

**Support for Media Rights as a Criterion
for Evaluating Journalism Education**

By

Lee B. Becker

and

Tudor Vlad

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research

Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication

University of Georgia

Athens, GA 30602

U.S.A.

Presented to the World Journalism Education Congress, June 25-28, Singapore. The authors
thank Dr. Robert Wyatt for making his data available for secondary analysis.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Abstract

Variability in journalism education exists both between and within countries around the world, yet relatively little has been done to examine empirically the consequences of journalism education or variation within it. One possible consequence is on attitudes of the graduates about journalism and journalistic practices.

This paper reports on the findings of studies conducted across time of graduates of the U.S. journalism and mass communication programs. The paper compares the attitudes of graduates of journalism and mass communication with those of the general U.S. population as one indicant of the impact of journalism training. It also compares graduates with different types of journalism education.

The data show that, despite the four years of instruction, the U.S. graduates gave only qualified support for the rights of the media. They were, however, more supportive than the U.S. public at large, though the differences were often relatively small.

In addition, the data show that the U.S. graduates with a print or broadcast journalism specializations were more supportive of media rights that those with telecommunications, advertising, public relations, and other majors. In other words, type of journalism and mass communication instruction was found to have an impact on the attitudes of the graduates.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Variability in journalism education exists both between and within countries around the world (Froehlich & Holtz-Bacha, 2003; Weaver, 1998; Gaunt, 1992), yet relatively little has been done to examine empirically the consequences of those variations. No consensus even exists on what standards might be set for the evaluation.

One simple strategy is to examine the impact of journalism education on attitudes of the graduates about journalism and journalistic practices. Those who complete journalism studies would be expected to have developed positive attitudes about the media and should be advocates of journalistic rights. The graduates should be, in comparison with the general population, champions of the media.

Existing studies on attitudes toward media rights is supportive of this argument (Andsager, Wyatt & Martin, 2004; Wyatt, 1991). Scholars have found that support for media rights changes over time, reflecting social and political change in cultures, and varies from one country to another, reflecting cultural differences. In addition, the research shows that the level of support especially for media rights varies within societies.

Though researchers have looked at demographic and other differences within the studied populations, they have not conducted research on important subpopulations, such as those who work in communication occupations or those preparing for such careers.

This paper reports on the findings of studies conducted across time of graduates of the U.S. journalism and mass communication programs. The paper compares the attitudes of graduates of journalism and mass communication graduates with those of the general U.S.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

population as one indicant of the impact of journalism training. It also compares graduates with different types of journalism education to assess differences in the impact of that education.

The data showed that, despite the four years of instruction, the U.S. graduates gave only qualified support to the media. They were, however, more supportive than the U.S. public at large, though the differences were often relatively small.

In addition, that data showed that the U.S. graduates with a print or broadcast specialization were more supportive of media rights than those with telecommunications, advertising, public relations, and other majors. In other words, type of journalism and mass communication instruction was found to have an impact on the attitudes of the graduates.

Evaluating Journalism Education

The Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, which evaluates journalism programs in the United States, requires its members to “regularly assesses student learning” as one of its nine accrediting standards (ACEJMC, 2007). The members are instructed to use “multiple direct and indirect measures to assess student learning.” The measures of learning are not specified, but the member is expected to maintain “contact with its alumni to assess their experiences in the professions and to gain feedback for improving curriculum and instruction.” Members most often use surveys of graduates to that end. These surveys usually ask about the graduate’s success in finding employment once leaving the university.

The level of employment of those who have completed the journalism training programs is one obvious standard for evaluating journalism education. The presumption is that the graduate who has learned the basics of the field will have more success in the job market. Based on an

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

annual survey of graduates of journalism and mass communication programs in the United States, Becker and his colleagues have shown that level of employment within the field of communication has varied as the job market itself has fluctuated (Becker, Vlad, Tucker & Pelton, 2006a). In 2000, two-thirds of the graduates had found work within the field of communication six to eight months after graduation, while in 2003, in a weak overall job market, only half of the graduates found work within their field. That ratio improved to six in 10 two years later. The level of employment varies by characteristics of the graduates, by field of study, and by university.

