PR UPDATE

THE NEWS JOURNAL
of the Public Relations Division
of the Association for Education in
Journalism & Mass Communication

Vol. 36 • No. 2 • Spring 2001

EDELMAN LUNCHEON FEATURES

Michael Deaver

Political media strategist and presidential leadership expert Michael K. Deaver is the speaker for the Public Relations Division noon luncheon, Tuesday, August 7, sponsored at no cost to attendees by Edelman Worldwide. First come, first serve reservations should be made through Linda Aldoory *(laldoory@wam.umd.edu)*.

Deaver has been "making it happen" behind the scenes of American politics for more than 30 years. From his time with Barry Goldwater to being the mastermind behind President Ronald Reagan's election campaigns, Deaver knows what works when it comes to politics and the media, elections, the U.S. political system, and the elements of presidential leadership. As international vice chair for Edelman Worldwide, Deaver manages Edelman's global public affairs programs for such major clients as United Parcel Service, Bacardi and Fujifilm. He also oversees U.S.-based image programs for the governments of Portugal, India and Chile. As director of Corporate Affairs in Edelman's Washington office, Deaver provides strategic counsel to many of the agency's most prestigious corporate accounts, including Nike, CSX, Nissan and Microsoft.

Deaver has established lasting contacts with both the elite media and those in the highest levels of government. One of the most oft-quoted sources on media and the presidency for America's top newspapers, he is widely recognized as one of the nation's premier professional communicators. He provides strategic communications advice to elected officials and influencers across the international political spectrum. He has met with heads of state, members of legislatures and parliaments in Europe, Asia and Latin America, providing insight on how officials can deal with an ever-growing Americanized media in their home countries.

In addition to managing high-profile international and corporate accounts, Deaver serves clients in other key sectors. In health care, he acts as public relations advisor to the Healthcare Leadership Council, the managed care industry's Washington-based lobby and advocacy group, and Cardinal Health, Inc., one of the nation's largest distributors of drug and health products. In technology and telecommunications, he has represented the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association, AT&T and the Competitive Long-Distance Coalition.

Deaver spent more than 20 years as one of Reagan's closest advisors in both Sacramento and Washington. In the White House, he served as assistant to the president and deputy chief of staff from January 1981 until May 1985. Deaver, Chief of Staff James A. Baker III, and Edwin Meese, counsel to the president, were seen as the triumvirate directing the Reagan administration's successful first term. Deaver is widely credited with being the architect of the Reagan communications program, including the landslide presidential campaigns of 1980 and 1984.

He was formerly president of Deaver and Hannaford, Inc., a public relations firm he co-founded in 1975. After he left the White House in May 1985, he formed Michael K. Deaver, Inc, a Washington-based public affairs firm servicing domestic and international corporate clients.

Deaver continues to comment on politics, the media and public affairs on the airwaves, appearing regularly on network public affairs programs. Audiences around the nation rave about his insights into U.S. politics, done in a way that is entertaining, informative and, most importantly, without partisanship. Deaver takes today's issues, provides the facts along with some great perspectives, and lets listeners make their own decisions about the outcomes of American politics.

2001 DC

THE RULES

BACK TO BASICS

By PRD Head
Pamela Bourland-Davis

Organizations and divisions such as ours often rely on collective memory for day-to-day operations. One thing I've learned over the past few months is how much I rely on that memory – and that even with division experience over the past several years, I still turn to others for answers to questions that arise.

The most recent question is whether graduate student membership, at the significantly reduced dues rate, includes the *Journal of Public Relations Research*. Unfortunately, the answer is "no," so any graduate students wanting the *Journal* would need to apply for membership at the regular level.

Other questions have dealt with elections. After tracking down a copy of the bylaws, I have found that we are supposed to be holding elections by mail – although changes in AEJMC conference dates and school schedules no doubt make this difficult to run during the summer. Nevertheless, I am asking the Nominating Committee (Barbara DeSanto, chair, Linda Aldoory and Meta Carstarphen) to manage the nominations and elections by mail as per our bylaws.

The bylaws specify that nominations should be submitted by April 15. Nominations can be e-mailed to any of the committee members. The elected positions for which nominations will be taken will be for the following.

(1) Vice Head-Elect: a three-year term which begins with the officer observing and assisting in the program planning the first year, serving as vice head and program planner the second year and as division head the third.

(2) Secretary-Treasurer

(3) At-large Board Member: an elected member who serves on the Executive Committee and assists with division activities.

The other Executive Committee members, who are appointed by the head are one at-large member and three standing committee chairs for Research, Teaching and PF&R. The immediate past head also serves on the Executive Committee. All other committee chairs and anyone interested in helping are always welcome at the executive business meetings.

