

Stanford

PLANNING
FOR
CURRICULAR
CHANGE
IN
JOURNALISM
EDUCATION

**Project on the Future
of Journalism
and Mass Communication
Education**

School of Journalism
University of Oregon

PLANNING FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE

A Report of the
Project on the Future of Journalism
and Mass Communication Education

Second edition

School of Journalism
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon
November 1987

Table of Contents

Preface	iii
Project Summary	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
I. A Reflective Self-Study	6
II. The Oregon Program in a National Context	8
III. Status Report: The Administrative View	11
IV. View from the Professoriate	21
V. Communication Industry—Media Professionals' Evaluations	28
VI. Coping with the New Technology	33
VII. Financing Journalism/Mass Communication Education	41
VIII. Toward Model Curricula	48
IX. A Plan for Our Future	56
X. Epilogue: Eight Journalism Educators Appraise the State of the Field Three Years After	60
Appendix A	
Attributes of Quality—Journalism and Mass Communication Education	71
Appendix B	
The National Task Force on Journalism and Mass Communication Education	72
Appendix C	
An Exchange: Two Articles from <i>ASNE Bulletin</i>	80
Appendix D	
"Journalism Education: Storm Swirls on Campus; Changes Coming," <i>presstime</i> , September, 1983	84
Appendix E	
Syllabi for two generic courses at the University of Minnesota	90

Preface

When *Planning for Curricular Change in Journalism Education* appeared in 1984, education for journalism and mass communication was a field in ferment. New programs of study were showing up at colleges and universities that had not before recognized these professional and academic specialties. Old-line programs were immersed in what might be considered a mid-life crisis: what should they be doing as society entered the Information Age, with its rapid technological and social changes? Enrollment in schools and departments of journalism was near an all-time high, placing great strains on resources and heightening a demand for efficiency and innovation.

At the same time these internal challenges were being felt, external voices were influencing the debate. Educators faced a mixed environment in the professional communities. It ranged from ambivalence about the quality and direction of educational programs to indifference, hostility, praise and support.

Enter the *Oregon Report*, as the *Planning for Curricular Change* document quickly came to be known. Originally launched as a project intended to bring the curriculum of the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon into line with the needs of faculty and students, the report also became a natural blueprint for evaluation and change across the educational landscape. It offered an assessment of the weaknesses and strengths of journalism and mass communication studies, and a strategic plan to bring these programs into their "rightful place in American higher education." The report that came out of the two-year study concluded that "The general state of journalism and mass communication education is dismal." It called for:

- better funding of programs;
- a recognition of the centrality of mass communication study to all university students;
- a larger emphasis on midcareer training of professionals;
- integration of technological advances into all aspects of the teaching program; and
- more coherence in curricula through generic courses that would serve students across the spectrum of career interests.

Copies of the *Oregon Report* were distributed widely to journalism educators, university administrators and executives in the constituent industries. It became a catalyst for widespread response, discussion and action. The first printing was quickly exhausted.

Did the *Oregon Report* achieve its goal, to become a blueprint for change? Before going to a second edition (made possible by a grant from the Gannett Foundation, the principal underwriter of the original study), we decided to ask a sampling of prominent journalism educators to respond to that question. They were selected because of both their achievements in educational innovation and the diversity of their vantage points on the institutional spectrum. The eight are:

- Everette E. Dennis, executive director of the Gannett Center for Media Studies, and, as dean of the School of Journalism at Oregon in 1983 and 1984, chief architect of the study.
- Sharon M. Murphy, dean of the College of Journalism at Marquette University and 1986-87 president of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC).
- David Weaver of Indiana University, president-elect of AEJMC for 1987-88.
- Edmund B. Lambeth, associate dean for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development at the University of Missouri School of Journalism, and former dean at the University of Kentucky.
- Travis Linn, dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Nevada-Reno.
- Maxwell McCombs, chairman of the Department of Journalism at the University of Texas at Austin.
- Walter Bunge, director of the School of Journalism at The Ohio State University.
- Jean Ward of the University of Minnesota School of Journalism and Mass Communication, and one of the key participants in the development of the *Oregon Report*.

They were asked to assess what they see happening today in journalism education, at their own schools and elsewhere. They were also asked to place the *Oregon Report* in that context to see what, if any, impact the study has had on change in the field.

That epilogue on the Project for the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication will be found in a new Chapter X of the second edition. We at the University of Oregon School of Journalism hope that you find the discussion relevant and useful, and that the *Oregon Report* continues to provide a stimulus for others as it has for us in the past three years.

Arnold H. Ismach
Dean, School of Journalism

Eugene, Oregon
May, 1987

Additional copies of this report are available at \$6.50 each. Please send check payable to "UO Foundation-Journalism" to:

School of Journalism
Allen Hall
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Project on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education

Purpose: To assess and evaluate the present status and future needs of the nation's schools and departments of journalism and mass communication through a series of studies and by fostering a national debate wherein interested parties may offer a critique.

Goals: To develop notes on a strategic plan for the field that can be useful to individual educators, administrators and schools;

To fashion model curricula for the field that will (a) accommodate and generate new knowledge; (b) accommodate technological change; and (c) be aware of the personnel needs of the communications industries;

To develop a new curriculum to be implemented at the University of Oregon as an outgrowth of the project.

Persons

Consulted: All of the nation's accredited schools and departments of journalism and mass communication as well as well-known non-accredited programs;

A selected list of 100 teachers in journalism and mass communication programs representing a range of scholarly and professional interests;

A selected group of 40 scholars from fields outside journalism and mass communication who are concerned with mass communication scholarship or the education and training of communication professionals;

Heads of all professional and industry organizations represented in the Council of Affiliates of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication;

A random sample of University of Oregon alumni from 1920 to 1982;

Nearly 40 industry, professional and scholarly organizations through speeches, workshops and other sessions aimed at encouraging their participation;

50 experts on new communications technology;

15 special consultants to specific topics of interest to the project team—e.g., new technology, curriculum reform, professionalism, etc.;

Scores of unsolicited letters, phone calls and other inquiries that came as a result of articles about the project in various trade papers, industry magazines, professional publications, and popular publications;

Members of the AEJMC Task Force on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education.

The Yield: An archive of materials on the programs of the nation's journalism and mass communication schools;

Historical documents and records about journalism and mass communication education;

A collection of articles, books and monographs that previously addressed journalism and mass communication education;

New data on structural, curricular, economic and other issues from the nation's journalism schools;

New data from industry and professional groups that evaluate and assess journalism and mass communication education;

Scores of letters from thoughtful educators and professionals speculating about the future and proposing solutions;

A comprehensive report on the project with recommendations that will be released in the spring of 1984;

Indication that scores of schools that have made inquiries here for assistance are involved in curriculum reform and revision.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge grants of \$70,000 from the Gannett Foundation of Rochester, New York, and \$16,000 from the Northwest Area Foundation of St. Paul, Minnesota, which made this project possible. The second edition was supported by a grant of \$4,000 from the Gannett Foundation. A variety of consultants from journalism education and the communication industries were helpful to us in our studies in connection with the Future Project.

Special thanks go to several persons who were involved in administering the project and in writing various sections of the report. They included Mary S. Hartman, Jeremy Cohen, Gregory Kerber and

Willard Rowland. The word processing and production of the report were directed by Etta M. Howard. Roy Paul Nelson designed the cover. Cheryl Dingle managed fiscal matters. Several graduate teaching fellows were involved in the preparation of the studies: They included Steve Dietz, David Morrissey, Gary Kim and Greg Kerber. James Lemert assisted with questionnaire construction.

Members of the journalism faculty at the University of Oregon were involved in discussing the report and critiquing it along the way.

To these persons and others in the journalism/mass communication education and professional fields, we are grateful.

Executive summary

The Future Project is a study of the present status and future direction of learning and the advancement of knowledge in the field of journalism and mass communication within the realities of American higher education. It is assumed that journalism/mass communication schools should be integrated into a college or university where the essential elements of general education are provided by other schools and departments. We agree with the national accreditation standard wherein students take up to 25 percent of their work in journalism and mass communication and 75 percent in the arts and sciences.

The project also operated under the assumption that two principal goals of the journalism/mass communication unit should be the promotion of literacy and the fostering of freedom of expression. The realization of these goals, of course, constitutes a contribution to the university generally.