Professional education and training is not only expected to produce skills that help the student to enter the workforce but also a set of attitudes about that work and about the value of the work to society (Becker, Vlad, Gans, Edwards, Daniels & Park, 2005; Freidson, 1994; Abbott, 1988; Freidson, 1986; Larson, 1977). Donsbach, Becker and Kosicki (1992) compared the occupational commitment and professional values of German and U.S. journalists separately, based on the types of journalism training they had received. The researchers divided the German journalists into four groups: those who had participated in on-the-job training programs without having a university degree; those who started university studies but did not complete a degree; those who completed a university program in journalism or communication, and those who completed a university program in any field other than journalism or communication. The U.S. journalists were divided into three groups: those with no college degree, those with a college degree in journalism, and those with a college degree in another field. The researches found significant differences among the journalists based on training. In the U.S. the journalists without

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

a journalism degree were less committed to their occupation and took a less aggressive stance in regards to news coverage. In Germany, the journalists with a university degree actually were less likely to take an activist approach to news gathering.

Press Freedom and Media Rights

In the United States, considerable attention in recent years has focused on public attitudes toward freedom of expression and freedom of the press. The 2006 State of the First Amendment Survey (First Amendment Center, 2006), for example, showed that, in 2006, 76% of the U.S. population disagreed with the statement that “The First Amendment goes too far in the rights it guarantees.” The figure had been 67% in a similar survey in 1999. A 2003 Gallup Poll (Survey by Gallup Organization, 2003) found that 36% of the U.S. population thought freedom of the press was “crucial” to the respondent’s sense of freedom, while only 4% said it was “not important at all.” In a 1999 survey, the Pew Research Center (2007) found that 69% of the U.S. population felt that freedom of the press was “a major reason for America’s success” in the 20th Century.

A Pew Research Center (1994) study of eight nations found that majorities of the populations of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Spain, the United Kingdom and the U.S. opposed putting restrictions on “what newspapers and TV news programs can report.” Opposition to reporting restrictions was highest in Spain in the 1994 study. A 44-nation survey conducted by the Pew Research Center (2003) showed that respondents in almost all countries said it was “very important” to live in a society with press freedom. Only in Russia, India and Indonesia was press freedom very important to less than a clear majority of the respondents.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

A more limited set of studies has focused on the attitude of populations toward specific media rights. The 2006 First Amendment Survey (First Amendment Center, 2006) showed that 75% of the 2006 survey respondents felt that “newspapers should honor government requests to withhold publishing information that might hurt efforts to win the war on terrorism.” The same study found that 66% of the public said “Even during wartime, the press should be allowed to publish stories that criticize the actions of the government.”

Wyatt (1991) found that one-third of the American public would not protect at all individual media activities such as reporting mistakes made by politicians in the past and siding with foreign governments when the journalists believe those governments are right. The highest rated media freedom item was the right of the journalists to keep their sources confidential, with only 16 percent of interviewees unwilling to offer any protection.

Wyatt interviewed more than 2,500 randomly selected Americans in two waves, in 1990 and 1991. The first wave of surveying (N=1,508) examined three major issues: Americans’ attitudes towards media rights; Americans’ attitudes toward the free expression of private citizens; and social, economic, political and religious factors that encourage or force Americans not to speak their minds. The participants were given three options to express their attitudes toward protection of media rights: to protect the rights all the time, some of the time or none of the time. The second wave (N=1,040) repeated most of the questions about press rights. The interviews were conducted in 1991, just before the beginning of the first war in Iraq. The findings of the survey showed a huge gap between the support of free press as an abstract First Amendment right and the support for specific topics related to individual media rights items. At

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

the same time, the study concluded that the citizenry support for the First Amendment was not strong.

Andsager, Wyatt and Martin (2004) re-analyzed these data as well as data gathered in Russia, Hong Kong, and in Israel. They concluded that press freedom received higher support, across different cultures, than particular media rights. They argued that the response to categories of media rights--such as political, potentially harmful or routine--varied from one country to another because of cultural differences and social-political change, such as the movement to democracy in Russia and Hong Kong's return to China. In addition, they stated that demographic variables were significant predictors of the level of support especially for media rights. Men were more likely to protect media rights than women. The largest gender difference in media support was in the United States, followed by the Israeli Arabs and residents of Moscow. Age also was an important predictor of the attitude towards specific press freedom items: the eldest respondents were the least likely to offer protection to media rights.

