

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
10/2/02		
10/2/02		
OCT 31 2002		
10/27		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

JOURNALISM EDUCATORS AND MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER PROFESSIONALS:
AN ACADEMIC INTERFACE ON EDUCATIONAL CRITERIA IN JOURNALISM
AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

By

Kenton John Pfister

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

School of Journalism

1989

ABSTRACT

JOURNALISM EDUCATORS AND MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER PROFESSIONALS: AN ACADEMIC INTERFACE ON EDUCATIONAL CRITERIA IN JOURNALISM AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

By

Kenton John Pfister

This thesis consisted of a study of Michigan newspaper professionals and journalism educators to determine their views of one another and education. The study also disclosed personal and professional characteristics that correlate with respondents' beliefs about journalism education and those in the education or newspaper professional communities. Data was obtained in a mail questionnaire distributed to journalism educators and newspaper editors statewide. The study found Michigan weekly newspaper professionals are more dissatisfied with journalism education than are daily professionals. It was also determined that the more experience newspaper people have in this field, the more likely they are to view journalism education negatively. It was also found that the more professionals interact with journalism educators, the more likely they are to view journalism education positively.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	3
Background Assumptions	
II. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	37
III. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	50
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	57
Analyzing the Responses	
Demographic and Psychographic Findings	
Interactions Between Respondents	
V. INDICATORS OF THE RELATIONSHIP	69
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	106

LIST OF TABLES

1. Daily/Weekly Beliefs on J-Education Issues . . .	71
2. News Professionals' Understanding of J-Schools	72
3. News Professionals' Beliefs About J-Students . .	75
4. News Professional/J-Educator Interactions . . .	77
5. News Professionals' Beliefs on J-Curriculum . .	79
6. J-Educators' Understanding of Newspapers . . .	81
7. J-Students' Knowledge of Newspaper Operations	84

INTRODUCTION

According to published figures, more than 100,000 students are enrolled in journalism and mass communications programs in the United States, a total that takes into account students studying newswriting, broadcasting, magazine writing, and all branches of today's multi-faceted communications education scene.¹ That is about 100,000 more men and women, many of whom will one day soon be out competing in an already-crowded and highly demanding job market that has major expectations of its employees and has little room for non-performers.

The climate that students will find when they enter this job market is one where the "practice of journalism is changing almost daily," writes Fredric A. Powell of the State University of New York, and where there is "less time than ever before for students to assimilate this understanding and practice before it becomes obsolete and

¹Paul V. Paterson, "Survey Indicates No Change in '83 Journalism Enrollment," Journalism Educator, Spring 1984, p. 3.

before it becomes obsolete and replaced by other technique."² It is, indeed, an environment that has little concern for would-be journalists who are not willing to pay the price to become a part of its ever-growing ranks.

This same competitive situation certainly faces graduates of Michigan's university journalism programs, many of whom seek employment at one of the state's fifty-two daily newspapers or scores of weekly newspapers. So what kind of education are these seemingly endless numbers of journalism students receiving nowadays--particularly in Michigan? Do Michigan's newspaper professionals today think highly--or not so highly--of the operations of journalism programs? And what is it about these professionals that correlates with their perceptions of and attitudes toward students educated in university journalism programs? These are questions that a survey conducted in May 1985 set out to address. The results of that survey, as will be discussed, ultimately answered these questions with a worthy amount of success.

²Fredric A. Powell, "Training Students More Realistically Through a Work-Setting Approach," Journalism Educator, Spring 1983, p. 52.

I. BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

The social significance of a study of this nature is apparent, as it sheds light on a most practical aspect of journalism in Michigan. In fact, it focused on what should actually be the most imperative responsibility for those charged with the responsibility of educating newspaper-oriented journalism students: that is, preparing up-and-coming news-editorial employees for the jobs that lie ahead of them. Illuminating Michigan newspaper professionals' outlooks on the educational training of journalism students provides compelling findings for the state's newspaper professionals (as peers see what others in the field are thinking about journalism education), for the educators (as they see what those who hire journalism students think of the job educators do), and, of course, for the students themselves.

