

## A New Year, A Continued Focus

The communication discipline shifts and redefines itself with each passing year. We revisit venerable theories, study new phenomena, and find new circumstances under which communication processes may or may not sustain themselves. The annual AEJMC conference provides an ideal venue for discussions of academic concerns and ideas. Certainly, those four days re-invigorate us as we enter another year of teaching, service, and scholarship.

That revitalization can make it difficult to remember that much happens outside those four days in a warm climate. Our professional work reaches important audiences on a regular basis, whether it be 300 undergraduates in a lecture course, four graduate students in a weekly research group, or our peers in e-mail conversations. We sometimes think about these audiences as disparate and, as such, tailor our messages to each. However, the commonality undergirding those messages is a passion about our work that cannot, and should not, be denied.

I invite all CT&M members to share their enthusiasm—both for their respective areas and the field

---

By  
**Patricia Moy**  
Division Head  
University of Washington

---

in general—and continue working toward the division's research, teaching, and professional freedom and responsibility missions. Our goals this year represent the core of our professional activities:

- **Research:** To advance discussion, understanding, and integration of various subfields of communication theory and methodology.
- **Teaching:** To provide tools for enhancing the teaching of communication theory and methodology courses, and to aid graduate students in their socialization into academic life.
- **Professional Freedom & Responsibility:** To encourage movement of scholarly research toward the realm of public scholarship, in which data and ideas are made accessible for non-academics.

These goals are particularly

salient as we find ourselves in the midst of heightened political, social, and cultural tensions. The domestic and international contexts in which these differences emerge offer numerous frameworks for the study of communication. More importantly, they afford us crucial opportunities to begin dialogues and contribute significantly to the world around us.

But the dialogue should begin at home. If you have any ideas or concerns, please share them with me, our leadership team noted below, and/or members of the CT&M listserv. □

**Share your thoughts  
about our discipline  
with other CT&M  
members by using the  
listserv e-mail:**

[ctm-discussion@journalism.wisc.edu](mailto:ctm-discussion@journalism.wisc.edu)

**Join the CT&M  
"Syllabus Exchange"**  
Send your syllabus to  
William "Chip" Eveland at  
[eveland.6@osu.edu](mailto:eveland.6@osu.edu).

**Division Head:**  
Patricia Moy, University of Washington

**Vice Head:**  
Dietram A. Scheufele, Cornell University

**Research/Program Chair:**  
Glenn Leshner, University of Missouri

**Executive Committee:**  
Erik P. Bucy, Indiana University  
Glenn Leshner, University of Missouri  
Pat Meirick, University of Oklahoma  
Lara Zwarun, University of Texas at Arlington

**Teaching Standards Chair:**  
Michael McDevitt, University of Colorado

**PF&R Chair:**  
Matthew C. Nisbet, The Ohio State University

**Newsletter Editor:**  
María E. Len-Ríos, University of Kansas

**Immediate Past Division Head:**  
William "Chip" Eveland, The Ohio State University

# Zero-Sum Game?

## Balancing Service, Teaching, and Research

---

By  
**Dietram A. Scheufele**  
Division Vice Head  
Cornell University

---

**R**esearch, service and teaching are the three areas that most academics at least pay lip service to in their professional careers. But everybody would probably also admit that in reality the three do not always go hand in hand, and that we often compromise our commitments to service for the sake of research or teaching and vice versa.

That does not mean, however, that balancing teaching, service and research is a zero-sum game. There are those rare instances where research, service and teaching complement each other. As a division, we should probably do some thinking on how to create more innovative ideas that tap into the synergies that can come from combining the three areas in our daily work.

I was exposed to the interplay between teaching, research, and service for the first time as a graduate student at Wisconsin working on Jack McLeod's community survey. It was one of the few classes I took in graduate school where the practice of teaching and research came together in a single course and where the outcome was a research project that provided information both about and for the community.

Since coming to Cornell, I have designed a research methods course that follows a similar model. It is based on a collaboration between the local newspaper and my course in *Industry Research Methods*. It originated from the perception that public discourse in Tompkins County and the Ithaca area, in particular, is often uninformed and dominated by a small, vocal minority. Other views are usually crowded out in public discourse. And when it comes to scientific controversies, such as a recent vote on fluoridation of drink-

ing water, credible scientific information is not widely distributed and citizens rely mostly on heuristic cues.