Journalism Education in the United States

Basic descriptions of journalism education in the United States are available from a variety of sources (Gaunt, 1992; Becker, Fruit and Caudill, 1987; Weaver & Wilhoit, 1986). Journalism education is offered at the university level, with students completing four-years of course work that leads to a bachelor's degree. A majority of the courses are taught in the last two years of study. Most journalists taking entry level jobs in news media come from such programs (Becker, Vlad & Martin, 2006; Becker, Vlad, Pelton & Papper; 2006).

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

A typical journalism curriculum includes courses designed to provide students with the basic communication skills required to find a job as well as with an understanding of the role of the media in a democratic society. Courses focus on the basics of writing and editing as well as on the history, ethics and law of the mass media.

Historically, journalism education in the United States prepared students for careers in the newspaper industry, but, as the field changed, the curriculum expanded as well (Becker, Fruit and Caudill, 1987). One key change across time has been the incorporation and expansion of courses preparing students for careers in public relations and advertising. Becker and Kosicki (1997) found that half of the journalism and mass communication programs in the U.S. offered a public relations curriculum, just under a third offered an advertising curriculum, and about one in 10 offered a combined public relations and advertising curriculum. A third of the programs offered a telecommunications curriculum. Just fewer than nine in 10 of the journalism and mass communication programs offered a curriculum focused on news.

In the autumn of 2005, the 458 journalism and mass communication programs in the United States enrolled 195,376 undergraduate students and another 13,783 graduate students, most seeking a master's degree, according to the most recent census (Becker, Vlad, Tucker & Pelton, 2006b). These programs granted 48,983 bachelor's degrees the year earlier, and 3,748 graduate degrees. Two-thirds of the undergraduate students were female.

Hypotheses

Given the focus of journalism and mass communication education, it is reasonable to expect that graduates would be more supportive of media rights than would the population at

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

large. The graduates should have participated in classroom instruction favorable to the journalism profession and its mechanisms of working. They also should have been informed of the historical bases and legal justifications for media rights and activities. In addition, since the students should have actually used these procedures as part of their instruction, internships and work for the campus media, they should have first-hand knowledge of their importance to the occupation. The general public, in contrast, should have encountered little explanation of these procedures and rights. This leads to the following hypothesis:

H1: Graduates of journalism and mass communication programs will show higher levels of support for media rights than will the general public.

Some of the students in journalism and mass communication programs will have focused on journalism, while others will have followed curricula that also use communication skills but that lead to careers in other occupations, such as public relations, advertising, and the broad field of telecommunications (including entertainment). While all of these students should have encountered instruction supportive of media rights, those in journalism would have more first-hand experience with the use of these rights and more understanding of their importance. This leads to the second hypothesis:

H2: Of the students who have completed university instruction in journalism and mass communication, those who had completed curricular with a specific focus on journalism should be more supportive of media rights than should other graduates.

The literature based on the general population has shown that women are less supportive of media rights than are men. There is some evidence that women, in fact, are less supportive of

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

the traditionally conflictual approach to news in the West (Becker, Vlad, Huh and Mace, 2003; Grabe & Kamhawi, 2006). While female graduates of journalism and mass communication programs would be expected to support media rights, they are expected to be less supportive than men. This expectation of a gender difference is the third hypothesis to be tested here:

H3: Male graduates of journalism and mass communication programs will be more supportive of media rights than female graduates.

The first two of these hypotheses can be viewed as evaluative. In other words, if journalism and mass communication education is effective, it should produce graduates who are more supportive of media rights than the general public, as stated in Hypothesis 1. The second hypothesis focuses on the differences in the curricula of such journalism and mass communication programs. If the curricular variations matter, the graduates of the traditional journalism and mass communication programs should be more supportive of media rights than the graduates of other curricula specializations. The third hypothesis says less about the impact of training and education programs than about the demographic characteristics of those who participate in them.

Methodology

Data from four different surveys were made available to the authors for secondary analysis to test the three hypotheses listed above. Two of the surveys were of graduates of journalism and mass communication programs in the United States, and two were of national samples of U.S. residents.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

In 1994, the *Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates* contained 16 questions from the original instrument on media rights used by Wyatt (1991). These 16 questions were repeated in the graduate survey of 2004 (Becker, Vlad & Coffey, 2005). In addition, two new questions on the war against terrorism were asked in 2004. The responses to the questions allowed for a comparison of change in the attitudes and behaviors of the graduates across time and a comparison of these graduates with the population at large.