From most indications, the linkage between the news media and journalism schools cannot be called a particularly tranquil one. It is, as James Carey, the former president of the Association for Education in

Journalism and Mass Communication, described, an "uneasy relationship."³ Literature reviewed on the journalism professional-educator relationship shows there are major disagreements among journalists in the field as to the educational processes transpiring in university journalism programs. Everette A. Dennis, then dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon, noted in an expansive report entitled "Planning for Change in Journalism Education" that major changes are needed in our universities' journalism programs. He said neither research nor the best of current journalism practices is presently being integrated into the curriculum at most schools. No one really has much of an idea how to advise students in the rapidly changing world of communications, he regretfully added, and besides, journalism educators are overworked as it is and have little if any opportunity for positive professional development.⁴

Dennis's report concluded that, in their present state, journalism schools in this nation are "nearly stagnant," not having changed their basic structure or curriculum in decades. At most, the report indicated, journalism schools offer "a patchwork of craft or conceptual courses" based on nothing more than student

³James W. Carey, "A Plea for the University Tradition," Journalism Quarterly 55 (Winter 1978):849.

⁴Ron Dorfman, "A New Deal for Journalism Education?" The Quill, February 1984, p. 18.

demand, faculty interest, and institutional attempts to meet special needs.⁵ Surveying journalism programs nationwide, Dennis found in his research that those programs do not have enough of a broad base of support at their universities, either. Instead, Dennis claimed the survey showed journalism schools are frequently subjected to harsh criticism from professionals in the news media, many of whom give "marching orders" to educators but little other constructive, much-welcome backing. This sad state of affairs, he offered, is particularly disturbing because journalism and mass communications are fields "central to the functioning of contemporary society."⁶ Therefore, the larger ramification of this less-than-optimal relationship journalism educators and media professionals is obvious: A public that, for a multitude of reasons, is probably not benefiting as it should from the finely honed talents of a wealth of properly trained journalism graduates.

This criticism of journalism education programs by working journalists is extremely apparent in research done on the topic. For example, most telling was a 1980 study whose findings indicated a prevailing dissent among media professionals with journalism students. The study, done

⁵Ibid.

⁶Beverly T. Watkins, "Many Journalism Schools at Universities Found to be 'Nearly Stagnant,'" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 5 July 1984, p. 9.

by Brigham Young University educators Gordon Mills, Kenneth Harvey, and Leland B. Warnick, consisted of a survey of 147 daily newspaper editors and eighty weekly editors. The trio found the majority of the editors surveyed were not overly impressed with the typical four-year journalism education program. Furthermore, those malcontent feelings about journalism graduates were directly reflected in the editors' views of schools from which these graduates hailed. Extremely indicative of these editors' negative feelings were the responses to a question put to them about their preferences among four kinds of preparation for workers in entry-level newspaper editorial jobs. Among the four modes of training offered, the program students follow in accredited journalism schools was rated last by the responding editors. More editors even said they would be more willing to hire a graduate of an intensive two-year trade school than a graduate of a university journalism program.⁷

A warranted follow-up question to this unsettling finding could be this: Why are there such negative feelings among newspaper people about the quality of education received by students in university journalism programs? One especially acute problem many editors

⁷Gordon Mills, Kenneth Harvey, and Leland B. Warnick, "Newspaper Editors Point to J-Grad Deficiencies," Journalism Educator, July 1980, pp. 12-14.

expressed in the Brigham Young researchers' survey--which may go a long ways toward answering this question--was with students' basic grammar, spelling, and writing skills. Thirty-five percent of those editors responding to the questionnaire mentioned these problems.⁸

Representative of these editors' beliefs was one respondent, who gave this frank answer to an open-ended question asking for specific problems with journalism students' skills: "We have almost given up on finding anyone skilled in basic grammar, spelling, and writing skills. We have had more luck with non-journalism graduates."⁹

Similar unsatisfactory appraisals of journalism education were echoed in another responses garnered during another survey, this one conducted by Edwin O. Haroldsen and Kenneth E. Harvey. In that survey, the data collected showed most of these editors believes journalism students did not have nearly the proper amount of preparation for the workplace. The Haroldsen-Harvey study revealed that 57 percent of the national magazine editors responding to their questionnaire agreed journalism graduates are poorly prepared or not prepared at all to handle magazine editorial positions, an opinion that was for the most part shared by editors of both large and small publications

⁸Ibid., p. 15.