This survey therefore taps levels of support for various issues that are relevant to our community among all citizens. It assesses what the public knows and how it feels about these issues. It not only informs public discussion, but it also helps policymakers tailor their decisions toward the larger public rather than a very vocal and highly visible minority.

As outlined earlier, the survey brings together three groups: academics, local media, and the community. The students in the course conduct a survey with a probability sample of about 700-800 citizens on important issues in our community. Issues in the past have included civil rights, fluoridation of drinking water, and the environmental risks of mall expansions in the community.

*(Zero-Sum - Continued on p. 5)*

## Teaching Methods as a Bridge Between Qualitative and Quantitative Research

---

By  
**Michael McDevitt**  
Teaching Standards Chair  
University of Colorado

---

**C**ontroversy about the FCC's regulation offers an opening for mass communication scholars to address issues of public interest. This policy debate may represent a historic opportunity for us to show the value and relevance of our research to our communities and our students. But as someone who has straddled the fence between quantitative and qualitative methods, I'm not sure that we as a scholarly community have been

effective in structuring the debate on this question. Critical perspectives on deliberative democracy are certainly prominent in critiques of ownership concentration, but such viewpoints are arguably more effective when backed up by systemic evidence.

As this year's Teaching Standards Chair, I invite you to discuss how to devise curriculum that effectively combines qualitative and quantitative methods. And borrowing from our friends in the Civic Journalism Interest Group, I'd also like us to consider teaching innovations that center instruction on problems in our local communities.

(See Scheufele article.)

No matter where your interests lie, I welcome your suggestions for panels, pre-conference seminars, online discussions, or other forums about the teaching of theory and methods.

I have some preliminary ideas. For example, I'd like to supplement our division's online syllabi exchange with a "Best Practices" section for teaching theory and methods. But my first goal is to get suggestions from CT&M members. Please contact me with your ideas.

□

## Looking Ahead to Toronto: A Request for Teaching and PF&R Panel Proposals

Program planning for the 2004 AEJMC meeting is already under way, and we are seeking your suggestions for panels in the areas of Teaching and Professional Freedom & Responsibility (PF&R).

If you are new to the division, or haven't been involved with organizing a panel in the past, you probably have questions about how the process works. By November 1 each division and interest group submits a group of panel proposals to AEJMC. The association then sends out a combined list of proposed panels across all divisions to each of the division officers. The various divisions and interest groups officers then negotiate co-sponsorship of panels, cutting down the number of panels to a workable number. Then, at the mid-winter AEJMC meeting in early December, the panels are fit into slots in the conference program based on the number of "chips" each division wants to devote to given types of conference programming. After this meeting, the speakers for each surviving panel

---

By  
**Matthew C. Nisbet**  
PF&R Chair  
The Ohio State University  
**Michael McDevitt**  
Teaching Standards Chair  
University of Colorado

---

are confirmed, and the panels composed of competitive research papers are finalized based on the peer review process.

We welcome your ideas on panels in the areas of Teaching (curriculum; leadership; course content and teaching methods; and assessment) and PF&R (free expression; ethics; media criticism and accountability; racial, gender, and cultural inclusiveness; and public service). We can't guarantee that every panel idea will ultimately be adopted, but sending your ideas along will definitely help in putting together a roster of panels that reflects the interests and strengths of our division.

If you would like to propose a panel, please send the following information:

- 1) An indication of which area (Teaching or PF&R) the panel covers;
- 2) A brief title for the session;
- 3) A paragraph describing the intended content of the session;
- 4) Suggestions about specific people who might be able to serve on the panel; and
- 5) Suggestions for divisions or interest groups who might consider co-sponsoring the panel with us. (Almost all CT&M panels are co-sponsored.)