We believe that journalism and mass communication are central to the functioning of contemporary society and that therefore providing an understanding of journalism and mass communication must be central to the mission of the university. We further believe that the journalism and mass communication unit must be the principal focus of the university's teaching, research and service activity in this field, because journalism/mass communication schools and the discipline have the strongest and most comprehensive traditions in these areas.

The general state of journalism and mass communication education is dismal. It is a field grossly underfunded, even when compared with other university departments, schools and colleges. Journalism/mass communication units have large, sometimes massive, enrollments, and tiny, overworked faculties, again by standards of the university generally. These units rarely play a major role in the governance of the university and rarely provide persons for the top cadre of leadership.

On matters of structure: We have concluded that the journalism/mass communication unit should ideally be a freestanding professional school reporting to the highest level of university leadership, not subsumed in a liberal arts college structure unless that is the clear preference of a local institution. (The University of Oregon already has this independent structure.)

On the changing mission of the journalism/mass communication unit: At present, undergraduate education is the highest priority, with graduate education sec-

ond. Service courses to the rest of the university, once an important contribution to general education, have diminished greatly. Research, public service and continuing education are highly valued, if somewhat secondary in importance, at most schools. In the future it is likely that undergraduate education will be de-emphasized somewhat and that continuing education, especially midcareer programs, will be accorded more importance. Graduate education will likely continue at the same or slightly accelerated pace.

On curricular change: The rapid infusion of new knowledge and pace of technological change will push journalism/mass communication schools away from industry-oriented sequence programs and toward more generic mass communication study. Highly specialized approaches will continue in the final year of a student's program and be extended into graduate and continuing education. Conceptual and craft courses will merge in many instances. Some programs may be realigned along competence and knowledge lines with specific instruction in literacy, visual literacy and computer literacy along with information-gathering; and conceptual courses (media and society, media economics, etc.) will be organized as linchpins to the liberal arts. Specific professional courses need to be organized in coherent modules that have specific outcomes for training stated well in advance and over which students can be tested for competency. Students leaving the university should have personal assessments from faculty that provide them with a suggested continuing education plan to meet their specific needs and deficiencies.

All courses should have a five-year review rule wherein course outlines and plans are submitted voluntarily to outside referees to ask whether the course includes the best of new knowledge, is responsive to technological change and is calibrated to social needs.

On technology matters: The journalism/mass communication unit should organize its technology instruction and education in harmony with other such instruction in the university and should clearly distinguish communication technology issues from the role of technology in society generally. That educational function should be within the purview of other units. Students should get conceptual instruction in the impact and influence of communication technology in society as well as specific hands-on instruction in areas related to entry-level work.

They should also get an overview of the uses of computers and other technology in the communication field. Schools should especially give instruction in data-base use. A technology laboratory for computer-assisted instruction and other uses is proposed.

On faculty and staffing: A faculty member should be capable of intellectual, academic and professional leadership. The most prevalent pattern now and in the future is the scholar/teacher with modest professional experience. There should be room for the professional teacher who comes from the media professions as well. Both the scholar/teacher and the professional teacher should be given clear direction about productivity demands and expectations. There should be greater use of professionals in residence and short-term appointments and more opportunity for scholars with little professional experience to get greater exposure to industry experience.

On the clientele: The principal clientele should be "the field" itself, that is, promotion to society through students of the study of mass communication as a central field of knowledge. There must be

clear recognition of student consumerism, especially the pattern of increasing enrollments in all of the communication fields. This should be monitored and attuned to the needs of society, and students should be given information and guidance about employment possibilities. Principal users of the journalism/mass communication programs will continue to be undergraduate and graduate students with increasing numbers of midcareer and other continuing education users from industry and the profession. A strong effort should be made to develop more service courses for general university students who are not majors in the journalism/mass communication fields.

On other issues: The journalism/mass communication field needs a strategic plan nationally and a strategic plan on every campus if it is to escape its present state and begin to take its rightful place in American higher education.

Knowing and understanding the mass media in American society are critical needs for all citizens and especially for those who will staff and direct the communication professions.

Introduction

Over a two-year period, the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon has conducted an extensive inquiry into the status and future of journalism and mass communication education. We encountered a field of study that is in the midst of extraordinary change, influenced largely by technology and the acceleration of new knowledge.

Our inquiry began with a critique of journalism and mass communication education. In the midst of what has been called a communication revolution, the nation's journalism/mass communication schools seemed anything but revolutionary. Indeed, there was abundant evidence that they were nearly stagnant. In their fundamental structure and curricular offerings, they had not changed much in decades. What changes they had made were typically incremental course additions and occasionally new sequences of study. Not one school that we could find had ever engaged in a systematic study of its curriculum in relationship to its peer institutions elsewhere in the United States. Many, however, had prepared mandatory self-studies that are required by the national accrediting body. Usually these were faculties talking to themselves with few outside reference points.

Although journalism schools had begun with lofty ideals and great expectations for the advancement of the press and the public, many were little more than industry-oriented trade schools by the 1970s and 1980s. There were understandable reasons for this apparent stagnation, not the least of which was heavy enrollments in the face of niggardly university budgets. Overworked and overcommitted faculties can hardly be expected to thoughtfully debate the implications of paradigm change in mass communication for mass communication education. So journalism schools were not exactly centers of innovation. They were regarded as following industry, not leading it; as the handmaidens to industry, not its critic or visionary guide. And the schools were beleaguered, not only by student demands, but by often-harsh criticism from industry, which rather gratuitously gave journalism/mass communication schools "marching orders" with little financial or moral support. While any critique of journalism/mass communication education tends to point up deficiencies, there are many understandable reasons for the field's problems. At the same time, there is much that is right with journalism/mass communication education, which—with all its faults—is still the best of its kind in the world and the envy of

many other countries and press systems. We hope that readers of this report will remember that its authors are committed and dedicated journalism/mass communication educators who also want to push the field toward excellence. We believe there is ample evidence that the American system of journalism/mass communication education is largely responsible for many notable improvements in the quality of mass communication in this century.

Still, we ourselves felt twinges of guilt in pointing up journalism/mass communication education's foibles, since we also knew some of the causes. We also know that there are ample positive reviews and many self-congratulatory reports by journalism/mass communication educators available in the professional and scholarly literature. Of the several hundred articles on our field we uncovered, all but a few were either descriptive inventories or ringing defenses. However, we believed—then and now—that our field could not advance if there was not a clear critique of its central dilemmas, be they financial, structural, intellectual or simply human.

The critique that was played out in several trade/industry journals attracted immediate response. Some journalism educators regarded criticism by their peers as inappropriate and unfair. Others said it was too emotional and done without listing the attributes of journalism education. In spite of this response, however, we also received a good deal of support from colleagues and acquaintances both from journalism/mass communication education and from the media industries and professions. Yes, they seemed to agree, it is time for change, and we need a thoughtful inquiry into the field, especially if it can produce the rudiments of a plan for appropriate change.

The critique was not initiated to denigrate journalism/mass communication education; indeed, this study is dedicated to its advancement. Rather, it was an attempt to take into account the changing role of mass communication and the mass media and to look at journalism/mass communication education in that context.

While some would argue that the news media were always important, there is some indication that the range and scope of their power and influence has accelerated in recent years. Post-industrial society is now called an "information society" wherein more than half of the work force is concerned with the production of information and the manipulation of symbols. It seemed to us that jour-

nalism/mass communication education, while long concerned with these matters, was poorly poised to take a leadership role in producing tomorrow's communicators—the modern information workers. As we looked around the country, we saw speech-communication programs, business schools, library science programs and other university departments moving steadily into education for the information society, often taking bolder leadership than we were in our own field. This concerned us, not because it meant a new source of competition, but because we felt that we were uniquely suited to lead this venture, not to sit on the periphery of it. Therefore, it was with those concerns and others in mind that we launched the Future Project.

If there is a communication revolution and if industrial society has been replaced by an information society, then clearly the journalism/mass communication schools must be responsive to new social conditions and demands.

Those who responded to our several studies expressed great interest in a systematic approach to structural and curricular reform. Most acknowledged that they were managing change in a parochial vacuum, with little knowledge of developments elsewhere. They expressed great enthusiasm for the Future Project at Oregon and are eager to learn of its findings.