⁹Ibid.

alike.¹⁰ In this survey as well, editors expressed great concern over journalism students' basic language and grammar training. Most of these editors, the authors' Journalism Educator report on the survey noted, would probably favor a specific journalism school course offering that focused specifically on basic language skills.¹¹

Random samplings of magazine editors' comments in the survey detailed what they felt are problems with the manner in which journalism schools are churning out graduates and with the skills that those graduates possess. One editor flatly said that schools of journalism have evolved into "factories to turn out the unfit instead of incubators for the relatively few of talent. . . . I see a good many journalism graduates; the foundering ones without talent are pathetic examples of the mass production now taking place in every school of journalism that I know anything about."¹² Comments such as this make it all too obvious that news professionals are not content with today's journalism school-educated students. And yet, the fact that journalists in the field

¹⁰Edwin O. Haroldsen and Kenneth E. Harvey, "Frowns Greet New J-Grads in Magazine Job Market," Journalism Educator, July 1979, p. 3.

¹¹Ibid., p. 26.

¹²Ibid., p. 3.

believe journalism students are not as prepared as they should be is not the only gap concerning journalism education that requires attention. There is also a noticeable discrepancy between journalists and educators as to their feelings about journalism students' preparedness, a review of the literature indicated. Thus, not only do those in the field that journalism students lack appropriate training, but there is apparently another formidable obstacle hindering the relationship between journalism educators and journalists: They disagree as to the quality of the education being administered.

One survey, undertaken as part of a doctoral dissertation by Haskell O. Gaddis, disclosed that journalism educators had a higher perception of the skills of journalism graduates than did newspaper editors. This comparative study, the researcher claimed, also found that editors saw much more of a need for improvement in journalism education than did those persons who were responsible for that education.¹³

Disagreement between journalists and educators over the preparedness of journalism students was also brought forth in conflicting articles appearing in a special September 1975 issue on journalism education in The Quill.

¹³Haskell O. Gaddis, "Journalism Career Preparation: Opinions of Selected Newspaper Editors Versus Those of Heads of ACEJ-Accredited News-Editorial Journalism Sequences," Journalism Abstracts, 1980, 18:11.

The combatants, John DeMott of Memphis State University and editor and publisher Ronald H. Einstoss, had far differing views on the job journalism educators are doing in preparing students for this relentless world of employment in today's media. Defending the work being done by journalism educators, DeMott wrote that "in little more than a single generation, professional journalism education has progressed from the uncertain status of a successful experiment" to a situation where "we are witnessing the establishment of journalism programs everywhere." DeMott condemned what he called "primitive newspaper editors who don't believe at all in journalism schools, and editors with no experience teaching who have a lot of beautiful theories about journalism education that don't work out in practice."¹⁴

DeMott also defended journalism education against the common criticisms it receives from those who say its practitioners are too busy with their research endeavors to keep current with what is happening in the so-called "real world." To these claims, he responded without hesitation:

Nonsense. Despite the presence of too many academicians of limited professional experience, today's average journalism professor has more professional experience than the average critic, and is more familiar with the developments in the field. I'm constantly amazed at the naivete displayed by many news reporters and editors brought into our

¹⁴John DeMott, "We're Doing a Better Job Than Ever," The Quill, September 1975, p. 16.

classroom. They are still slow to see that the ivy-colored ivory-tower myth is just that.¹⁵

DeMott's arguments did not sway the viewpoint of Einstoss, who retorted that by and large, journalism students still lack the necessary "newspaper intelligence," as he put it, to step into hectic news-editorial positions. Newspaper intelligence, Einstoss elaborated, consists of curiosity; language skills; integrity; passion to communicate; understanding of the newsroom, community, nation, and world; ability to find things out and ask questions; street sense; motivation; and acquisition of certain indispensable newspaper skills. Said Einstoss, passionately: "The young man or woman who possesses all of those competencies would be a welcome addition to any newsroom, large or small. But it would seem that not many j-school graduates possess them." Einstoss said editors know what they expect of a beginning reporter, but are not encountering the realization of that expectation in the journalism students they come across. "And they expect as much from the novice as any other (reporter) because they don't label stories as written by beginning, intermediate, or advanced reporters," he added. "Readers pay for a professionally done product and expect one."¹⁶

¹⁵Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 21.