Please send all PF&R panel proposals to Matt Nisbet at [nisbet.4@osu.edu](mailto:nisbet.4@osu.edu), and all Teaching panel proposals to Mike McDevitt at [michael.mcdevitt@colorado.edu](mailto:michael.mcdevitt@colorado.edu) by October 25, 2003 in order to have them considered for the 2004 conference. □

### For descriptions of what PF&R means, go to:

<http://aejmc.org/about/PF&R.html>

### For information on teaching standards, go to:

<http://aejmc.org/orgs/TScriteria.html>

## Great Ideas for Teaching Theory ...Or At Least Ones Worth Trying

---

By  
**Anne Cooper-Chen**  
Ohio University

---

As I write this, Ohio U. has been in session for three weeks. Already in J803 Mass Communication Theory, we have covered most of Severin & Tankard (2001), part of Shoemaker & Reese (1996) and the first set of

journal articles—sensory overload for new (and even slightly used) grad students. In my class of 14, only one person is a School of Journalism Ph.D. student who might "make a living from" theory. For MSJ students headed for the professional world and the Ph.D. students from outside the J School, here are some classroom techniques that seem to bring concepts alive and may even elicit the comment

that the "theory is fun."

**\*Redundancy/entropy (Cloze procedure):** Give each student a Post-it® note to set in the right margin of a passage that discusses—what else?—redundancy. Cover up the last letter of each line, and all will still be able to read the passage. Voila—redundancy ("wasted" letters)! Move the Post-it® far-

(GIFTT - Continued on p. 4)

# CT&M-sponsored Panel at MAPOR to Address Journalists and Polls

By  
**Matthew C. Nisbet**  
PF&R Chair  
The Ohio State University

**A**s originally founded, the goal of CT&M was and still is to advance the study of communication through theory-based, methodologically sound research. Though other divisions of AEJMC are also involved in communication research, no other division emphasizes and allots as much of its conference programming to research.

Given the focus of CT&M, the division can play a unique role in its sponsorship of Professional, Freedom, & Responsibility programming by connecting this important AEJMC theme to research. In line with what was initiated last year, I have been working with Division Head Patricia

Moy to organize CT&M sponsored panels at other research conferences that CT&M and AEJMC members often attend, freeing up additional space on the AEJMC conference program for more CT&M-sponsored research panels.

Our first out-of-conference panel will be at the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research (MAPOR) meeting in Chicago in November. To address "Media Accountability and Criticism," CT&M has organized a panel on "Building Public Trust in Survey Research," featuring David Weaver (Indiana), Michael Traugott (Michigan) and Gerald Kosicki (Ohio State).

These panelists will address challenges facing journalists and their reporting of polls. Specifically, what can we as journalists, scholars, and teachers do to rehabilitate the public image of

polling? How can we promote both public trust and understanding of survey research? Beyond these efforts at public engagement, do real changes in technology as well as other factors pose serious challenges to the validity and future of polling?

For the "Public Service" component of PF&R, we are proposing a panel for ICA on the topic of public scholarship, featuring leading researchers in the field who have also served as leading public scholars.

Although we continue to develop good ideas, we welcome your ideas and participation in organizing panels at AEJMC or at other conferences. (See the call for proposed panels in this newsletter.) We also welcome your submissions of newsletter articles that emphasize PF&R areas. □

*(GIFTT - Continued from p. 3)*

ther to the left. Still OK. Keep going until the passage is unintelligible.

**\*Schema:** Copy a black-and-white photo of a famous person such as Princess Diana on the darkest copier setting. Students will be able to identify her even from the oversimplified outlines. Explain that information overload requires people to retain just the basic outlines of a concept, event, ethnicity, etc. as a coping device.

**\*Information Processing Theory:** Have 12 students count off 1 A, B; 2 A, B...up to 6 A, B. Arrange it so student 3A is a speaker of a language other than English. All the A's are the stoppers; they do nothing. All the B's are the movers; they respond. Create a message that

aims to change attitudes AND behavior, like "Give blood." The steps in McGuire's (1968) theory hold that a message must be 1) communicated; 2) attended to; 3) comprehended; 4) yielded to; 5) remembered; and 6) acted upon. Have person 2A pretend to fall asleep. Have person 3A say "Give blood" in another language. Finally, have person 6B pretend to give blood.