The *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates* is designed to monitor the employment rates and salaries of graduates of journalism and mass communication programs in the United States, including Puerto Rico. In addition, the survey tracks the curricular activities of those graduates while in college, examines their job-seeking strategies, and provides measures of the professional attitudes and behaviors of the graduates upon completion of their college studies.

Each year a sample of schools is drawn from those listed in the *Journalism and Mass Communication Directory*, published annually by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, and *The Journalist's Road to Success: A Career Guide* (Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, 2006). Schools list themselves in the *AEJMC Directory*. All U.S. programs accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications and all U.S. members of the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication are in the *AEJMC Directory*. To be included in the *Newspaper Fund Guide*, the college or university must offer at least 10 courses in news-editorial journalism and those courses must include core

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

courses, such as an introduction to the mass media and press law and ethics, as well as basic skills courses such as reporting and editing.

Selection of schools for the graduate sample is probabilistic, so that those chosen represent the population of schools in the two directories. In 1994, 86 schools were drawn from the 431 unique entries of four-year programs in the U.S (including Puerto Rico) in the two directories. In 2004, 97 schools were drawn from the 459 unique entries of four-year programs in the U.S. (including Puerto Rico) in the two directories.

Administrators at the selected schools are asked to provide the names and addresses of their spring bachelor's and master's degree recipients. A questionnaire was mailed in November of each of these years to all spring graduates receiving either a bachelor's or a master's degree from the selected programs. A second questionnaire was sent to nonrespondents in January. A third mailing was sent in March to graduates who had not responded to the first two mailings.

In 1994, the survey was mailed to 5,101 individuals whose names and addresses were provided by the administrators of the 86 programs. A total of 2,776 returned the questionnaires by the end of May of 1995. Of the returns, 2,388 were from students who reported they actually had completed their degrees during the April to June 1994 period. The remaining 388 had completed their degrees either before or after the specified period, despite their inclusion in the spring graduation lists. A total of 267 questionnaires was returned undelivered and without a forwarding address. Return rate, computed as the number of questionnaires returned divided by the number mailed, was 54.4%. Return rate, computed as the number returned divided by the

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

number mailed minus the bad addresses, was 57.4. Of the 2,388 usable questionnaires, 2,238 were from bachelor's degree recipients and 151 were from those who received a master's degree.

In 2004, the survey was mailed to 9,796 individuals whose names and addresses were provided by the administrators of the 97 programs. A total of 3,640 graduates returned the questionnaires by the end of May of 2005. Of the returns, 3,356 were from students who reported they actually had completed their degrees during the April to June 2004 period. The remaining 284 had completed their degrees either before or after the specified period, despite their inclusion in the spring graduation lists. A total of 643 questionnaires was returned undelivered and without a forwarding address. Return rate, computed as the number of questionnaires returned divided by the number mailed, was 37.2%. Return rate, computed as the number returned divided by the number mailed minus the bad addresses, was 39.8%. Of the 3,356 usable questionnaires, 3,123 were from bachelor's degree recipients and 233 were from those who received a master's degree.

Women made up 65.9% of the respondents in 1994 and 72.8% of respondents in 2004. Members of racial or ethnic minorities made up 18.3% of those returning questionnaires in 1994 and 19.1% of those returning questionnaires in 2004. These sample characteristics are similar to those in recent years. Overall, the sample reflects slightly higher return rates from women and slightly lower return rates from minorities, based on the known characteristics of the schools from which the sample was drawn.

Because undergraduates make up the heart of journalism and mass communication education in this country, the analyses that follow are based on their responses, not the responses of the master's degree recipients.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

The data from the graduates surveys were compared with the data gathered by Wyatt (1991). The 1990 survey was based on a national, probability sample of 1,508 persons 18 years old and older. The second survey in 1991 included responses of 1,040 individuals, also selected probabilistically to represent the U.S. population. Interviews in both years were conducted by telephone, using a random-digit-dialing sample. In home selection was based on the next birthday method. In both cases, commercial survey firms conducted the interviews.