Members elected or appointed to positions should plan to attend the meetings conducted by AEJMC to assist officers of the divisions. These are typically held during the morning of the last day of the convention.

So please submit any nominations you may have for consideration by the Nominating Committee who will put together the slate for elections. The nominations must be in by April 15.

Elections will be held during May/June. (If you're renewing your membership, you may want to consider using your home address if you won't be going into the office, but want to vote.) Election ballots, according to bylaws, will have a place for write-ins. The candidates will know the results prior to the convention, and any run-off elections will be held at our business meeting.

STUDENT AWARDS

NOMINEES AND SPONSORS

By Katherine Kinnick

PRD is seeking nominees and sponsors for Inez Kaiser Awards for Graduate Students of Color and for the Susanne A. Roschwalb Grant for International Study and Research. The deadline for receipt of nominations is May 1.

KAISER AWARD–For a $60 sponsorship, PRD members can provide a one-year membership to both AEJMC and the Public Relations Division, including publications, to a graduate student of color. The number of awards given each year is dependent on the number of sponsorships received; 25 students received the awards in 2000.

Any domestic or international graduate student of color pursuing a graduate degree in public relations or conducting research in public relations is eligible for an award. To nominate a student, send address, phone and e-mail addresses for yourself and the student, along with two or three sentences describing the student's accomplishments, teaching or research interests to PRD Student Awards Committee, c/o Teresa Mastin, School of Journalism, Box 64, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN 37132. You may nominate more than one student.

Inez Kaiser was the first African-American woman to become a member of PRSA and to head a public relations agency with national clients.

ROSCHWALB GRANT–The $250 Roschwalb Grant is awarded to a full-time public relations student to help offset the cost of travel for international study or research. Undergraduate and graduate students are eligible. A description of the nominee's study program, a letter of support from a full-time PR faculty member, address, e-mail and phone number should be sent to PRD Student Awards Committee, c/o Lisa Lyon, Department of Communication, Kennesaw State University, 1000 Chastain Rd., Kennesaw, GA 30144.

Susanne Roschwalb was active in PRD until she died from complications of breast cancer in 1996. Contributions in any amount are welcome to ensure continuation of the grant. The 2000 winner was Doga Taslardan, an undergraduate student at Abilene Christian University, who used the grant to attend an international study program in Athens, Greece.

For more information about either award, contact Katherine Kinnick, PRD Student Awards Committee chair, *770/423-6471, kkinnick@kennesaw. edu.*

Learning and Retention of the RACE Algorithm in Public Relations Undergraduate Education

A Comparison of Lecture Instruction, Case Method and Simulation

By David O. Woolverton, Ed.D., APR
Eastern Kentucky University

This article reports the results of an experimental study concerning the educational effects of lecturing, case studies and simulation as teaching methods. The study compared the effects of four different combinations of these teaching methods on students' ability both (a) to use the RACE formula for solving public relations problems and (b) to retain that ability for use at a later time. For initial learning, the results indicate that a combination of case studies and simulations worked best for initial understanding as compared to lecturing alone or even to case studies or simulations alone. For retention, the results indicate that lecture is the least effective, and there is no significant difference between case studies, simulations or a combination of case studies and simulations.

Submissions to *Teaching Public Relations* must focus on the enhancement of public relations education and are accepted based on Editorial Board evaluations of relevance to public relations education, importance to public relations teaching, quality of writing, manuscript organization, appropriateness of conclusions and teaching suggestions, and adequacy of the information, evidence or data presented. Four hard copies of each manuscript (no fax submissions) must be submitted to TPR Editor Linda Morton, Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019. Names of authors should NOT be listed on the manuscript itself. A detachable title page should include title, office address and telephone number, fax number and e-mail address of the author. Upon final acceptance of a manuscript, the author is expected to provide an electronic copy by plain text-only (not by attachment) e-mail. Submission in other electronic formats may delay the article's publication. Manuscripts should be about 3,000 words including references and tables. Back issues of *Teaching Public Relations* are available on the PRD website: *http://lamar.colostate.edu/~aejmcpr.*

INTRODUCTION

While school lessons are to be learned, they also must be retained and then applied if professional higher education is to be of value. Simulation, which is administered in various forms, is purported to be a more effective teaching method than lecture. Proponents contend that when simulations, including the scenario-type of simulation, are in a narrative, realistic form, students become active, involved learners rather than passive recipients of information. The term "simulation" is used here to denote a category of teaching methods ofted described by the term "active learning." The term "scenario" is used to denote a sub-category in which teaching is facilitated by describing a particular situation.