Disagreement with and concern over the operations of journalism programs at the nation's colleges and universities was also expressed by educators and news professionals at a joint conference in 1973 sponsored by the American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA) and the Association for Education in Journalism. A major theme expressed time and again at that session, according to an Editor & Publisher recapitulation, was that together journalism educators and news professionals can achieve far more than either group can by working separately. This togetherness, admitted those attending the conference, was not occurring at that time.¹⁷ Reviewing more recent writings on the subject, this quested-for cohesiveness simply is not taking place today.

While the literature indicates educators are more positive about their lot than news professionals, this does not mean there is universal contentment with the state of affairs. One educator, Dave Berkman, chair of and a professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, contended in a 1985 article that journalism education is not attaining the level of education mandated by its purported mission of training students to commence careers in the media." The reason for this gloomy prognostication, he said, is plain

¹⁷Hillier Kriegbaum, "J-School Training Criticized in ANPA-AEJ 'Rap' Sessions," Editor & Publisher, 10 November 1973.

and simply a lack of quality students.¹⁸ Noting that until 1983, median SAT verbal test scores for journalism students had declined for eighteen straight years, Berkman said this implies that journalism programs students "who can have no legitimate expectation of pursuing a career that centers on the craft of writing." But Berkman said none of this surprises him, adding:

Those to whom I speak, almost without exception, express incredulity about the poor writing skills of those whom we graduate as journalism or broadcast majors--and those whom we have ostensibly "credentialed" as qualified for entry-level positions. Yet, despite of this kind of feedback--and given its consistency, it cannot be exceptional--we go on enrolling students, large numbers of whom have no right to expect to earn their living by writing.¹⁹

Berkman also said journalism educators "can go on ignoring the problem," but doing so would constitute living a "professional lie." This is strong language shows there are passionate feelings out there about how and why it is significant that a hard look be taken at the job that journalism education is doing.

Since it may be accurate to say that there is a gap between what many educators and professionals think of journalism education, the next step is to identify some possible factors contributing to existence of this gap. This step is essential if journalism education is to

¹⁸Dave Berkman, "Student Quality Fall Affects J-Schools," Journalism Educator, Winter 1985, pp. 33-34.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 34-35.

improve, concluded researcher Woody Gaddis. After his 1979 survey of journalism educators and newspaper editors, Gaddis resolved that these two groups must cast aside their differences of opinion about the successes and failures of journalism and jointly advocate the development of widespread public support for quality journalism.²⁰

One primary reason for this discrepancy something which has surfaced frequently in a thorough review of related literature, may be that the groups lack formidable ties and familiarity with each other. Evidence of the lack of familiarity of news professionals with journalism education (and vice versa) surfaced strongly in a survey survey of 191 editors and 164 educators undertaken by ANPA. In that study, reviewed in the April 1972 issue of The Quill, the difference in the two groups' views of journalism education was extreme. Author John L. Hulteng reported that, when asked what degree of understanding journalism graduates have of objectivity in reporting, nearly 90 percent of the responding educators said "a great deal" or "quite a lot," while only half of the editors agreed with those estimates.²¹

²⁰Woody Gaddis, "Editors, Educators Agree on Many Key J-Education Issues," Journalism Educator, July 1981, pp. 26, 46.

²¹John L. Hulteng, "The J-Graduate--How Well Prepared? Educators and Editors Don't See Eye to Eye," The Quill, April 1972, p. 15.

The differences go on and on. To a question about journalism graduates' understanding of editorializing in news copy, nearly 80 percent of the professors said their graduates understood this problem well, while fewer than a third of the editors had the same opinion of those journalism graduates who came to them for jobs. Although more than 70 percent of the educators said journalism graduates were well prepared to handle a copy-editing or headline-writing assignment, only slightly more than 10 percent of the editors agreed. And when asked how well journalism students were prepared to write usable news copy, nearly 90 percent of the educators responded "well prepared" or "very well prepared," but less than 50 percent of the editors checked either of those answers. According to Hulteng, the findings made it clear how wide the difference is between the journalism educational and professional arenas when it comes to gaging journalism education's effectiveness. "In every instance, the educators were far more optimistic about the abilities of their charges than were the editors," said the former dean of the University of Oregon Journalism School.²²

Interestingly, the survey also showed some major variations in the perceptions held by the two groups about the manner in which newspapers are operated. "Generally, the editors' impressions of the functions carried out by

²²Ibid.

their papers tended to be significantly more idealistic than the educators' appraisals of newspaper performance," Hulteng commented. But when it came to journalism education, he said, editors "displayed in their responses a lack of accurate knowledge of the nature and course of programs at most journalism schools." In the same piece, United Press International's Roger Tartarian said:

