substitute it.

Department requirements for all students include COMM 103-Career Planning, which serves as an overview of the field, as well as public speaking, law/ethics, communication theory, communication research and practicum, Augustine said.

Within each emphasis, students complete 18 additional required hours and choose from a list of related electives. These courses lean toward the skills related to the emphasis, such as Broadcast Announcing, Feature Writing and Public Relations Campaigns, but they are not exclusively skills-related.

Augustine said the department's philosophy has been to balance skills and theory, and students have generally understood why that balance is necessary.

"That question never comes up - 'Why do I have to do this?'" he said. "Once in a while, you have to explain how this applies. If you don't have this base of knowledge, you're not going to be able to apply the skills. They realize there are certain things they've got to learn."

Susquehanna has about 250 communications majors, Augustine said.

At Midwestern State, we were faced with redefining ourselves in two separate ways about a year ago.

After considerable discussion about how we were going to address convergence and digital media, we decided we couldn't do anything the way it needed to be done without a new faculty line. In what became the proverbial lemonade after the lemons came our way, we were allowed to convert a line after a failed search.

As we discussed new sequences and new courses, we kept coming back to our second dilemma, how to balance theory and practice. Although everyone was forced to compromise regarding the final revised curriculum, we were fortunate

enough to start at the consensus that students still need that balance, even as we were adding a minor in digital media that would lean toward skills acquisition.

Like others, we also wrestled with the question of how specific our curriculum needs to be. Are we training media professionals in general or are we training newspaper reporters, television producers and advertising copy writers, for example?

I think we made the right decision by sticking to the original premise, which is a balance, starting with a major that stresses cross-platform training and including a minor that allows specialization.

I argued that web design, computer-assisted reporting and other courses are important for our minor in digital media, but I also argued that we need a course that addresses the ways in which society interacts with the Internet. With courses in media ethics and law required alongside those stressing writing, reporting and production, I think we have found the correct balance.

And the next Katie Couric? She is now teaching. She gets in touch periodically a) to thank me for insisting on a balanced curriculum, and b) to ask me for advice on how to handle her doubting students.



ASJMC

Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication

The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication promotes excellence in journalism and mass communication education. A valuable resource for chairs, deans and directors, ASJMC is a non-profit, educational association composed of some 190 JMC programs at the college level. The majority of the association's members are in the United States and Canada. Eight international journalism and communication schools have joined the association in recent years.

www.asjmc.org