Throughout the fact-finding phase of our Project, a working group of faculty members at the University of Oregon School of Journalism has monitored results and discussed implications, especially for curricular change. In addition, our planning project funded by the Northwest Area Foundation was joined with a longer-term implementation grant from the Gannett Foundation, which has allowed for several additional and more extensive studies. In 1983, the dean of the School at Oregon was elected to the presidency of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and appointed a National Task Force on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication that worked with and relied upon the work of the Oregon Future Project in its deliberations. This gave greater national scope to the project and attracted considerable interest.

In addition to a faculty retreat and frequent meetings of the working group, a national summit on the future of journalism and mass communication was held at the University of Oregon in January, 1984, with some 30 leading scholars, administrators and media professionals participating.

The national task force meeting heard the central findings of the project and debated many key issues

and perspectives. Participants agreed strongly that journalism/mass communication education must rely on a strong relationship with the liberal arts and sciences. They also agreed that since mass communication is central to society itself, universities must give more attention to this vital study and discipline. In short, they proposed that learning and the advancement of mass communication become central to the mission of the university, a position it does not now enjoy.

Beyond this advisory role the national task force did not go, and they were not asked to vote on or agree with any of the findings of this report. What appears here are exclusively the conclusions of the Oregon Project.

We began this project with the goal of developing guidelines for a new curriculum essentially for ourselves but with the hope that our findings might be useful to the nation's other journalism and mass communications schools. This was done with full knowledge that these schools are diverse programs and that any "model curriculum" would need to have several alternative approaches to reflect the diversity of approaches, philosophies and goals of various programs. What we had not fully anticipated was that the project would be a lightning rod for a national debate on the goals and purposes of journalism education. Indeed, this debate, reported in various industry journals and carried in the newsletter of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, may be an important additional benefit of the Future Project.

While we are in this report addressing issues and problems internal to journalism and mass communication education, it should be noted that we have operated under the assumption that undergraduate instruction in journalism and mass communication should exist in a university environment where students take the bulk of their course work in fields other than journalism. We are in agreement with the national accreditation standard that requires undergraduate students to take 75 percent of their work in the arts and sciences. These guidelines include specific humanities, social science and science components, with some latitude for individual schools to determine particular weightings.

The report that follows examines a variety of questions involving the structure of journalism and mass communication units in American higher education, the changing mission of the journalism/mass communication school, curricular issues and problems, technology issues as they affect the mass com-

munication field, faculty and staffing, the student clientele and several other related matters.

This report includes summary material from our studies of journalism/mass communications administrators, selected faculty members in journalism/mass communication schools, scholars in outside fields, leaders of the mass communication industries and professional societies, a special

analysis of technology concerns and some recommendations.

The next phase of our activity will include implementation of some of these recommendations at Oregon as well as continued action and planning at the national level through the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication to bring curricular reform to the field generally.

I. A reflective self-study

The faculty and dean of the University of Oregon School of Journalism engaged in a thoughtful self-study during 1981 and 1982 just prior to initiation of work on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education Project reported here. This was done partly as preparation for this curricular study and partly in connection with our national professional school accreditation. The purpose of the self-study was to examine the School's historic and continuing goals and to assess the quality of the journalism program at Oregon. The self-study reaffirmed the School's seven principal objectives:

- (1) To provide professional coursework designed to prepare students for careers in the various fields of mass communication;
- (2) To provide course offerings of interest and value to students in the University who are not journalism majors;
- (3) To support and encourage research in the various fields of mass communication;
- (4) To maintain a mutually constructive and helpful liaison with mass-communication professionals;
- (5) To provide opportunities for the continuing education of journalism professionals in the various fields of mass communication;
- (6) To bring about improvement in the performance of the mass media; and
- (7) To encourage improvement in scholastic journalism programs and publications in secondary schools.

The goals and objectives of the School center on learning and the advancement of knowledge in journalism and mass communication. They are directed to the needs of the School's clientele, including:

- (1) undergraduate and graduate students in journalism and mass communication;
- (2) other students at the University of Oregon who wish to take journalism and communications courses;
- (3) communications professionals seeking continuing education;
- (4) other college, community college and secondary school programs in journalism and their students and faculty; and

- (5) the general public, especially citizens concerned about the impact and the role of mass communication.

The Oregon journalism school, like many of its sister institutions in the United States, is plagued by serious and longstanding underfunding. This is not just a typical educator's lament, but a description of the real state of affairs in journalism schools that are profit centers for their colleges and universities because of their escalating enrollments, but rarely share in the bounty of funds which those students generate.

A second problem identified by the faculty and others that is true here and elsewhere is the establishment of a proper relationship between broad-based conceptual study of mass communications and exposure to the realities of contemporary practice in the communications industries. This relationship is important not only in the development of specific courses and overall curricula, but also in the constituent relations of the School (e.g., those with alumni, media professionals) with regard to continuing education, service and research.

The self-study is a kind of "as-we-were" in the summer of 1981 statement rather than a reformulation of the program and its structure. It defines the Oregon journalism school as it entered its 70th year as a professional school that is well-integrated into a liberal arts university. The Oregon program was primarily an undergraduate program with some limited attempt to fulfill the other objectives set forth.

Critique of the self-study. As a result of the grants from the Northwest Area and Gannett Foundations, the administration and faculty of the School took a hard look at their own curricular "architecture" and offered a critique summarized in part in the grant proposal.

The Oregon School of Journalism, like its counterparts elsewhere in the United States, has a core of journalism and mass communication courses aimed at providing a general overview of the field as well as various professional practice and skills courses aimed at the training of journalism and other communication-industry professionals. The division between conceptual and craft courses, as well as an industry-oriented sequence structure that allows the School to offer five independent but interrelated programs of study (news-editorial, magazine, broadcast news, public relations and advertising), tends to fragment the efforts of a small

faculty and a large student body. There are only fifteen full-time-equivalent faculty and a few adjunct professors to serve more than 750 undergraduate and 60 graduate students. Further, while the School requires its students to take 75 percent of their academic work in the liberal arts and sciences, there is little direct connection between the School and its courses and the rest of the university. Oregon, like other universities, has few cross-listed courses or joint appointments and little genuine interdepartmental cooperation.

Another of the problems common to all professional schools is the relationship between new knowledge generated by systematic research and new knowledge that comes from the world of professional practice. The field of journalism education has long been beset by a conflict between faculty members who regard themselves primarily as teachers and researchers and those who identify themselves as masters of the profession—practitioners who are also teachers. While the schism between research-oriented scholars and educators who are professional practitioners is pronounced at some schools, it not a significant problem at Oregon. The Oregon faculty generally is highly productive in generating original research and texts that break new ground, or both. They also are involved in continuing service to the media industries and pro-

fessions as well as to particular constituent groups with an interest in the press or mass media. However, the notion that craft courses adhere to professional standards set by the industry and that conceptual courses are governed by the realm of scholarship is still a persistent pattern.

The original proposal for a planning grant noted three interrelated problems for the somewhat stagnant journalism school curriculum in the so-called "steady state" university where, because of static budgets, change is hardly encouraged. New knowledge must be monitored and integrated into the curriculum. New technology must be addressed. In the midst of what has been called a communication revolution, journalism schools must give their students utilitarian information about the state of the art in technology that will affect communications, both from the standpoint of its social impact and practical "hands-on" experience. Finally, the communication industries needs for educated personnel as well as society's needs for educated citizens who know and understand mass communication must be recognized and dealt with. The existing journalism school curriculum at Oregon does not really do this in any systematic way. The paradigm of journalism education has not changed much in 40 years despite massive changes throughout the field of mass communication.

II. The Oregon program in a national context

Journalism schools, like their parent institutions of higher education, come in several types, sizes and shapes. Large-scale, comprehensive units offer a full range of programs, from undergraduate education to doctoral studies. Such units have research divisions and ambitious service programs. Others, quite modest in scope, offer only limited undergraduate instruction or a one-year master's program. Still others are small service units or community colleges.

In the 1970s, a Carnegie Commission report identified four basic types of higher-education institutions in the United States. They are (1) research universities with comprehensive graduate programs as well as undergraduate instruction; (2) state col-

leges and universities, many of which were former teachers' colleges that expanded into universities and that continue to emphasize undergraduate study; (3) private liberal arts colleges that are usually small, premium-quality institutions that lean toward a classical liberal arts approach; and (4) community colleges that generally offer vocationally oriented two-year programs designed either to send people immediately into the work force or to prepare them for senior colleges and universities.