Active learning research generally parallels the method and result of this study. A study by McCarthy and Anderson (2000) found role play in a required history course and student team study in an honors political science course both exceeded results generated from traditional lectures. DeNeve and Heppner (1997) found role playing more beneficial than lecture in a college-level industrial psychology course. A study by Dewey and Meyer (2000) reported that hands-on learning in a college-level climatology course improved grades over traditional lecture instruction.

Research comparing various types of simulations with various other teaching methods (usually lecture) has been conducted for some time. Researchers almost universally find simulation instruction better or not significantly different from other methods. Only a few studies, however, compared simulations with other instructional methods in terms of both initial learning and retention, as does this study.

The case method is used for a number of topics but was developed for teaching business administration (Christensen and Hansen, 1987). Beaudin (1996) contended the case should be real, an actual happening, which should only be fictionalized when original identities cannot be revealed. Lovelock (1986) contended that cases need not be based on real situations. He noted that cases tend to be selective in their reporting in order to fit a relatively short class period and to focus attention on a predefined type of problem. Lovelock's approach was used in this study.

Similarly, McKeachie (1978) recommended that teachers choose initial cases in which differences are clear before advancing to more complex cases. This approach was used in this study.

Erickson and Strommer (1991) said that in case studies teachers could lead students through a process with step-by-step questioning. Graham and Cline (1980) said this method could be applied to a class as a whole. These approaches were used in this study.

As a result of the findings cited in the literature, the following hypotheses were developed:

HYPOTHESIS 1–A group receiving an introductory lecture and a case method treatment will demonstrate greater initial learning than a group receiving the same amount of time in a lecture setting.

HYPOTHESIS 2–A group receiving an introductory lecture and a scenario exercise will demonstrate greater initial learning than a group receiving the same amount of time in an introductory lecture and case method treatment.

HYPOTHESIS 3–A group receiving an introductory lecture and case method and scenario exercise will demonstrate greater initial learning than a group receiving the same amount of time in an introductory lecture and scenario exercise.

HYPOTHESIS 4–A group receiving an introductory lecture and a case method treatment will demonstrate greater retention than a group receiving the same amount of time in a lecture setting.

HYPOTHESIS 5–A group receiving an introductory lecture and scenario exercise will demonstrate greater retention than a group receiving the same amount of time in an introductory lecture and case method treatment.

HYPOTHESIS 6–A group receiving an introductory lecture and case method and scenario exercise will demonstrate greater retention than a group receiving the same amount of time in an introductory lecture and scenario exercise.

TPR
Teaching Public Relations
MONOGRAPH 53
Spring 2001

TPR Editor
Linda Morton
lmorton@ou.edu
University of Oklahoma

METHOD

Participants were students enrolled in four intact classes of an introductory mass communication course at Eastern Kentucky University during two consecutive semesters. The course is an option within the university's general education requirements, so the students were enrolled in a great variety of majors. The students' ages ranged from 17 to 26 years, with the exceptions of three people aged 28, 31 and 41. There were 27 freshmen, 49 sophomores, 30 juniors and 27 seniors with a total of 64 males and 69 females. To overcome differences between the four intact class groups, the GPA of each individual was used to establish a covariance for each group using the SPSS program. The assignments for this experiment were graded as part of the class work to try to ensure motivation.

The simulations used in this experiment are simple because the students in this experiment were being exposed to their first experience with a public relations problem-solving algorithm. An earlier pilot test conducted by giving a group in the same course in the previous semester a similar public relations problem established that the students did not have an innate sense of how to use the principles of the algorithm.

Content validation, as called for by Cole (1997), Gredler (1996) and Bowen (1987), was addressed in two ways:

First, content validity of the two simulation assignments used in this experiment comes from their source; they are based on assignments in a public relations textbook by Hendrix, (1997) who holds a doctorate and is professionally accredited by the Public Relations Society of America. His book has also been reviewed by six other public relations professors.

Table 1

Comparison of Initial Mean Scores of Treatment Conditions

Treatment condition	n	Mean score	Standard deviation
Lecture	39	2.62	1.86
Case Study	26	3.30	1.82
Simulation	36	3.97	1.99
Combination	32	4.32	2.01

Second, content validity was further assured through an external review as recommended by Popham (1999). That review by four experts produced endorsement of the treatments, assignments and grading criteria. Two of these experts are practicing, accredited public relations professionals who hold leadership positions in a Public Relations Society of America chapter. All endorsed all parts of the presentations and assignments and grading as reflective of actual practice within the field. One of the practicing professionals noted a lack of budget and scheduling information in the simulation but acknowledged that these are too involved to be included in an introductory lesson. One professor compared the initial and retention assignments and found no difference in difficulty.