**\*Source credibility/ sleeper effect:** Tell half the students they are watching talk show A and half, talk show B. The topic of both is "Islam Today." Have group A name a high-credibility source; have group B name a low-credibility source (Britney Spears?). Explain that as time passes, the two talk show audiences will disassociate source and message.

**\*Opinion leadership:** The two-step flow may be dated in terms of voting, but it can be illustrated by asking students why they read a recent fictional work, since most decisions about books to read come from recommendations of other people. See if the recommenders fit the qualities of classic opinion leaders: same SES, trusted, has contacts outside the group.

**Help.** Who else has classroom exercises to which students respond? After all, says McGuire, we first must gain our students' attention or the message about the usefulness of theory will stop dead. □

**Please submit your teaching ideas for the next newsletter to Maria Len-Rios at [mlenrios@ku.edu](mailto:mlenrios@ku.edu).**

# The American Journalist in the 21st Century

By

David Weaver  
Randal Beam  
Bonnie Brownlee  
Paul Voakes\*  
G. Cleveland Wilhoit  
Indiana University

This first look at key findings from the main sample of 1,149 mainstream U.S. journalists interviewed during the summer and fall of 2002 suggests that in a time of increasing change and uncertainty, U.S. journalists are showing signs of increased professionalism. Compared with the last study done in 1992, we find more college graduates, better compensation, increased job satisfaction, and somewhat increased endorsement of the journalistic roles of investigating government claims, analyzing complex problems, and being skeptical of business actions.

Other signs of increased journalistic professionalism during the past decade include less emphasis on the entertainment role and less willingness to justify employment to gain inside information, to use personal documents without permission, to pose as someone else, to use hidden microphones or cameras, and to disclose the names of rape victims.

Journalists also continued to regard journalistic training as the greatest influence on their news values, and a majority thought that the quality of journalism has been rising steadily at their news organizations. Nearly three-fourths thought that producing journalism of high quality was very important to their owners or senior managers, and a majority disagreed that profits are a higher priority than good journalism at their news organizations.

But this study suggests there are still problems in recruiting younger people to journalism, attracting and retaining women and minorities, and dealing with shrinking newsroom resources. More than three-fourths of journalists think that their owners and senior managers consider above-average profits and large audience size as quite or extremely important, and a slim majority agree that at their news organizations newsroom resources have been shrinking over the past few years.

The findings that we report here come from 50-minute telephone interviews with 1,149 journalists working full time for a wide variety of daily and weekly newspapers, radio and television stations, wire services, and newsmagazines throughout the United States. These interviews were conducted from July 12 to Nov. 30, 2002. The study was funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

Journalists in the main random sample of 1,149 included 571 daily newspaper journalists, 179 from weekly or less than daily newspapers, 163 from television stations and networks, 105 from radio, 69 from the wire services, and 62 from newsmagazines.

The authors are working on a book reporting these findings in much more detail that will be published by Erlbaum, hopefully in the summer of 2004, under the title, *The American Journalist in the 21st Century*. This forthcoming book builds on the major national surveys of U.S. journalists begun in 1971 by sociologist John Johnstone (*The News People*) and continued in 1982 (*The American Journalist*) and 1992 (*The American Journalist*

**For more detailed findings, go to:**

[http://www.poynter.org/content/content\\_view.asp?id=28235](http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=28235)

in the 1990s) by journalism professors David Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit of Indiana University. □

\*Paul Voakes was at Indiana University at the time of the study and is now at the University of Colorado.

**(Zero-Sum - Continued from p. 2)**

The intriguing part about this survey is that the community is informed about all the steps along the way. That means the *Ithaca Journal* covers the research process in a series of articles leading up to the reporting of the final results. It usually runs a short article on interviewing, on the issue itself, and also on the pros and cons of polling. The goal of this continuing coverage is to inform and involve the community as much as possible and to stimulate discourse among different groups in the community.

All of our polls have done that. In fact, the conclusions that the *Ithaca Journal* drew based on our findings were as hotly debated as the methodology. This included the initial coverage as well as letters to the editor that followed the publication of some of our poll results and discussions of our results in Common Council meetings.