Schools of journalism and mass communication usually follow a similar pattern. A typology of journalism/mass communication programs and the colleges and universities with which they are associated is shown in the following table.

Types of journalism and mass communication programs

	Characteristics	Examples	Structure	Institutional Setting
Comprehensive journalism/mass communication unit	Undergraduate, master's, doctoral programs of scholarly and professional interests, sub-programs, usually industry-oriented; institutes and research centers	Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, North Carolina	Freestanding school organized within liberal arts college	Research university; in rare instances, state college or university
Communication studies	Mass communication studies in context of a generic communication program; little professional instruction	Michigan, Hartford, Stanford; Annenberg Schools at Penn., So. Cal.	Arts and Sciences college; college of professional studies	Research university or state college/university; private liberal arts college
Graduate professional school	Preparation of professionals for specific industry roles such as reporters, editors, broadcast specialists	Columbia, Northwestern, UC Berkeley	Freestanding professional school	Traditional research university
Undergraduate professional school	Preparation of professionals for entry-level media work; industry-oriented	Nebraska, California state universities	Arts and Sciences colleges; professional school div.	State colleges; research universities
Community college	Vocational craft courses; preparation of entry-level workers in two years	Community, junior colleges; other two-year programs	Separate departments, part of English or other department	Community colleges

The University of Oregon School of Journalism is a well-established, comprehensive journalism and mass communication program. Founded in 1912 as the Department of Journalism, Oregon became a full professional school in 1916, making it one of the four or five oldest such programs in the United States. The School today has five accredited sequences recognized by the American Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, which is sanctioned by the U.S. Office of Education. Oregon is one of only about 10 journalism schools in the United States accredited in as many as five fields. Oregon's accreditation includes sequences in news-editorial journalism, magazine journalism, advertising, public relations and broadcast news.

Although Oregon does not have a Ph.D. program in mass communication, its master's degree program trains two distinct student clienteles: those interested in a professional master's program in preparation for careers in the news media and those interested in scholarship and research. Students in the latter program usually go on to doctoral programs elsewhere or enter industry in research departments or government in policy-making roles. In fact, the M.A. program has comprehensive course requirements and all students take both theory/research courses and professional/practice courses. Students with a more scholarly orientation write master's theses, while those who are more professionally oriented do professional projects or take comprehensive exams.

Oregon is known for its especially strong news-editorial and advertising programs, and these two programs get the bulk of the School's resources. Both have achieved considerable national distinction and are directed by highly qualified and prestigious faculty members.

The magazine and broadcast news units are relatively small and have limited goals for training a specific type of professional (e.g., broadcast news reporters). The public relations sequence has relatively few courses and draws heavily on courses in the other sequences.

Like most other comprehensive journalism-education programs, the Oregon School has both craft and conceptual courses. The organizational structure is designed to support the various sequences with some modest emphasis on shared courses. For example, all students, whether their primary interest is in news/editorial, broadcasting, public relations, advertising or magazine, are required to take two out of the three following courses—law of the press, history of journalism, and journalism and

public opinion. The implicit rationale is that these courses fill certain generic needs important to everyone interested in communications.

A major concern of the School is literacy training, to which considerable time is devoted. All students are required to take Introduction to Journalistic Writing (unless they pass a mandatory waiver/ placement examination). After completing this course, which covers basic principles of writing, such as grammar and mechanics, students choose from a wide variety of writing courses that focus on medium-specific styles. Students in advertising take courses such as advertising copywriting and advanced message strategy. Broadcast students concentrate on writing appropriate to radio and television.

Clearly, many of the writing courses are medium-specific, although many students take a broader approach in choosing their courses with the understanding that increasingly today's media overlap in their approaches to function and style. The faculty encourages this generic approach for its students; however, in recent years, pressure from those who establish accrediting standards has been directed at encouraging a more fragmented approach in which students have little time to take courses outside their specific sequences.

Essentially, the problem is that journalism schools tend to operate on an industry model. That is, students are taught the entry-level skills they will need to secure their first jobs in a single, specific communication industry such as newspaper or broadcasting. Reliance on the industry model, however, does not give students the sufficient understanding of the media as a whole that they will need to advance later in their careers. An alternative approach would be to use a generic model of journalism/mass communication education. Amidst a communications revolution outside of the university, journalism schools need a regular, orderly way to accommodate at least three concurrent developments that cut across all of the traditional industry-oriented sequences:

- (1) The massive growth of knowledge from a variety of scholarly and professional sources that alters our understanding of journalism and mass communications;
- (2) Breathtaking technological change wherein the computer, the microchip, the satellite and other devices are changing society and the communications industry; and

- (3) Changing organizational patterns and personnel needs in the communications industries requiring new knowledge and different skills from those entering the field.

In substantive terms, the generic model will enable students to develop a better understanding of the fields in which they wish to work. It makes no sense to teach libel law without also covering the economics of communication. Yet such a generic approach is rarely attempted under the current industrial model.

Despite national emphasis on the industry-model approach, the Oregon faculty has been extremely active in remaining at the forefront on changes in the media, as indicated by their publication productivity. The faculty currently has more than 50 books in print, and scores of recent articles in scholarly and professional publications. Many faculty members also have continued to publish in popular magazines and newspapers. The faculty also engages in midcareer education and maintains a strong service relationship with state and regional communication industries. This relationship ranges from the development and presentation of professional workshops to the organization and hosting of special conferences for area professionals.

While viewing the Oregon school in a national context, it should be noted that none of the existing models of journalism education comfortably comports with the massive changes in new knowledge, technological change and the long-term needs of the new communication industries for personnel with flexible capabilities. Oregon students do, however, have a good record for literacy, technical ability to function as entry-level communicators, and knowledge of the mass communication field.

The School is known for distinctive courses in such fields as book writing, cartooning, interviewing, media sociology and newspaper management. The program emphasizes both production of the

message in mass communication and the social consequences of that message.

In the 1982-83 academic year, the School of Journalism celebrated its 70th anniversary and saluted the strengths of the School in its past, which included all of the above and the solid integration of the School with the liberal arts and sciences.

In essence, the Oregon School of Journalism has a strong program in the context of the traditional patterns of journalism education. Our self-evaluation, however, makes it clear that there is an immediate need to develop and evaluate a new curricular structure to meet the demands generated by the infusion of high technology and rapid information exchange into the fabric of American life itself as well as the communication industry.

Our self-study and our national inventory of journalism/mass communication education make it clear that students receive little in journalism schools that will enable them to develop flexible strategies for the future. Far too much emphasis has been placed on the tactics of accomplishing specific entry-level skills at the cost of preparing students for the changes that are already upon us. Much of the blame for this state of affairs must be leveled at the continued use of the industrial model of journalism education. It is therefore vital that Oregon develop a program to serve its own students and other constituents and to provide a model other schools can emulate, a program that will accomplish two goals. The first goal is to take the best from the industrial model but put an end to curricula that exists for no other reason than that it was developed during the earliest days of journalism education. And, second, a new curriculum must be set in its place that not only replaces the old but provides faculty and students with a means to compete in and contribute to the role of communication in American society.

III. Status report: The administrative view

Planning for the future of journalism and mass communication requires considerable knowledge of the relevant environment, the context against which individual programs and the field generally operate. There are more than 80 colleges and universities in the United States with accredited journalism and mass communication programs. Several others of high standing choose not to be accredited. Although all of the journalism/mass communication schools share some common goals and purposes, they also have evident differences, both in philosophy and operations. They range from schools with tiny enrollments concerned mostly with vocational training to larger programs that are highly theoretical in their approach to education. Nevertheless, because of the common goals and standards that are encouraged by the accreditation process and by various scholarly and professional organizations, the nation's journalism schools do constitute an indelible component of higher education.

In order to get a better understanding of the nature, scope, concerns and problems of journalism education, the Future Project systematically surveyed the administrators of the 81 accredited programs and several others of importance that were not on the accredited list. Administrators (deans, chairpersons, directors) were contacted because they are the most knowledgeable individuals with an overview of their own programs and have access to data that may not be available to individual faculty members.

Eighty-two of the questionnaires directed to administrators were returned, a 91 percent response rate. In addition, several administrators wrote lengthy letters amplifying and augmenting the inquiries made in the questionnaire. The result is a fairly complete national profile of journalism education in the United States, at least with regard to the questions raised here.