DESIGN

The design of this experiment was developed after considering the studies cited in the literature, especially five retention studies. The Carney, Dietrich, Freeman & Mott (1995) study used five simulation methods, but failed to discriminate among effects of these methods. The Boettcher (1981) and Vincent (1984) studies compared only one simulation method (computer assisted instruction) to lecture. The Larson (1981) study compared two simulation methods. This experiment most closely follows the pattern of a study by Fishman (1984), which used two simulation methods and compared their effect individually with instruction by lecture.

The four intact groups were each given an identical one-hour introduction on the principles and practices of the public relations problem-solving algorithm. This method, created by Marston (1979) and well known in the profession (Grunig & Hunt, 1984), uses four steps. The steps are research about the situation, action-planning to set an objective, communication designed to accomplish the objective, and evaluation of effectiveness. The presentation included the principles underlying the four steps. The presentation also listed the various techniques used within each step and their characteristics.

The second hour-long treatment was different for each group. This created the four treatment conditions that were compared.

The lecture group received a lecture including videotape examples of application of the RACE algorithm to real public relations efforts and further describing techniques, work environments and specialties within public relations.

The case method group was engaged in an instructor-presented case method treatment. The instructor led the class through the use of the algorithm in a realistic public relations simulation. For each of the four steps, the students wrote individually at their desks their own determination of the best response to various stages of the problem presented, and these responses were discussed. The instructor then presented model responses and explained the reasons for them.

The simulation group engaged in a simulation with the instructor leading them through a realistic public relations scenario. This exercise required them to make choices among alternative methods at each stage of the problem using a latent-image exercise. The latent image exercise provided a written paragraph describing a situation, and let students choose between a variety of options printed below it. The options were chosen by marking a form with a special pen. Marking the form revealed a latent image (invisible ink) response as to the appropriateness of the choice. A key to all appropriate responses was provided at the end of the simulation so the students could score their performance. This simulation was completed individually at the students' own pace.

The combination group received the same case method treatment as the case method group and the same latent-image simulation treatment the simulation group. (Please contact the author for a copy of the text of the four treatments, if desired.)

In order to assess students' ability to use and retain this algorithm, one day after the treatment, the lecture group and the case study group were given the assignment of writing individually their solution to a realistic public relations simulation. Two days after the treatment, the scenario group and the combination group were given the same assignment. The times between instruction and the first assignment were dictated by the university calendar. Then, to assess their retention, one week after the initial assignment, all students were asked to write individually their solution to another realistic public relations simulation. All initial assignments were identical, and all retention assignments were identical.

Three public relations faculty members rated each student's performance on the initial assignment and the retention assignment. The raters did not know the identity of the students whose work they were grading. The rating guides used by the raters measured the students' ability to use each of the algorithm's four steps. The interrater reliability was in the "fair to good agreement beyond chance" range according to Fleiss (1981, p. 218). A covariance based on grade point averages was used to allow for comparison of the four intact groups.

The hypotheses were somewhat unusual for this type of study in that they posited a ranking of the results, based on what was found in the literature. Because a ranking was posited, hypotheses were stated in a simpler format than for some other studies, that is, if case method teaching was significantly better than lecture, and simulation teaching was significantly better than case method, then simulation was automatically significantly better than lecture, and so on up the ranking.

Since a ranking was posited, the analysis was done by the planned contrast method of analysis. This method better fits the format of the study and offers a more powerful analysis.

PROCEDURE

The initial assignment was a realistic public relations problem involving a disagreement between a local, private university and a neighborhood opposing expansion of the campus. The retention assignment was a realistic public relations problem involving a conflict between a city government and an ethnic minority. (Please contact the author for a copy of the two assignments, if desired.)

Each assignment was administered the same way in each group's classroom. Students were given a written description of the problem and wrote individually what research should be done. That response was presented to the instructor. The instructor initialed across the response so it could not be altered, and then provided the student with a description of the research results. The student then wrote his or her solution to the rest of the problem including the action plan, communication and evaluation steps. All assignments were completed individually, and all students were invited to use their notes.

This method followed the pattern identified as the post test-only control group design by Campbell & Stanley (1963). They noted that this is a common research design in educational practice because teachers frequently experiment with entirely new subject matter, for which pretests in the ordinary sense are impossible.

To assure that the introductory lecture was delivered consistently to all treatment groups, and to avoid possible bias from different levels of teaching abilities from different teachers, the principal investigator conducted all the treatments.

Because the treatments were conducted on intact classes, the statistical analysis was conducted by analysis of covariance to control for any systematic differences in ability level of students across these classes, following criteria from Williams (1979). The covariate was the individuals' cumulative grade point average, since it reflects cumulative academic achievement at the college level. The ANCOVA was followed by a planned contrast analysis.