Findings

The responses of the U.S. general population and of the graduates of U.S. journalism and mass communication programs to 18 questions about media rights are shown in Table 1. The table contains the exact questions for the 16 items used in the 1994 journalism graduate survey that were taken from the national surveys in 1990 and 1991 and the two new items included in the 2004 journalism graduate survey. Though many of the national items were included in both the 1990 and 1991 surveys, data are shown for the 1991 survey where possible, since it was nearest in time to the 1994 data from journalism graduates. The national data also are shown for the full sample and for the respondents in the sample who were 18-24 years old when they were interviewed. Most graduates of journalism and mass communication programs would be a part of this age cohort.

As the table shows, the samples differ less in terms of the “Protect all the time” category than they do in terms of the “Not protected at all” category. In other words, the variability in responses is associated with denial of protection of the media, rather than with absolute protection. The first item in the table on advertising pornographic or obscene material illustrates

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

this. Across all four columns in the “All the time” row, almost no differences surface. The percentage of the total sample of U.S. adults, the percentage of the national sample 18-24 years old, and the percentage of the 1994 and 2004 journalism and mass communication graduates willing to offer absolute protection are the same. Only about one in 10 of the respondents takes this position.

In contrast, 66% of the national adult sample said such media behavior should not be legally protected at all, while 56% of the national sample aged 18-24 felt this way, and 30% of the 1994 graduates and 35% of the 2004 graduates held this position. The journalism and mass communication graduates are more likely to see more nuance in the questions, it seems, and, in this particular case, more likely to say that there are circumstances under which the media should have legal protection to advertise pornographic or obscene materials than did the general population. Older members of the general population were less likely to see circumstances under which such action would be legal than younger. The journalism and mass communication graduates in 1994, however, were significantly more likely to see such circumstances than were even the younger members of the general population, consistent with the first hypothesis.

Roughly this same pattern holds for 10 of the 16 items shown in Table 1. Journalism and mass communication graduates were more likely to offer legal protection, at least under some circumstances, to the advertising of products that are legal but harmful to the public, such as tobacco and liquor. They also were more likely to offer at least some protection to journalists who side with a foreign government, who keep their sources confidential even if a court demands disclosure, and to journalists who report on classified information. The journalism and mass

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

communication graduates also extended at least some legal protection to high school students reporting on controversies at school, to media that run graphic photographs of violent events, to journalists reporting about national security without government approval, to journalists reporting on the errors of public officials, and to journalists reporting in ways that might affect the outcome of a trial. All of these are consistent with the hypothesis that journalism education would lead students to be more supportive of media rights.

The six exceptions are significant and in conflict with the hypothesis. The journalism and mass communication graduates were not more likely to offer legal protection to journalists who inaccurately report or to the broadcast media when they project the winners of elections before the polls close. The journalism graduates also did not differ from their age cohort in the general population in terms of supporting the right of journalists to name the victim of a rape or to identify juveniles accused of crimes. They also are not more supportive of the broadcasting nude pictures or using them in books or magazines.

It also is striking how little support there is for absolute protection for the media across the 16 items used in the four surveys. Despite the training in journalism and the instruction on the importance of media access to information, only a quarter of the journalism and mass communication graduates, for example, would give journalists protection to write about classified materials under all circumstances. Even absolute protection of confidential sources is not supported by a clear majority of the 2004 journalism and mass communication graduates.

The two items added to the 2004 survey are perhaps most telling in this regard. Only 30% of the graduates would give absolute protection to television stations that run video containing a

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

message from terrorists, and only 42% would give absolute legal protection to journalists who write stories about U.S. soldiers that portray the soldiers unfavorably.

The consistency of the responses of the journalism and mass communication graduates between the two waves of surveys also is worth noting. In general, it seems, graduates of journalism and mass communication programs were leaving universities with much the same beliefs about media rights in 2004 as was the case in 1994. Given the turmoil in the industry, this may be surprising. The consistency, however, suggests reliability in the measurement and a basic instructional program at the university that has not altered even as the media industries have adapted to increased market competition and technological change.

The 16 items that were included in both of the *Annual Surveys of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates* were summed to create an index to make it easier to test the second and third hypotheses. (The need to use some items from the 1990 survey made this not practical for a test of the first hypothesis.) The first response category (All the time) was given a score of 3, while the third response category (Not protected at all) was given a score of 1, with the middle response given a score of 2. The overall mean score on the index was 32.58, with a standard deviation of 5.20. The index had a theoretical range of from 16 to 48. The mean score in 1994 was 32.66 (SD=5.29), while the mean score in 2004 was 32.52 (SD=5.13). Given the lack of difference by year, the data were analyzed across 5,005 students from the two years who answered all the 16 media rights questions.