The survey addressed five areas of concern, namely:

- (1) *The placement of the journalism/mass communication unit (school or department) within the larger university or college.* The literature of the sociology of organizations suggests that the "structure is the message" and that a school's status and functioning are largely determined by where it is placed in the larger organization. We wanted to know whether the journalism schools were freestanding units, part of a col-

lege of professional studies, or somewhere else in the organizational pattern. We hoped to elicit some opinions about the "ideal structure" as it pertains to the culture and tradition of a particular educational institution.

- (2) *The internal organizational pattern of the journalism/mass communication unit.* How was it organized and to do what? Some schools are unified programs with no subdivisions; other have a sequence structure. Some have departments organized along industry lines; others opt for generic or conceptual approaches. We asked the administrators to reflect on their structure and evaluate its effectiveness and efficiency. We also asked them if there was a better way to do it or whether they, in their own place, saw any organizational changes that would better advance the cause of journalism education in an era of swift change.
- (3) *The primary goals of the journalism/mass communication unit both now and in the future.* This part of the survey elicited information about the program's general mandate, the constituencies it serves, the values of the educator/administrators with regard to setting priorities for the use of educational resources for journalism/mass communication purposes.
- (4) *The curriculum now in place in journalism/mass communication units.* How is it organized? Toward what end? How is it coping with social change and what has been its recent history of substantive curricular change?
- (5) *Changes that journalism/mass communication educators would like to implement.* Here we asked the administrators to dream a bit, to speculate (without regard to resources) what they'd like to do, what kind of programs they would implement under optimum conditions that would address future needs and demands.

Journalism/Mass Communication in Higher Education

Where and how a journalism or communication program is organized within a college or university determines in large part what role it will play in the university and what resources it can command. Structure may also be related to status. Imagine,

for example, the difference between a law department in a college of professional studies and a law school that is a freestanding independent unit. The place that a journalism/mass communication programs occupies in the structure of the university will probably determine in large part its philosophical orientation and its specific mission. Schools and departments that are part of colleges of liberal arts and science within the larger university compete with such sister departments as history, political science and mathematics in the scramble for resources. Their success may depend on the degree to which they are scholarly competitors. And their relative prestige will be governed by the degree to which they are like—and excel—in the company of their competitors.

In addition to where they are placed, the journalism/mass communication units also call themselves by different names. Originally, most were schools or departments of journalism. Then, many changed their designation to "journalism and mass communication" to reflect their concern with academic programs beyond the scope of news-editorial and informational functions. The term "journalism and mass communication" was a useful moniker to describe professional schools that were concerned with advertising and public relations, telecommunication, communication research and other activities beyond "pure journalism." The term, though, is not without its detractors. Professor John Bremner of the University of Kansas, an authority on grammar and syntax, complains that "journalism and mass communication is akin to saying apples and fruit." Some programs have opted for the term "media studies" or simply "communication" or "mass communication." The journalism/mass communication unit, in most instances, faces several campus competitors who also concern themselves with the study of communication. These include most notably the former speech departments, which now call themselves "communication arts" or "speech communication." In some instances, these component departments are part of a larger "college of communication," which includes the usual journalism school elements and other coursework, research and service activities that relate to the study of communication, mass communication and the mass media.

Names do have considerable meaning, though. "Media studies" has a particular connotation that links it to the British cultural/critical studies school of media analysis; "journalism and mass communication" usually describes some generic mass-communication coursework that is linked to industry-

specific sequences (news-editorial, public relations, etc.). There is little agreement about a name that fully describes the concerns of the modern journalism/mass communication school.

Different names to describe what is at least superficially the same activity are also reflective in the structural placement of the journalism/mass communication unit within the university or college where it is organized. Unlike law or business schools, which are almost always independent professional schools reporting directly to administration, the journalism/mass communication schools have a wide variety of administrative arrangements. However, there are some definite patterns.

Despite widespread agreement among educators that the best structural arrangement for journalism/mass communication programs is usually that of independent status within the university, nearly 75 percent of the programs do not operate with such autonomy. The administrators were asked:

Where is your program located in the organization of your university or college?

81 responses to this question.	
Independent Professional School	— 21 responses or 26%
School within Liberal Arts Unit	— 14 responses or 17%
Department within Liberal Arts Unit	— 28 responses or 35%
School within Professional Studies Unit	— 5 responses or 6%
Department within Professional Studies Unit	— 7 responses or 9%
Elsewhere	— 6 responses or 7%

The independent professional school or college usually, although not always, reports to central administration: to a provost, academic vice president, or, in some instances, directly to the president of the institution. There are fewer layers of bureaucracy between that unit and the top and comparable schools of journalism lodged, for example, in colleges of arts and sciences. Another characteristic of the independent school is more direct control over its own environment. Although there is the strong belief that membership in the arts college carries some significant advantages, such as being a part of the most important single element of the university, there are also critical disadvantages in the allocation of resources. Part of this is related to pre-

stige. Even at universities with strong and highly respected journalism schools, it is rare that those units would be ranked within the top ten departments in the liberal arts and science college in terms of relative prestige, specifically faculty resources or other indicators that can be involved.

Many administrators in their comments to us indicated that the independent professional school has distinct advantages in "bad times." In good times, when universities are growing and strong support comes to those who generate large numbers of students, the journalism schools can flourish in a liberal arts college environment. During times of retrenchment and cutbacks, tradition reigns supreme in many universities and the old-line departments hold on to what they have always had even if they face enrollment declines. Student consumerism, which is used as the argument for more resources in times of growth, is discounted as irrelevant in periods of recession. In the past twenty years, this has meant serious losses for the journalism/mass communication units. They have continued to grow while the rest of their universities have declined or maintained a steady state. Yet, they report that they have seen little in the way of growth in resources even as student populations have burgeoned.

The problem of where a journalism/mass communication unit should be is a complex one. There are strong and vital programs in the arts and science tradition, notably Minnesota, Wisconsin and others in the Big Ten where journalism education has always had considerable strength. Some of the best-known professional programs such as Columbia and Northwestern are freestanding schools outside of the arts and sciences tradition.

The lack of independent status for journalism/mass communication programs may carry inherent problems such as the inability to get adequate financing, staffing, and physical resources. Perhaps the most serious drawback to a lack of independent status is the problem of enrollment controls. Journalism/mass communication units can better determine the admission of students and the curriculum for those students when the unit has the independent status of a professional school. Closely linked to the problem of structure/placement is a dearth of journalism/mass communication faculty members who have moved from their programs into university-wide administrative posts. Without administrative representatives who have had direct experience with the problems unique to journalism/mass communication, the journalism dean seeking support for his or her unit from the administration

becomes just one more voice in a chorus. This problem is accentuated when the dean, director or chairperson reports to a liberal arts dean or provost in an office where journalism/mass communication faculty have never been represented in the leadership cadre. The table below suggests that it is rare for journalism educators to be selected for central administration assignments.

Within the past 10 years, how many of your program's faculty have served in administrative posts elsewhere in your institution?

79 responses to this question.

0	— 46 responses or 58 percent
1	— 19 responses or 24 percent
2	— 8 responses or 10 percent
3	— 2 responses or 3 percent
More	— 4 responses or 5 percent

Journalism/mass communication educators rarely become presidents, provosts or deans of arts colleges or graduate schools. This is not to suggest that journalism/mass communication educators are completely isolated from the rest of the university. There is university-wide involvement through joint appointments, service courses, cross-listed courses and service on university committees. The importance of these findings should not be underrated. Cross-fertilization provides important educational links for both faculty and student. It does not, however, aid the journalism/mass communication unit with the important task of obtaining and maintaining ever scarcer resources.

In what other ways does your program maintain links with the rest of the institution? (check as many as apply)

80 responses to this question.

Joint appointments	— 35 responses or 42%
Cross-listed courses	— 52 responses or 63%
Faculty on graduate committees in other units	— 59 responses or 71%
Joint programs/Interdisciplinary programs	— 58 responses or 70%
Dual majors	— 65 responses or 78%
Faculty on important committees	— 77 responses or 93%
Other	— 14 responses or 17%

Departmental Administration

In contrast to university-wide administration, journalism/mass communication faculty members take an active role in the administration of their own units. Rarely did the survey find that faculty were not involved in departmental policy. The table below provide a summary of faculty activities within departmental administration.