Formative evaluation, as called for by Gredler (1996), was conducted. Two pilot studies were performed prior to the main study. One pilot study found no significant innate ability of the students to use the principles in the algorithm prior to the instruction. A second pilot study tested the grading guide and led to revisions in the guide to improve interrater reliability.

MAIN STUDY

The total number of subjects was 133. The generally accepted .05 significance level was chosen for this experiment.

Six hypotheses were developed. Three of these hypotheses deal with comparing initial learning resulting from each of the instructional conditions and are shown in Table 1. Three of these hypotheses deal with comparing retention from each of the instructional conditions and are shown in Table 2.

After the initial assignment was completed, an overall ANCOVA was conducted in order to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in the initial mean scores across the four incremental treatment conditions taken as a whole. A statistically significant difference was found: F (3, 394)=22.003, MSE 3.231, p=.000). Following the ANCOVA analysis, a Tukey planned contrast analysis was conducted to test the hypotheses.

Analysis by planned contrast found significant difference among all treatment groups for initial learning. The analysis found the effectiveness of the treatment groups ranked in the order hypothesized.

HYPOTHESIS 1–The case method group will demonstrate greater initial learning than the lecture group, was supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = 1.313 +.472, p.=000.)

Table 2

Comparison of Retention Mean Scores of Treatment Conditions

Treatment condition	Mean score	Standard deviation	Change from initial test
Lecture	2.41	1.55	-1.56
Case Study	4.11	2.02	+0.81
Simulation	4.19	2.04	+0.22
Combination	4.50	2.12	+0.18

HYPOTHESIS 2 – The simulation group will demonstrate greater initial learning than the lecture group, was supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = .726 +.484, p.=.007.)

HYPOTHESIS 3 – The combination group will demonstrate greater initial learning than the simulation group, was supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = 1.315 +.1.08, p.=.000.)

After the retention assignment was completed (one week after the initial assignment) an overall ANCOVA was conducted in order to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences for the mean retention scores across the four incremental treatment conditions taken as a whole. A statistically significant difference was found: F (3, 394)=14.345, MSE = 5.454, p=.000). Following the ANCOVA analysis, a Tukey planned contrast analysis was conducted to test the three hypotheses related to the retention assignment. The results of the Tukey planned contrast analyses are reported individually.

An analysis by planned contrast for the retention assignment found a statistically significant difference between the lecture group and the three other, interactive groups. No statistically significant difference was found among the three interactive groups.

HYPOTHESIS 4–The case method treatment group will demonstrate greater retention than the lecture-only treatment group, was supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = 1.51 +1.22, p=.000.)

HYPOTHESIS 5–The simulation method treatment group will demonstrate greater retention than the lecture and case method treatment group, was not supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = .045+.09, p=.896.)

HYPOTHESIS 6–The combination treatment group will demonstrate greater retention than the simulation group, was not supported, (95 percent confidence level contrast estimate = .462+.924, p=.200.)

RESULTS

The results for initial learning indicate that either case method or simulation presentation when combined with the introductory lecture, result in more initial learning than lecture alone. The results also indicate that a combination of all methods is better than either of the other two.

For retention, the results are more mixed. The lecture method was found to be least effective, with the retention mean score significantly below the initial mean score for this group. No significant differences in performance on the retention assessments were found between the case method group, the simulation group and the lecture, combination group.

Comparing the differences between the initial assignment and the retention assignment for each group also showed mixed results. The lecture group's mean score was significantly lower on the retention assignment as compared to the initial assessment (F.=7.61, p.=.007). All other treatment groups' mean scores improved between the initial assignment and the retention assignment. However, the increase was significant for only the case method group at (F=28.53, p.=.000).

Another observation about instructional method is worth noting. The interactive instructional methods results, as shown in the retention assignment, were all statistically significantly higher than the score of the lecture group. All the interactive methods were clustered closely together in terms of their performance scores. This finding supports the contention of many active learning advocates, who contend that lecturing, as a passive form of learning, not only has low effectiveness for initial learning, but also creates learning in a way that is very difficult for students to retain.

This study is unique from those cited in the literature in that the students in this study were not involved in professional training for their careers. Three of the retention studies cited used nursing students studying nursing skills (Larson, 1981; Boettcher et al., 1981; Vincent, 1984), one used practicing nurses improving their skills (Fishman, 1984) and one used practicing doctors improving diagnostic techniques (Carney et al., 1995). The students in this study had merely enrolled in an elective university course which included public relations along with other mass communications topics. Presumably their motivation level was not as high as that of students learning a professional skill they would use in their careers.