It shows that despite all ecumenical efforts, the short circuit between editors and journalism educators persists to a considerable degree. Many editors apparently cling steadfastly to false notions about journalism education. . . . As for the educators, they not surprisingly have a higher opinion of the professional capabilities of their graduates than do most of the men who hire them.²³

The final verdict on the study's findings, Hulteng stressed, was although dialogue between editors and educators may have been expanding to some degree, "apparently it still has a long way to go."²⁴ To make up some of this "long way" Hulteng described, DeWitt C. Reddick, in the introduction to The Quill's earlier mentioned exploratory series on journalism education, urged that links must be developed between educators and professionals. "Journalism education is of vital concern to all professional fields of journalism," he wrote. "Ways must be found for a continuous interaction between journalism teachers and professionals on newspapers,

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

magazines, the electronic media, in advertising, public relations, and other communication fields." Reddick, once dean of the University of Texas College of Communication, said the constant complaints about journalism education from news professionals concerns him deeply. He noted:

It concerns me when I hear a newspaper editor complain: "Those people on the journalism faculty haven't been down to see me in months." I'd like to say to him: "The distance from the university to the newspaper office is the same as the distance from the newspaper to the school; have you been out to see the faculty on campus?" But I'd also say to the faculty: "You are neglecting your most valuable resources." The imperative rests alike on both sides to maintain communication. For the good of all.²⁵

Ronald Einstoss said both educators and news professionals are to blame for the split that has occurred. He admitted the media need help from educators in the fight to be "bold, imaginative, and innovative in our approach to the packaging of the news." At the same time, though, he said some of the burden must be put on news executives. Unless they take enough interest in journalism schools to exert effort and "breed and carry that fight" to the university administrators (those who can do much to improve journalism programs), journalism professionals will get graduates among their ranks who are far lower in quality than they could or should be.²⁶

²⁵DeWitt C. Reddick, "From a Variety of Voices, A Myriad of Grays: Introduction," The Quill, September 1975, p. 15.

²⁶Einstoss, "You're Still Short of the Mark," p. 24.

Again, neither journalism educators nor journalism professionals are on the "right" side of this difference, Einstoss points out. "We've all been trying to get by with a head-in-the-sand defense, consisting mainly of blaming the other guy, long enough," he wrote. "If we start putting a few points on the scoreboard, our students and readers will be the winners."²⁷

In addition to this observed lack of familiarity between journalism editors and news professionals and the institutions represented by both groups, also widening this gap may be a shift in journalism students' career interests. When considering newspapers, the shift in student interests may be another probable cause of the gap between journalism education and newspaper editors and publishers. Why? Because student interest in newspaper careers has been dwindling greatly. So much so that the number of journalism students pursuing newspaper careers does not make up anywhere near a majority of the overall number of students seeking journalism or communications degrees. And this can hardly be called a recent phenomenon in education circles.

Even well over a decade ago, evidence was surfacing that showed newspaper work was no longer the primary career interest it once was for journalism school-trained students. In an October 1972 survey of University of

²⁷Ibid.

North Carolina students, researcher Thomas A. Bowers found that only 30 percent of those students anticipated working for newspapers five years after graduation. Furthermore, 30 percent of the respondents also anticipated being in non-journalism careers altogether five years following graduation. This, Bowers interpreted, "suggests many journalism students might not be committed to a journalism career." Given these findings--which had to be disturbing to both journalism schools and newspaper people--Bowers proposed the possibility of separate curricula being created for students who are interested in a communication field but not specifically a traditional journalism career.²⁸

This move away from one-time traditional newspaper careers seems to have gathered a great deal of momentum in the years that followed Bowers' study. A national survey done in 1980 by the Frank E. Gannett Newspaper Foundation showed that journalism students' career interests were appreciably wide in scope--so wide that only 13.3 percent of the students responding said they intended to seek employment with newspapers. Only 10.9 percent of those students said they intended to work with daily newspapers, the remaining 3.4 percent preferring community-type publications. This percentage of students wanting to work

²⁸Thomas A. Bowers, "Student Attitudes Toward Journalism as a Major and a Career," Journalism Quarterly 51 (Summer 1974), 266, 269-70.

on newspapers was smaller than the percentages wanting to work in either public relations, advertising, or television-radio careers.²⁹ With newspaper careers no longer a dominant career goal of journalism students, the greater likelihood would appear to be that newspapers are seeing fewer journalism-educated students apply for their news-editorial openings. Thus, can it be surprising newspaper people do not view journalism education kindly?