Table 2 shows that, consistent with the second hypothesis, significant differences in terms of support for media rights were found based on their specialization while at the university.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Those students who had completed a traditional print or broadcast journalism curriculum were more supportive of media rights than other students. The advertising and public relations students were less supportive overall than others.

Table 2 also shows support for the third hypothesis, that men would be more supportive of media rights than women. Both specialization and gender matter, as the bottom of the table shows. Men in journalism were more supportive of media rights than women in journalism; men not in journalism were more supportive than women not in journalism. Journalism and mass communication graduates with a specialization in traditional journalism were more supportive of media rights than journalism and mass communication graduates who did not specialize in traditional journalism. There is no evidence of an interaction of these two factors.

All of the differences in Table 2 are small, it is important to note. Given the large sample size, the small differences are likely to be statistically significant, as they are shown to be in Table 2. It would be a mistake to argue that there is evidence that specialization within the field of journalism and mass communication made a tremendous difference, and it would be wrong to argue that men were very much more supportive of media rights than women. It also would be wrong to argue that there were no differences.

Conclusions

This paper began with the observation that variation in journalism education exists among countries of the world and within those same countries. Yet little is known about the impact of these variations.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

The paper suggested that one way to assess the impact of journalism education is to look at the professional attitudes of the graduates of those programs. If the journalism and mass communication graduates differ little from the general population in terms of their attitudes about the occupation, the educational experience would seem to have had little impact.

To test this hypothesis, secondary analyses were conducted of four large, national data sets from the United States. Two of these data sets were from the U.S. adult population. Two were from national samples of graduates of U.S. journalism and mass communication programs. Both of the data sets contained a set of items focusing on the rights of media organizations and of working journalists.

The measures seem particularly appropriate for an examination of the impact of journalism training. The items dealt with the rights of journalists to protect confidential sources, the rights of media to examine national security issues, the rights of the media to include content that some might find offensive, and the rights of the media to advertise products that are health hazards. Journalism and mass communication instruction in the United States certainly should deal with these topics. The instruction should be critical, but all these rights are ones that are supported by the basic legal structure of the U.S. and are consistent with the norms of journalistic and media behavior.

The evidence is that journalism education did have an impact on the students who completed the curriculum. Across many of the measures, the journalism and mass communication students were more supportive of media rights than the general population. In general, however, the journalism and mass communication students did not become absolutists in

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

terms of their support for media rights. Rather, they seemed to have gained an appreciation of subtlety and nuance. On some key items, they were, in fact, no different from the general population. Many of the legal restrictions that a significant number of the graduates accepted would be at odds with current media practice.

The evidence, however, is that there has been consistency in the message about media rights in the journalism and mass communication curriculum across time. The graduates of the U.S. journalism and mass communication programs in 2004 were not much different from the graduates 10 years earlier. Changes in the field seem not to have resulted in a changed set of beliefs about media rights.

As predicted, the specialization with the curriculum at the U.S. universities also seems to have made a difference. Those graduates who had completed a course of study leading to a traditional job as a journalist were more supportive of media rights than were students in other curricular specializations, such as public relations and advertising.

Female students, who were the majority of the graduates and who make up the majority of those enrolled in journalism and mass communication programs in the United States, offer less legal support to the media rights than do men. The finding is consistent with the observation that women are less enamored of the traditional definitions of news than are men.