The lack of direct relevance of the RACE algorithm to the students in this study could explain why the mean performance scores in this study reached only 4.5 in a grading scale of 0 through 12. It might also be noted that this was the students' first exposure to this algorithm, which could account for what might otherwise appear to be low scores.

Generalizations beyond the present study should be made cautiously. However, in combination with other studies cited in this document, the results tend to endorse the value of case method and simulation in combination with lecture as opposed to lecture alone.

Future studies might profitably investigate a broader scope than is usually the case. Most of the studies found in the literature concentrate on small increments of learning, presumably in order to accurately measure results. These, however, do not reflect the reality that several factors are often involved in an actual situation. Feldman (1995) endorses research with complex cases and simulations because they enable students to practice higher levels of abstract analysis of complex problems under conditions of uncertainty. Capstone courses frequently provide this broad application of problem solving principles and skills. Thus capstone courses could be a fertile field for research in teaching the application of public relations skills.

REFERENCES

Beadin, B. P. (1996). *The case method: Theory and application.* (Report ETT-96-02). High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety, Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University.

Boettcher, E. G., Alderson, S. F., & Saccucci, M. S. (1981). A comparison of the effects of computer-assisted instruction versus printed instruction on student learning in the cognitive categories of knowledge and application. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 8, 13-17.

Bowen, D. D. (1987). Developing a personal theory of experiential learning. *Simulation & Games*, 2, 192-206.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963) Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carney, P. A., Dietrich, A. J., Freeman, D. H. & Mott, L. A. (1995). A standardized patient assessment of a continuing medical education program to improve physicians' cancer-control clinical skills. *Academic Medicine*, 70, 52-58.

Christensen, C. R. & Hansen, A. J. (1987). *Teaching and the case method.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Cole, H. P. (1997). Stories to live by: A narrative approach to health-behavior research and injury prevention. In D. S. Gochman (Ed.), *Handbook of health behavior research methods*, New York: Polenum.

DeNeve, K. M. & Heppner, M. J. (1997). Role play simulations: The assessment of an active learning technique and comparisons with traditional lectures. *Innovative Higher Education*, 21, 231-246.

Dewey, K. F. & Meyer, S. J. (2000). Active learning in introductory climatology. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 29, 265-271.

Erickson, B. L. & Strommer, D. W. (1981). *Teaching college freshmen.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feldman, H. D. (1995). Computer-based simulation games: A viable educational technique for enterpreneurship classes? *Simulation & Gaming*, 26, 346-360.

Fishman, D. J. (1984). Development and evaluation of a computer assisted video module for teaching cancer chemotherapy to nurses. *Computers in Nursing*, 2, 16-23.

Fleiss, J. L. (1981). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions* (pp. 212-236). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Graham, P. T. & Cline, P. C. (1980). The case method: A basic teaching approach. *Theory into practice.* 19, 112-116.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). Educational games and simulations: A technology in search of a (research) paradigm. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.) *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 521-540). New York: Macmillan.

Grunig, J. E. & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations.* New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hendrix, J. A. (1997). *Public relations cases.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Larson, D. E. (1981). The use of computer-assisted instruction to teach calculation and regulation of intravenous flow rates to baccalaureate nursing students. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Lovelock, C. H. (1986). Teaching with cases. In Lewis, L. H. (Ed.) *Experiential and simulation techniques for teaching adults.* (pp. 25-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lubbers, C. A., & Gorcyca, D. A. (1997). Using active learning in public relations instructions: Demographic predictors of faculty use. *Public Relations Review*, 23, 67-80.

McCarthy, J. P. & Anderson, L. (2000). Active learning techniques versus traditional teaching styles: Two experiments from history and political science. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24, 279-294.

McKeachie, W. J. (1978). *Teaching tips.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Hatch & Company.

Marston, J. E. (1979). *Modern Public Relations.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Popham, W. J. (1999). *Classroom assessment.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Saunders, M. D. & Perrigo, E. (1998). Negotiation as a model for teaching public relations professionalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 52, 57-65.