In sum, this survey is explicitly designed as an impact survey, i.e., as a project that brings together academia, the community, and local media to stimulate and inform public discourse about science-related and environmental issues. In other words, it is designed to make a difference or at the very least create the discursive environment that allows for informed change to take place. □

# Deliberating Teaching Evaluations: A Report From AEJMC '03

By

**Glenn Leshner**

Research/Program Chair  
University of Missouri–Columbia

**C**T&M co-sponsored several Teaching Panels during the 2003 annual conference.

One of the most energetic was the panel co-sponsored with GEIG, the Graduate Education Interest Group, titled, "Evaluating student evaluations." The panelists were Tamara Baldwin (Southeast Missouri State University), Mary Ann Ferguson (U. of Florida), Doug McLeod (U. of Wisconsin–Madison), Lana Rakow (U. of North Dakota), and Lee Wilkins (U. of Missouri–Columbia). Even though this panel was scheduled on the last day in the afternoon, 20 people attended and were treated to a lively discussion about the value of teaching evaluations.

The panelists represented a broad range of universities and experiences, from teaching institutions to large research universities, and from faculty who served as administrators to members of department and university promotion and tenure committees. The range of perspectives available on the panel was impressive.

The first part of the panel was dominated by the problems of teaching evals (which prompts to "evil" in my spell checker), including the lack of validity of the measures, the timing of the data collection, and the susceptibility to student vengeance. Also discussed was how administrators use evaluations to evaluate faculty members's contributions. Included were some "horror stories" some of us may be familiar with when teaching evaluations are used in ways for which

they are inadequate.

The second part of the panel focused on the value of teaching evaluations as a way to foster better teaching and self-reflection. Ways identified for which evaluations could inform teaching included: suggestions on course content, ways for communicating with students, enhanced assignments, etc.

There were numerous questions and comments from a diverse audience, ranging from graduate students to senior faculty. The general consensus was that great care must be used in interpreting student evaluations and in understanding the context in which they were obtained. When used appropriately, faculty can generally learn something from evaluations about how to improve their courses and their teaching. □

## Up Front: Studying Strength of Association with Anti-Drugs Ads

By

**Carson B Wagner**

University of Texas–Austin

**S. Shyam Sundar**

Penn State University  
2003 Top Faculty Paper  
Winners

**W**e know that anti-drug ads can be recalled, the knowledge they impart can be remembered, and the negative attitudes to which they contribute can be later expressed, but unfortunately we know far less about whether ad-induced attitudes will automatically activate to guide behavior in drug-taking situations.

Strength-of-association (SOA) measures assess attitude activation unobtrusively, and so, especially where social desirability and situational norms are methodological concerns, they predict behavior better than self-reported attitudes. However, despite presenting ad types best suited for affecting SOA—those that simply stress an association between drugs and negativity—prior research has failed to demonstrate SOA change. One possibility is that viewing conditions may critically affect SOA differences by influencing the nature of information processing.

Theoretically, ad viewing styles

that focus the viewer on drug/negative associations as opposed to encouraging them to scrutinize the ads would have a more favorable effect on SOA. The study reported

*(Up Front - Continued on p. 7)*



**Above:** Carson B Wagner prepares to present the top faculty paper at the Best of CT&M panel in Kansas City, 2003.

# Top Student Paper Winner Concentrates on Methodology



By  
**Li Cai**

2003 Top Student Paper Winner  
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill

**M**y research in quantitative methods while at the Ohio State University focused on two major areas: 1) consequences of assumption violations in general linear models and the development and application of robust methods, and 2) the development of computer programs to facilitate the use of resampling-based tests, especially a permutation-based statistic called the Multi-response Permutation Procedure (MRPP; Mielke, Berry, & Johnson, 1976).

My interest in both areas were inspired and heavily influenced by my advisor Dr. Andrew Hayes. We collaborated on several research projects, and coauthored at least two papers, both of which are under review. Apart from statistical work, I also collaborated in a research project headed by Dr. Chip Eveland. My thesis project, part of which presented at the 2003 AEJMC conference in Kansas City, grew out of an intercoder reliability assessment problem we encountered in that particular project. Because there was no immediately available solution at hand, I tried to tackle the problem by using the

MRPP framework that I had been studying for a while. And luckily, it seemed that I arrived at a solution. It has intuitive appeal because it is actually a kappa-type measure of intercoder agreement. With the encouragement and approval from my examination committee, I was able to move forward and produce the paper which I submitted to AEJMC before the completion of my thesis.