How is your faculty involved in the administrative/policy work of your program? (check as many as apply)

80 responses to this question.	
Regular faculty meetings	— 79 responses or 95%
Regular sequence or subgroup meetings	— 51 responses or 61%
Standing/ad hoc committees	— 69 responses or 83%
Rotating administrative appointments	— 14 responses or 17%
Faculty rarely in administrative work	— 10 responses or 12%
Faculty rarely in policy matters	— 2 responses or 2%
Other	— 7 responses or 8%

The survey also attempted to identify what deans and chairpersons would consider to be an "ideal" administrative structure within their own units. The responses from the front suggest two things. First, journalism/mass communication deans are under heavy siege and need reinforcements in the form of assistant deans, administrative assistants and other such "support" personnel. And second, the notion of administrative structure, at least in the minds of those responding to the survey, is interlinked with curricular questions. Should broadcasting be taught within a school of journalism? What is the proper mix among traditional skill-acquisition courses, conceptual courses such as press law and media economics, and theory-based coursework such as mass media research and research methodology?

The survey spawned what can best be described as a plea for more staff, but few addressed directly the question of what an ideal administrative structure should look like within a journalism/mass communication unit. Those who did address the issue often focused on a theme succinctly stated by Dean Donald G. Hileman at the University of Tennessee College of Communications. "Separate college status," Hileman said, "is vital to maximum development."

Gerald C. Stone, chairman of the Department of

Journalism at Memphis State University, said the "ideal program in journalism education will include departments in advertising, broadcasting, broadcast news, magazine, mass communication, newspaper, photojournalism, public relations, and perhaps technology." Many schools appear to approach the question with a response that seems to label various curriculum units, something which is now the standard practice at many schools. Stone's comments are reflective of the current preoccupation with the industry model.

The ideal structure for Billy I. Ross at the Department of Mass Communication at Texas Tech University "is to get out from under arts and sciences." Ross summed up his problems that result from a lack of autonomy this way: "We were set up by merging journalism, telecommunications and advertising into a department in 1970 with the specific charge from the president to develop a School of Mass Communications. Four presidents later we are still where we started. Basically we operate as a school but when it comes to budget, personnel, etc., it goes in with 24 other departments within a College that has one-third of all the students and one-half of all the faculty on campus. It's an administrator's nightmare." Ross's comments illustrate the notion that the name can be as important as the structure.

Paul Sullivan of Temple University agreed, writing, "I believe that journalism schools should operate as individual professional schools within universities. Journalism programs are never served well as step-children in colleges of arts and sciences."

To Ralph Lowenstein of the University of Florida, his College of Journalism and Communications comes close to being ideal. The structure of the Florida program is unlike that of many other schools in that:

All broadcasting media at the University of Florida are assigned to the College of Journalism and Communications. All mass communications and media-related sequences are assigned to the College of Journalism and Communications. Thus unlike most universities, this college is (1) independent of any liberal arts and science college, (2) responsible for teaching broadcast production as well as broadcast news, and (3) in complete control of all broadcasting properties.

Lowenstein supervises general managers of broadcast stations as well as heads of academic departments within his school.

The University of Illinois and the University of

Missouri also have administrative structures under which broadcast stations (and other service elements of the university's media facilities) are organized under the dean of the college of journalism or communication. At Missouri, the student newspaper, a community daily, is also administratively responsible to the dean.

Some administrators strongly disagree with this model, suggesting that having wide-ranging media operations under the journalism unit is clearly undesirable. At one time, university presses and printing operations also reported to the journalism unit. This is rarely true today.

Some schools use the student newspaper for laboratory experience for their students, while others opt for the independent student press model, which is distinctive and separate from the journalism/mass communication unit.

If there is an ideal structure, it is the one that works for a particular department or school within the confines of its own campus environment. It is a structure that allows the journalism/mass communication unit to carry out its educational mission—which includes teaching, service and research—in the most supportive and efficient way. It means getting a fair share of the resources of the university, enough to carry out with competence the programs offered in the journalism/mass communication unit. And, one hopes, a byproduct of an ideal structure is prestige and status within the university and outside. Naturally, this should be determined by the quality of the program, the faculty and the students as well as such factors as alumni achievement and professional relationships. But none of these can truly flourish in a structural arrangement that strangles the journalism unit, treats it like a step-child or prohibits its members even in a de facto fashion from full participation in the leadership ranks of the institution.

Clearly the dream of an ideal administrative structure is a notion that sparked many responses, but just as clearly those responses were fuzzy when it came to specifics. The responses suggest that the "ideal" administrative structure of a journalism/mass communication unit must take into account at least two elements. First, the curriculum itself may dictate certain systems with needs for specialists in curriculum, academic planning, advising, institutional policy, and outside aspects such as internships and relations with local media.

Second, the structure must fit within the framework of the host institution. There are clear advantages to an independent unit from the

standpoint of resource management, control of curriculum and selection of students and faculty.

The "ideal" administrative structure of a journalism/mass communication unit could not be identified from the survey. But the survey does suggest that such a structure is an important element of the educational process that has received too little systematic study in the past and that many administrators would welcome a new choice of models that might be applicable to their unique situations.

Our analysis suggests that either our survey instrument did not clearly present the issues to the journalism/mass communication administrators or that had many given little thought to the distinction between how a journalism/mass communication should be structured as opposed to how it should be administered.

The Goals of Journalism/Mass Communication Education

What do journalism/mass communication deans and chairpersons see as their primary charge? The survey, not surprisingly, found strong agreement that undergraduate education is the number-one goal. The following two tables illustrate the responses of educators asked to rate the traditional functions of journalism/mass communication education in terms of their own schools.

Please rank the following functions of journalism/mass communication education in terms of their relative current importance in your program. (1 = top rank, 5 = bottom)

Rating (averaged)	Function
1.1	Undergraduate education
2.6	Graduate education
3.1	Service to communication industries/constituencies
3.5	Advancement of knowledge through research
4.2	Continuing/midcareer education

Function	1	2	3	4	5
Undergraduate education	74	2	0	0	0
Graduate education	7	41	10	5	9
Service to industry, etc.	1	18	27	24	3
Research	3	3	29	21	11
Continuing mid-career education	0	4	10	23	35

They provided nothing to suggest that undergraduate education will not remain the most vital element of American journalism/mass communication schools. About one-half of the respondents, in fact, said they were not inclined to change this situ-

ation in the future. Some faculties have seriously debated whether journalism education is more appropriately a graduate or undergraduate endeavor.

Whether journalism/mass communication education should be conducted at the graduate or undergraduate level has long been the subject of debate within the field. Although the field began as an undergraduate endeavor, Columbia, one of the most prestigious schools, dropped its undergraduate program in 1935, opting for a one-year professional master's. The University of California at Berkeley also operates in this mode. Most schools have both undergraduate programs and professional master's or theoretically oriented master's or doctoral degrees. The professional master's is more in the tradition of the M.B.A. degree with an emphasis on professional development for a specific career role in the communication field. The more theoretically oriented master's emphasizes research and conceptual knowledge of the field over professional practice. Some persons in these programs continued to study for the Ph.D., but most enter the communications field in a wide variety of assignments.

Open-ended comments from the deans and chairpersons, however, indicate a strong interest in strengthening three areas. Increased involvement in midcareer and continuing education sparked significant interest. As Mark Popovich, chairman of the Journalism Department at Ball State University, put it, "I would hope our professionals would continue to seek knowledge and stay abreast of everyday happenings. Our journalism schools should be able to show them how to continue to do so. Our schools should be retreats for our professionals when they get 'burned out' and when they seek career changes within the profession."

There was also interest in increasing emphasis on graduate education and on the research component of undergraduate education. It is significant to note that only one educator saw the need to actively increase the emphasis on involvement with the community and with professionals.

This last finding could suggest one of three things. There is already significant involvement with the community. Educators do not consider this to be an important function of their schools. Or, educators have been turned off for one reason or another by their experiences in this area. The area clearly deserves some follow-up.