Vincent, J. L. (1984). *A comparison of learning outcomes of lecture discussion and computer assisted instruction in a baccalaaureate nursing program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Williams, F. (1979). *Reasoning with statistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

PRD DIVISION HEAD

Pamela Bourland-Davis

Georgia Southern University
Department of Communication Arts
P.O. Box 8091
STATESBORO, GA 30460
912/681-0027 (office)
912/681-0822 (fax)
pamelagb@gsvms2.cc.gasou.edu

IMMEDIATE PAST HEAD

Barbara J. DeSanto

Oklahoma State University
School of Journalism & Broadcasting
220 Fairway Circle
SAND SPRINGS, OK 74063
918/241-1632 (office)
918/361-8529 (fax)
918/361-8529 (cell)
paradoc@cowboy.net

VICE HEAD

William Thompson

University of Louisville
Department of Communication
310 Strickler Hall
LOUISVILLE, KY 40292
502/852-6976 (office)
502/588-8166 (fax)
LocusMedia@aol.com

VICE HEAD-ELECT

Kenneth Plowman

San Jose State University
School of Journalism and Mass Communications
SAN JOSE, CA 95192-0055
408/924-3247 (office)
408/924-3220 (fax)
plowman@jmc.sjsu.edu

SECRETARY

Patricia A. Curtin

University of North Carolina
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
11 Saddlewood Court
DURHAM, NC 27713
919/962-4091 (office)
pcurtin@email.unc.edu

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Shannon Bowen

Auburn University
Department of Journalism
AUBURN, AL 36849-5206
334/844-4607 (office)
334/844-4665 (fax)
ProfBowen@aol.com

PF&R CHAIR

Derina Holtzhausen

University of South Florida
School of Mass Communication
4202 E. Fowler Ave. • CIS 1040
TAMPA, FL 33620-7800
813/974-6800 (office)
dholtzha@luna.cas.usf.edu

RESEARCH/PAPER COMPETITION CHAIR

Louis Falk

Youngstown State University
Williamson College of Business Administration
Department of Marketing
One University Plaza
YOUNGSTOWN, OH 44555-0002
330/742-3078 (office)
330/742-1459 (fax)
lkfalk@cc.ysu.edu

TEACHING STANDARDS CHAIR

Andi Stein

California State University
Department of Communications
P.O. Box 6846
FULLERTON, CA 92834-6846
714/223-9408 (office)
714/278-2209 (fax)
andistein@fullerton.edu

MEMBERSHIP CHAIR

Alan Freitag

University of North Carolina
Department of Communication Studies
9201 University City Blvd.
CHARLOTTE, NC 28223-0001
704/547-2867 (office)
arfreita@email.uncc.edu

LISTSERV
listserv@email.uncc.edu

TEACHING PUBLIC RELATIONS EDITOR

Linda Morton

University of Oklahoma
Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication
NORMAN, OK 73019
405/325-5221 (office)
405/364-4643 (home)
lmorton@ou.edu

PR UPDATE NEWS JOURNAL EDITOR

Susan Gonders

Southeast Missouri State University
Department of Mass Communication
CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO 63701-2750
573/651-2486 (office)
573/651-5967 (fax)
573/339-0774 (home)
SGonders@hotmail.com

DEADLINES
Oct. 15, Jan. 1, March 15, June 1

WEBMASTER

Kirk Hallahan

Colorado State University
Journalism & Technical Communication
C-225 Clark
FT. COLLINS, CO 80523-1785
970/491-3963 (office)
970/491-2908 (fax)
970/206-9025 (home)
kirk.hallahan@colostate.edu

WEBSITE
http://lamar.colostate.edu/~aejmcpr

SUMMER ISSUE DEADLINE – JUNE 1

Submit plain text-only e-mail to: *SGonders@hotmail.com*

D.C. TRAVELOGUE

FREE AND CHEAP

By Linda Aldoory

The AEJMC convention is in Washington, D.C., this August, and we all think we know what that will be like: hot, muggy and expensive. Some PRD members may feel that they've been to D.C. dozens of times and don't expect to find anything new.

I'd like to try to convince you otherwise. I moved to the D.C. area last year, and being from here originally, I was desperate to find new venues for entertainment. Plus, being a new assistant professor, I could not afford the expensive opportunities D.C. offers. Let me share with you, then, the free museums and memorials, affordable theaters, and cheap eats that I have found that can make your convention trip worth its airfare.

Free museums and memorials: The trick about the Smithsonian, which is completely free to patrons, is taking advantage of the special exhibits that come through town. You can find out about what will be on exhibit during August by either visiting the Smithsonian's webpage or by talking to the hotel's concierge in August. Also, don't forget the less popular Smithsonian museums that offer very interesting exhibits, such as the Center for African American History and Culture, the National Museum of African Art, and the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage. There's also the Sackler and the Freer Galleries. For some of you who have not been here in a while, there are a couple of new, moving memorials – the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the FDR Memorial, which I highly recommend.

Affordable theaters: I love going to plays and cabarets, but I can't afford the Kennedy Center and the National Theater every weekend. I have found entertaining and cheaper shows and music at Studio Theater, Lisner Auditorium at George Washington University (which has concerts and ballets), Lincoln Theatre (which sometimes has free concerts), and the D.C. Arts Center Theater (which is a small troupe interactive theater).