The evaluation of journalism education is an important undertaking worthy of more investment of resources than has been the case to date. This paper offers evidence that journalism education does matter, and that differences within the curricula are worth examining. At the same time, the characteristics of the students themselves seems to matter.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

References

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ACEJMC (2007). *Assessment of learning outcomes*. Retrieved on January 3, 2007, from <http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std9>.
- Andsager, J.I., Wyatt, R.O., & Martin E. (2004). *Free expression in 5 democratic publics*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.
- Becker, L.B., Fruit, J.W., & Caudill, S.L. (1987). *The training and hiring of journalists*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Becker, L.B., & Kosicki, G.M. (1997). Annual survey of enrollment and degrees awarded. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 1997, 52 (3), 63-74.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., & Coffey, A.J. (2005, August). The 2004 annual survey of journalism and mass communication graduates. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Antonio, TX.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Gans, E.M., Edwards, H.H., Daniels, G.L., & Park, N. (2005). Professionalism of news workers. In S. Dunwoody, L.B. Becker, D.M. McLeod & G. M. Kosicki (Eds.), *The Evolution of key mass communication concepts* (pp. 79-111). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Becker, Lee B., Vlad, T., Huh, J., & Mace, N. (2003). *Gender equity elusive, surveys show*. Retrieved on November 11, 2005, from: <http://www.freedomforum.org/templates/document.asp?documentID=17784>.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., & Martin, H. (2006). Change and stability in the newspaper industry's journalistic labor market. *International Journal of Media Management*, 8, 39-49.

Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Pelton, R., & Papper, R.A. (2006, August). *2005 Survey of Editors and News Directors*. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Tucker, M., & Pelton, R. (2006a, August). *2005 annual survey of journalism & mass communication graduates*. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Francisco, CA.

Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Tucker, M., & Pelton, R. (2006b). 2005 Enrollment Report: Enrollment growth continues but at a reduced rate. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 61 (3): 297-327.

Donsbach, W., Becker, L.B., & Kosicki, G.M. (1992). *On-the-job vs. academic training: A comparative study of instructional alternatives in journalism education*. Paper resented to the Professional Education Section of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Dow Jones Newspaper Fund (2006). *The journalist's road to success*. Retrieved on January 5, 2007, from <http://djnewspaperfund.dowjones.com/fund/pubcareerguide.asp>.

Freidson, E. (1988). *Professional powers: A study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Froehlich, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (Eds.) (2003). *Journalism education in Europe and North America*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

First Amendment Center (2006). *2006 State of the First Amendment survey*. Retrieved on December 20, 2006, from http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/sofa_reports/index.aspx.

Gaunt, P. (1992). *Making the newsmakers: International handbook on journalism training*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Grabe, M. & Kamhawi, R. (2006). Hard wired for negative news? Gender differences in processing broadcast news. *Communication Research*, 33 (5), 346-369.

Larson, M.S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pew Research Center (2007). *Successes of the 20th Century*. Retrieved on January 4, 2007, from <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID=282>.

Pew Research Center (1994). *Eight Nations, People & The Press Survey: Mixed message about press freedom on both sides of Atlantic*. Retrieved on January 4, 2007, from <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/19940316.pdf>.

Pew Research Center (2003). *Views of a changing world*. Retrieved on January 4, 2007, from <http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/185.pdf>.

Gallup Organization (2003, November 10-November 12). Survey retrieved on January 4, 2007 from <http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/ipoll.html>.

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G.C. (1986). *The American journalist: A portrait of U.S. news people and their work*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Support for Media Rights as a Criterion for Evaluating Journalism Education

Weaver, D. (Ed.) (1998). *The global journalist: News people around the world*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Wyatt, R.O. (1991). *Free expression and the American public*. Murfreesboro, TN: Middle Tennessee State University.

Table 1. Media Rights Items: General Population and Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates

<i>Question: The law protects the media such as television, newspapers, radio and magazines under certain circumstances but not under others. Do you feel the media should be protected all the time, protected under certain circumstances, or not protected at all when...</i>					
Media Right	General Population 1990/1991		JMC Graduates		Sign. 18-24 vs. JMC 1994**
	Total	18-24 yrs.	1994	2004	
<i>Advertising pornographic or obscene material?*</i>					
All the time	11	11	12	11	
Under certain circumstances	23	32	58	54	
Not protected at all	66	56	30	35	0.01
<i>Advertising products that are legal but harmful to the public, such as tobacco or liquor?*</i>					
All the time	22	21	30	22	
Under certain circumstances	44	55	55	63	
Not protected at all	34	24	13	15	0.01
<i>Journalists take sides with a foreign government against the position of the United States?</i>					
All the time	33	33	45	42	
Under certain circumstances	22	22	41	43	
Not protected at all	43	45	14	16	0.01
<i>Journalists keep their sources confidential if a court demands to know the identity of a source?</i>					
All the time	48	41	59	47	
Under certain circumstances	34	41	37	47	
Not protected at all	16	18	4	6	0.01
<i>Journalists report classified material that the government wishes to keep secret?</i>					
All the time	17	18	26	25	
Under certain circumstances	23	28	62	58	
Not protected at all	60	54	13	17	0.01
<i>Journalists report factually inaccurate information that they believe to be true?</i>					
All the time	27	25	12	11	
Under certain circumstances	28	31	48	48	
Not protected at all	42	45	40	41	NS
<i>Television stations project the winners of an election while the people are still voting?</i>					
All the time	26	24	23	18	
Under certain circumstances	12	29	30	36	
Not protected at all	61	46	47	47	NS
<i>High school students report controversial issues in their student newspapers without approval of school authorities?*</i>					
All the time	28	38	49	63	
Under certain circumstances	46	47	44	33	
Not protected at all	25	15	8	3	0.01
<i>Newspapers or television stations run graphic photographs of violent events?</i>					
All the time	34	40	28	28	
Under certain circumstances	38	45	63	66	
Not protected at all	26	15	9	6	0.01

Table 1. Media Rights Items: General Population and Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates

<i>Question: The law protects the media such as television, newspapers, radio and magazines under certain circumstances but not under others. Do you feel the media should be protected all the time, protected under certain circumstances, or not protected at all when...</i>					
Media Right	General Population 1990/1991		JMC Graduates		Sign. 18-24 vs. JMC 1994**
	Total	18-24 yrs.	1994	2004	
<i>Journalists report stories about national security without government approval?</i>					
All the time	19	20	20	30	
Under certain circumstances	20	22	58	51	
Not protected at all	59	59	22	19	0.01
<i>Journalists report about the mistakes a public figure made more than 20 years ago?</i>					
All the time	41	44	43	46	
Under certain circumstances	28	29	42	44	
Not protected at all	28	27	15	10	0.01
<i>Journalists report the name or identity of a rape victim?</i>					
All the time	22	22	10	9	
Under certain circumstances	22	24	34	36	
Not protected at all	54	54	56	55	NS
<i>Journalists report the name of a juvenile charged with a crime?</i>					
All the time	37	34	16	11	
Under certain circumstances	31	34	53	55	
Not protected at all	31	32	31	34	NS
<i>Television broadcasts pictures of nude or partially clothed persons?</i>					
All the time	26	28	19	16	
Under certain circumstances	34	49	62	63	
Not protected at all	40	23	19	20	NS
<i>Selling magazines or books that feature nude pictures?</i>					
All the time	44	50	33	32	
Under certain circumstances	27	36	49	49	
Not protected at all	28	14	18	19	NS
<i>Journalists report stories that may affect the outcome of a criminal trial?</i>					
All the time	23	25	14	15	
Under certain circumstances	26	31	52	54	
Not protected at all	49	44	34	31	0.01
<i>Television newscasts include video that may contain a message from terrorists?</i>					
All the time				30	
Under certain circumstances				59	
Not protected at all				12	
<i>Journalists write stories about U.S. soldiers in combat that portray them unfavorably?</i>					
All the time				42	
Under certain circumstances				46	
Not protected at all				12	
N (minimum)	1,472/1,004	201/151	2,161	2,972	

*1990. Others are for 1991.

**Difference of proportions test, one-tailed.

Table 2. Comparison of Means for Media Rights Index by Major and Gender

Major	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Journalism	33.72	1,506	5.38
Telecommunications	32.51	251	4.87
Advertising	31.70	669	4.89
Public Relations	31.72	895	5.02
Other	32.32	1,560	5.14
Total	32.57	4,881	5.21

F=30.38, p<.01

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	33.71	1,512	5.42
Female	32.09	3,484	5.02
Total	32.58	4,996	5.20

F=103.49, p<.01

Major	Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Journalism	Male	34.81	546	5.52
	Female	33.09	957	5.19
	Total	33.72	1,503	5.38
Not journalism	Male	33.02	929	5.31
	Female	31.69	2,440	4.90
	Total	32.06	3,369	5.05
Total	Male	33.68	1,475	5.46
	Female	32.08	3,397	5.02
	Total	32.57	4,872	5.21

t for beta for Major = 9.63 (p<.01); t for beta for Gender = 9.15 (p<.01)