Program Mission: Unique Characteristics

The functions of an individual journalism/mass communication program are related, of course, to

the clientele and to the constituency served. It is also connected to the school's mandate, especially its geographic mandate. A school that sees itself as international in its orientation does different things than a school that sees itself mainly serving the vocational training needs of a local community. Geographic mandate is also related strongly to reputation. Various reputation studies conducted over the years by *Change Magazine* and other organizations concerned with journalism/mass communication schools' reputations either with educators or professionals invariably give highest marks to institutions that have national or international concerns, as opposed to those that serve a more limited area. Such ratings, of course, may have little to do with the present quality of a program. The flaws inherent in such studies are well-known.

With regard to their geographic mandate, those surveyed responded as indicated in the following table.

What is the primary geographical constituency of your program?

State	38 percent
Regional	28 percent
National	9 percent
Combination	25 percent

Each of the journalism/mass communication units surveyed was asked to describe the attributes that made its program unique because of the way it defines its mission. Few schools, it appears, could actually be described as unique.

Several programs believed they were unique because of their internships or "real world" programs. Others felt they were distinctive because of specialization in community journalism, international journalism, science and environmental reporting, agricultural reporting and urban reporting. Some programs stressed their "hands-on" programs made possible by on-campus newspapers, television stations and radio stations. Some mentioned their midcareer, continuing education, or research emphasis. Two mentioned their attention to theory and research. Two schools—Florida A&M at Tallahassee and Howard University—said they were distinctive because they emphasized the training of minority students.

The question becomes: What actually distinguishes a journalism/mass communication program? Although the survey suggests few schools are truly unique, the potential exists for schools to dis-

tinguish themselves in numerous areas. For example, a school such as the University of Oregon might well want to consider a program of environmental reporting. Oregon's natural resources and commitment to the environment make such a program appropriate. Northwestern with its Chicago location pioneered a program in urban journalism while Marquette has worked in religious journalism. Oregon is already developing coursework on the Pacific Rim and other schools might learn from this example. The original idea for such specialization can be traced back to Midwestern schools specializing in agricultural journalism that began half a century ago.

Faculty Interests, Qualification

Here survey data do not fully point up the lack of distinctiveness of most journalism/mass communication programs. Curricula are so similar in many schools as to be nearly interchangeable. While research interests of faculties often reflect distinctive personal interests or characteristics of the community where the university is located, there are relatively few specialized or unique programs that truly distinguish an individual journalism/mass communication program. When asked in more descriptive letters to identify unique characteristics of their program that truly distinguished it from others in the United States, few administrators could offer comment. One very frank answer simply said, "Nothing here is distinctive, unique or distinguishable from anything anywhere else."

Clearly this is an area that needs investigation. Does it mean that programs are nearly uniform and therefore not serving the special needs of their constituency? Or does it mean that "journalism is journalism," as one dean said, and that courses, philosophical orientation and faculty interests are rather homogeneous in the field? Here a full understanding of similarities and differences in various programs is essential. Obviously it is important for some commonality to exist; otherwise, there is no unified field of interest. At the same time, student needs, faculty interests, regional characteristics and other factors ought to operate to give any creative faculty and school a distinctive imprint, one that represents a particular approach to subject matter, offering of specialties, distinct methods of instruction or other factors.

An important attribute of journalism/mass communication education more easily identified than "unique" program aspects is that of faculty interests and qualifications. A key toward understanding the types of self-identified goals and missions of jour-

nalism education is likely to be found in the types of educators within the field. The typology below identifies the frequency of four categories of journalism/mass communication educator.

	Strong research interest	Weak research interest
Strong professional experience	.44	.40
Weak professional experience	.09	—

The remaining 7 percent were categorized under the type, "other." "Other" was variously self-described as having strong interests in continuing education, no experience to speak of but a good teacher, and, in one case, "outdated professional experience and no interest in research." The administrator who made this comment added, "If directors/chairs were candid, I think you would find similar problems in many programs."

One measure of journalism/mass communication education is to examine the categories of courses that have been added to programs over the last five years. Every school surveyed had added courses they described as conceptual in nature. This grouping included courses such as law of the press, women and media, ethics and international press systems.

In the skills/craft area, 70 schools added courses within the last five years. Many of these were in the area of broadcast and video technology such as electronic reporting and videotape editing.

While most of the new courses do not from their titles appear to be new or unique offerings on the national level, a few are worth special mention. There is no suggestion here that these courses mark the beginning of a trend. They do, however, indicate the acceptance at some schools that there are important craft and conceptual areas that need further attention. These courses included the following:

- Computer-based media planning
- Newspaper management
- Telecommunications policy
- Videotex, teletext, and new technologies
- Legal and social aspects of advertising
- Publishing and management of the media.

The addition of a few courses is not the only change apparent in journalism/mass communication programs over the past five years. The chart below indicates that every program had either made some changes or was in the process of doing so.

What (if any) changes has your program undergone in the past five years?

None	0	0%
Complete restructuring	9	11%
Major curriculum reform	33	40%
Addition of new sequences or major units	38	46%
New courses for new areas	52	63%
Partial or modest restructuring	6	7%
Other	14	17%
No changes yet, but they're planned	4	5%

The survey did not provide a definitive answer as to what motivated the various changes, but some indicators were identified. A number of programs cited the requirements for accreditation as their motive for instituting change. For some schools this meant reducing the number of journalism classes required for graduation while in others there was a need to increase such offerings. The responses from five of the schools are especially noteworthy. The University of Minnesota developed a new curriculum that has both competency training and conceptual components that are generic in nature, moving away from the traditional industry-oriented sequence structure. In the professional area, rather than training students specifically in newspaper reporting in the early phases of the academic program, students instead get courses in developing media messages, and information gathering. Conceptual courses emphasize the common thread of law, history and ethics through case study courses.

Although it is not yet a discernible trend, there is clearly interest in the journalism/mass communication schools in moving away from the sequence model, which emphasizes the current communications industries by treating the distinctive elements of each without much interchange between them. As the communication field has become more cohesive due to technological change resulting in a singular electronically based computer-driven system, the common elements between the various delivery devices (newspapers, magazines, cable, etc.) seem to demand interactive educational treatment. There is little clear thinking about this yet, but certainly it is on the minds of educational administrators and their faculties in the journalism/mass communication schools. The University of Texas, Austin, reported that it is preparing to drop its use of traditional sequences in favor of a curriculum to prepare students to work with new and evolving information-delivery systems. Such responses indicate a recognition that the traditional model of journalism/mass communication involving sequences

in areas such as advertising, public relations, news-editorial and broadcasting may no longer be sufficient to deal with the technological, industrial and social changes with which students must be prepared to deal. Iowa State reported that it is incorporating more audio and visual material into its basic coursework, again in recognition that in many ways print and broadcast media appear to be merging. It is important to note here, however, a contradiction between the survey responses and data that may be obtained from reading catalogs and course descriptions. Although 33 schools reported undergoing major curriculum reform, the actual number is probably much lower than that. This is probably a definitional problem. It appears that many schools defined "major curriculum reform" as the addition of courses in traditional areas such as broadcasting and news/editorial. There is little in the catalogue descriptions to suggest that a significant number of schools have actually gone through a significant metamorphosis. The industrial model is still the rule and, while there are many more courses available today than there were a decade or two ago, the emphasis remains on entry-level-skill acquisition.

Colorado State University at Fort Collins was representative of a national problem when it reported a reduction of its service-course offerings because student demand exceeded the ability of the department to provide such coursework. The heavy dependence of programs on high enrollment figures to justify resources coupled with the scarcity of such resources, even with large enrollments, may well be a major problem. Clearly there are two possible solutions. The first requires increased funding. Since state legislatures seem unlikely to provide significant financial increases in the near future, journalism/mass communication schools may have to rely more on financial contributions from the industry. This will require a serious change in the pattern the mass communications industry now follows.

Educational Innovations: Technology

Many schools were in agreement when it came to identifying the major innovations in journalism/mass communication education over the past ten years. Courses dealing with technology ranked as the primary innovation. What was not clear from the responses was just what was meant by technology. Many appeared simply to be referring to the use of hardware such as VDTs for editing and copywriting and video equipment in broadcast labs. While students must be introduced to the hardware they will encounter professionally, few responses indicated that the exploration of technology has found its way into conceptual courses that explore the impact and meaning of such systems on the society and the communications profession.