Cheap eats: I have found wonderful restaurants in great areas on my budget. In the Adams Morgan area, there is Carribean (Ricky's Cafe), Ethiopian (Meskeram or Red Sea) and Mexican (Lauriol Plaza). In Dupont Circle, there's Asian Fusion Tapas (Raku), Chinese (City Lights of China), and various Italian and American bistros. The ones listed above I've been to and highly recommend. There is also Teaism near Dupont Circle where Japanese food and varieties of teas are offered, and Xando, a coffee house that offers s'more making at your table, complete with the flame and the Hershey's chocolate bars. Plus, don't forget that D.C. has its own Chinatown relatively near the hotel site.

This article just starts the list of affordable and different opportunities for entertainment and eats in D.C. For more details, check out the webpages for the Smithsonian, for Zagati's restaurant guide, and for the *Washington Post* for theater and restaurants. I hope to see you out and about during the convention!

In Memoriam

Patrick Jackson, APR, Fellow PRSA, died March 22 at age 68. The founder of Jackson, Jackson & Wagner was editor of *PR Reporter* for more than 30 years. He was elected president of the Public Relations Society of America in 1980, and he was a recipient of both the PRSA Gold Anvil and the Arthur W. Page Award. Donations may be made to the Patrick Jackson Fund, c/o PRSA Foundation, 33 Irving Place, New York NY 10003.

Southeast
Missouri State University
DEPARTMENT OF
MASS COMMUNICATION
MS 2750
One University Plaza
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701-4799

WHITE HOUSE FREE IN DC

By Susan Gonders

George Washington and city planner Pierre L'Enfant chose the 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. site for the President's House. Construction on the design by Irish emigrant James Hoban began in October 1792, and the John Adams family became the first residents in 1800. It was rebuilt after the British torched it in 1814, it was gutted and renovated during the Truman administration, and Pat Nixon completed Jackie Kennedy's project of historical renovation.

It officially became the White House in 1901 under Theodore Roosevelt, and it is the only private residence of a head of state open to the public free of charge – that is, 11 of its 132 rooms.

The Visitors Entrance on the southeast corner leads to the Vermeil Room, a sitting room for formal occasions that includes an 1815 Duncan Phyfe sofa. The room that became the Library in 1935 also has 1800-1820 Phyfe furniture, as well as an 1800 gilded wood chandelier that belonged to the family of James Fenimore Cooper.

Designated the China Room in 1917 under Wilson, service from most of the administrations is displayed chronologically. Unfortunately, 19th-century china was routinely sold to buy new.

Franklin Roosevelt delivered his "Fireside Chats" from the Diplomatic Reception Room on the south central side of the house. The "Views of North America" panoramic wallpaper was first printed in 1834.

Site of dances, concerts, weddings, funerals and roller skating when T. Roosevelt's children lived there, the large East Room on the northeast corner also housed Union troops during the Civil War. The grand piano was a 1938 gift to the White House.

Originally intended for dining, the Green Room has been a sitting room since Calvin Coolidge furnished it from the Federal period.

James Monroe selected French Empire style for the Blue and Red Rooms. The oval Blue Room, which did not actually become blue until 1837 under Martin Van Buren, retains eight pieces acquired by Monroe, including an 1817 round marble-top table. The Red Room is lighted by an 1805 carved and gilded wood chandelier.

Located on the northwest corner, the State Dining Room seats up to 140. Monroe's two Italian marble fireplaces were removed to the Red and Green Rooms in 1902, and replaced by a single larger fireplace. Also in the 1902 renovation, one stairway was removed from the Center and Cross Hall to enlarge the State Dining Room, and the other set of steps was enlarged to the grand stairway. Visitors exit from this Hall on the north central side of the White House.

Open Tuesday-Saturday (closed Sunday and Monday), the White House accommodates 6,000 visitors per day. Contact your representative or senator two or three months in advance for free reserved tickets for Congressional guided tours that start 8:15-8:45 a.m., last about a half-hour, and are appropriate for high school age and older. Or free tickets for public self-guided tours are distributed at the White House Visitor Center, located at the southeast corner of 15th and E St. They are issued first come, first serve only on the morning of the tour, beginning at 7:30 a.m. One person may obtain up to four tickets, which indicate when, between 10 a.m. and noon, that you join the line.

Free orientation at the Center, open 7:30 a.m.-4 p.m. every day, significantly enhances the tour. Use the rest room in the Center – you cannot do so in the White House. *www.whitehouse.gov/tours/*