After graduating from Ohio State, I moved to the University of North Carolina. I am at present a first year doctoral student in the L. L. Thurstone Psychometric Lab of the Department of Psychology. In addition to my previous research interests, I now have a growing interest in variance components models, covariance structure models with latent variables, and psychological measurement. Right now I am undertaking a research project comparing the behavior of maximum likelihood, ordinary least squares, and alpha factor analysis methods in the presence of model error under the direction of Dr. Robert MacCallum. □

Mielke, P. W., Berry, K. J., & Johnson, E. S. (1976). Multi-response permutation procedures for *a priori* classifications. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, *A5*, 1409-1424.

(Up Front - Continued from p. 6)

in our paper, “Automatic Activation of Drug Attitudes: Anti-Drug Ad Viewing Styles and Strength of Association” investigates this possibility by manipulating viewers’ motivation and opportunity. Unmotivated viewers and those who were asked to remember phone numbers during the ads watched more passively than participants who were motivated and did not perform a secondary task. The results have considerable theoretical and practical implications.

Most persuasion theories recommend grabbing viewer attention and making strong, memorable arguments about the dangers of drugs, and anti-drug ad producers strive to do so. However, in our study, those who viewed the ads less effortfully showed significantly more negative SOA. This is probably because theory and practice are built around self-report measures that rely on conveying specific messages, whereas SOA assesses cognitive associations that are automatic rather than controlled. As strong associations directly influence perception and behavior, changing SOA is likely to be more predictive of behavior change than simply changing self-reported attitudes, even though such SOA change is achieved under conditions of low cognitive involvement. □

## Keeping Current

**Raymond Ankney** has published a new book titled *The Influence of Communication Technologies on Political Participation and Social Interaction* with Mellen Press.

**Katherine McComas** and **Craig W. Trumbo** are working on a grant from the Decision, Risk and Management Sciences division of the National Science Foundation to examine risk communication and citizen-initiated cancer clusters. McComas has recently moved to the Communication Department at Cornell University. Trumbo has relocated to the Office of Health Promotion Research in the College of Medicine at the University of Vermont.

## The University of Kansas

The William Allen White School of Journalism  
and Mass Communications  
Stauffer-Flint Hall  
1435 Jayhawk Blvd., Room 200  
Lawrence, KS 66045

# Focus on Our Global Future

By

**T. Kenn Gaither**

2003 Barrow Scholarship Winner  
University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill

**M**y research, which has been spurred by the Barrow Minority Scholarship, is to analyze how governments of developing countries represent themselves, their people and their polices on the World Wide Web. For my dissertation, which I plan to complete in early 2004, I will use a mixed-methods approach for studying the 31 developing countries (by World Bank criteria) that have official English-language Web sites. Ultimately, I would like to develop new ways of conceptualizing the relationship between per-

suasion, propaganda, and public relations to extend existing theory and develop a culturally sensitive model of effective public relations practice.

This research is born of my own academic travel pursuits, which have taken me to more than 25 countries, including Brazil, Ghana, Cambodia, and Ukraine. Public relations is lagging far behind other mass communication disciplines in theory development and has traditionally centered on Western models. By incorporating cross-cultural variables, I want to problematize Western views of public relations. I have started this research by studying certain regions of the world, including quantitative content analyses of official govern-

ment Web sites in both Africa and the Middle East and a narrative analysis of Eastern European Web sites.

Upon completion of my dissertation, I plan to continue this research stream of understanding the public relations function in an international context, particularly as it relates to developing countries. From my dissertation and conference presentations, I hope to build a broad publication base – including a book on international public relations – that will inform my research and teaching for years to come. I think Dr. Barrow would approve. I am honored to join the esteemed previous winners of this award and to have an award bearing the name of such a visionary scholar. □