Although there may be some rare pockets of innovation, the administrators we contacted seemed distressed and perplexed by technological changes in the communication industry. Some responded by lamenting their inability to keep up with the hardware in the field. Others said they feared becoming too technologically bound to the detriment of other concerns of the journalism/mass communication school. What was clearly lacking was any sophisticated effort to distinguish communication industry technology and that affecting mass communicators from technological studies elsewhere in the University. There was a similar inability to itemize the need for students to know and understand the impact of technology in a variety of conceptual courses that could be linked effectively to coursework elsewhere in the university curriculum.

Some schools did have some emphasis on the uses of technology and were trying to give their students the rudiments of "hands-on" experience necessary for survival in entry-level jobs.

There is relatively little computer-assisted instruction in the journalism schools, almost no concern with access to data bases. There is much more interest in administrative uses of computers for office operations among administrators.

Ten programs pointed to the teaching of media management courses as innovative additions to journalism/mass communication education. And a number of respondents indicated agreement with attempts to knock down the walls between communication-research and craft courses, such as the program now being instituted at Texas. On the other hand, Temple University responded that "the separation of professional sequences...is the most important thing to happen professionally. To the detriment of some programs, too much emphasis has been placed on theory in the undergraduate programs."

Journalism/Mass Communication: The Future

The journalism/mass communication deans and chairpersons surveyed were asked to address the future as well as the present. Two specific concerns were addressed in an open-ended format. First, if things like money were not a problem, what changes would the educators like to see implemented at their own schools, and, finally, what changes would educators like to see generally for journalism/mass communication education.

The ten most frequent responses for the in-house wish list are categorized below. Clearly the need to lighten the teaching loads of faculty and to find resources to modernize journalism/mass communication schools are top priorities.

Desired changes

Change	Frequency
More equipment	35
Reduced faculty load/more faculty	32
Money for research, travel and salary increases	23
Additional courses	16
New buildings	16
Student newspaper, television and radio stations	9
Graduate education	9
Expansion of existing programs	9
Student internships and exchange programs	8
Midcareer opportunities	7

What changes would deans and chairpersons like to see generally for journalism/mass communication education in the United States? The educators provided varied responses, but it is not difficult to identify an underlying theme. The quality of journalism/mass communication education needs improvement. What tasks are involved in accomplishing such a goal?

The quality of students is one element that received comment. Both Stanford and the University of Arkansas favor reducing student enrollments. Similarly, Dean Albert T. Scroggins at the University of South Carolina said, "I would support fewer schools but better ones." Two elements are inherent in the discussion of enrollments and schools. First, there is a possibility that because resources are pegged directly to enrollment in most cases, journalism/mass communication schools have opened their doors wider than they should. The journalism major has continued to grow in popularity since the late 1960s, yet neither educational resources nor the job market has kept pace. And second, there is the ultimate question of quality. Faculty have taken on tremendous teaching loads in addition to university service, community and research responsibilities. Can the quality of teaching remain high when faculty are pushed to their limits?

Interest in changing or updating the primary charge of journalism/mass communication education also was evident in the survey responses. Many referred to the need to meet the challenges not only of journalism as we have known it, but of the information society that is now in only its infancy.

Professor Sandra Ernst Moriarty at Michigan State University commented extensively on the problem. Essentially, Moriarty said that changes in technology have implications far greater than the need to teach students to work on video display terminals. "It will take a massive educational ef-

fort," she said, "to move people from being passive viewers to sorters and selectors. New courses will be taught to use extensive data banks just as we learn (poorly) to use libraries. Media courses will focus on such skills as "how to find out what you want to know" or "how to master the media." A course in news information will be "a service course and part of the general education curriculum."

Moriarty sees a broadening of skills that must be delivered to journalism/mass communication majors in the future. "Majors will be a combination of reporters/librarians/data processors. Information majors will take courses in information processing, logic and management of large-scale databanks."

Many educators were not displeased with what is now taught but saw the need for additional work in substantive areas such as media management, community media and financial reporting.

And finally, an old problem for journalism/mass communication once again surfaced. What is the proper balance among scientific method, theory construction, conceptual courses and craft courses? While some complained that there was too much attention to theory, others, such as E.P. Bettinghaus, dean of the College of Communication Arts and Sciences at Michigan State, said that we need to do more basic work with a goal of identifying and explaining the basic elements of the communi-

cation process. "I think that the broadest term that we can use," Bettinghaus said, "is 'information' and I think I see more and more work which asks very basic questions about information, and forms postulates and statements about information." Bettinghaus did not denigrate the need for continued excellence in traditional craft areas. But he is representative of those who see the need to expand the traditional focus in a systematic manner.

The surveys did not provide a detailed blueprint for the journalism/mass communication educational program of the future. But they did raise a very central issue. How will journalism/mass communication make the transition into the information age? The question is far from premature. The technology is already upon us. While a few leaders are at least cognizant of the problem, little has been done to grapple with either the conceptual or practical ramifications of an information society. In some ways, journalism/mass communicators are getting a late start in dealing with the information-age concept. Yet it is clear that much of the educational response to the inherent elements of an information society must and should come from those who traditionally have been involved in journalism and mass communication. Although all of the problems are yet to be identified, clearly we are at a point at which new programs must be put into effect, programs that can deal with the educational needs of both students and the society as a whole.

IV. View from the professoriate

Formal surveys with administrators who can report accurately on their institutions are of course valuable. Yet, the Project Team also wanted input from at least two other university groups. The opinions of journalism and mass communication professors naturally were of interest. Also queried, however, were university scholars concerned about mass communication studies, especially from a research perspective, who teach outside of the formal framework of journalism and mass communication departments and school.

Letters aimed at eliciting opinions, views, suggestions and projections about the field were sent to both groups of professors — a list of more than 100 from the journalism/mass communication programs and of about 40 from other (related) fields.

Instead of sending a systematic questionnaire to a highly select universe of scholar/teachers, we decided to try to engage them in a written dialogue that could produce thoughtful and creative results. This proved to be the case.

The letters from the two groups are rich and varied. The rate of return was high — more than 70 percent — and people took on the assignment with gusto. Some wrote a few paragraphs; others wrote several pages. What unfolded was a useful critique of the field with many helpful suggestions about planning for the future.

Scholars in other fields

Many important contributions to our understanding of journalism and mass communications have come from outside journalism/mass communication schools and the industries themselves. The literature contains many contributions from scholars in American Studies, Sociology, Economics and other diverse disciplines.

A purposeful sample of these scholars was contacted based on the identification of work they have done related to journalism/mass communication. Their names are "household words" in the journalism/mass communication schools, but they are not themselves faculty members in such programs. We asked our faculty at Oregon and selected faculty members elsewhere to submit names for inclusion, and the list finally was narrowed to 40 persons. Of the 40 nationally prominent scholars we contacted, 37 responded — although several had no specific substantive information to suggest to us. Some were even surprised to learn that their work was widely used in journalism/mass communication programs.

Each person received a letter acknowledging his or her "role" in our field and requesting a response to several questions.

The intent was not that they would provide a comprehensive view of journalism/mass communication education, but rather that they would — as contributors to our field — have useful views about the education and training of media people.

A primary theme running through the scholars' responses is one of concern for what political scientist Bernard Hennessy, the author of the most widely used public opinion book in the field, described as a "classic liberal arts" education. Hennessy's notion of such a program includes a dual major in literature and history. "At Syracuse University Journalism School," Hennessy said, "I had a course on type faces; the next semester as an English major I had courses in Chaucer and Milton. I was 23 years old and I needed to follow the argument of *Areopagitica* much more than I needed to know about Bodoni Bold."

Many of the scholars readily admitted that more work is needed in basic language skills. Yet, as a group, they did not appear to sense that the best training for young people seeking careers in journalism and other mass media industries should to a great extent involve the traditional offerings of journalism skills-acquisition coursework. Consistently, there were calls for reduced emphasis on journalism classes and greater emphasis on studying the liberal arts such as economics, history, literature, business and political science.

Leo Bogart, a pioneer in mass communications research and now Executive Vice President and General Manager of the Newspaper Advertising Bureau, Inc., said, "I would be inclined to reduce the communication-journalism 25 percent share of the undergraduate curriculum to 15 percent and to substitute composition, literature and social science."

Others expressed sentiments similar to Bogart's. Benjamin Compaine is Executive Director for the Program on Information Resources Policy at Harvard University. His comments deserved significant analysis.

It is my view that in an increasingly complex world, the most important education for prospective journalists is an understanding of how to think, how to analyze and how to express themselves. Most, if not all of this, can be