Also inhibiting future newspaper employees' development, many believe, are constraints slapped on accredited journalism programs by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC), the organization responsible for evaluating and re-evaluating journalism criteria of universities and colleges that participate voluntarily in its program. ACEJMC requires that at least 51 percent of the undergraduate students in accredited schools maintain a "general ratio" of three-fourths courses in liberal arts to one-fourth journalism courses.³⁰ Because of this standard, many say journalism students are not permitted to take all of the journalism courses they want and, indeed, need to better prepare themselves for the

²⁹William J. Roepke, "Educators Ponder Shifts in Student Career Goals," Journalism Educator, October 1981, pp. 3, 6.

³⁰Michael Mokrzycki, "Provisional Accreditation Rejected by Boston University," Editor & Publisher, 12 February 1983, p. 14.

newspaper world. Newspaper professionals, it would seem likely, are among the harshest critics of this requirement.

The national survey of newspaper editors by Brigham Young's Mills, Harvey, and Warnick gave support to this possibility. A general finding in their study was that the editors' mean response indicated a student's journalism course load should be increased from the present 25 percent allowed by ACEJMC standards to about 40 percent.³¹ Perhaps representative of those editors who would applaud an increase in allowable journalism courses, a managing editor from a smaller Michigan daily newspaper said: "I feel journalism students better learn the ABCs of the profession and to hell with all the theory and advocacy bull they seem to be filled with." Emphasizing that journalism is a profession, akin to other fields requiring special talents, he accused journalism schools of passing on students who should "be detoured in college" and then forcing newspaper editors "to cull them (students) out after accepting their diploma as prima facie evidence of competency."³²

In education circles, however, there are people on both sides of the fence of the liberal arts-journalism

³¹Mills, Harvey, and Warnick, "Newspaper Editors Point," p. 12.

³²Ibid., pp. 15-16.

question, thus adding more uncertainty to the picture. Supporters of the present ACEJMC standard say the three-to-one ratio of liberal arts and journalism courses gives students a taste of a multitude of subjects that might have remained unknown to them if they were in a more journalism-dominated curriculum. James Carey, now dean of the College of Communications at the University of Illinois, said the standard is a necessity. "When a certain skill is divorced from any of the larger purposes that are presumably what we are trying to cultivate in this civilization, there is a real danger," he professed.³³

Sharon Murphy, dean of journalism at Marquette University in Milwaukee and advocate of a strong liberal arts education, said such a background produces people who can "stretch the ideas" of the journalistic profession. "By graduating those who are only ready for their first job, we're cheating ourselves," she matter-of-factly claimed.³⁴

But not all educators are of this opinion. Kenneth Edwards, addressing this topic in a 1983 issue of Editor & Publisher, writes that the three-to-one accreditation rule greatly inhibits journalism schools. "Journalism

³³Tim Talevich, "Liberal Arts Tradition Backed at J-Education Summit," Presstime, February 1984, p. 38.

³⁴Ibid., p. 39.

education is not handicapped by too much journalism instruction," said the former University of Alabama journalism professor. "There are hundreds of students in accredited journalism programs who would like to enroll in courses teaching reporting, writing, and practical research but who cannot do so because of the 75-25 rule." Students whose course load is limited by accreditation standards, Edwards contended, are not acquiring enough of the skills that are so strongly sought after by those hiring entry-level journalists.³⁵ There is also strong evidence that journalism schools do not fully understand what accreditation actually means for their students. In a survey of twenty-four ACEJMC accreditors and sixty-seven administrators done in the spring of 1983, Gerald C. Stone of Memphis State University reported this finding: An "air of uncertainty" existed among journalism school administrators as to what ACEJMC's three-to-one rule means. Answers obtained in the survey, according to Stone, indicated that journalism schools and accreditors seem to operate on two unattached plateaus. He announced:

Among administrators of ACEJMC-accredited programs, and among members of the accrediting group itself, there is a dose of different interpretation and at least a modicum of misunderstanding about how the rule should be applied to specific courses. . . . There seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding between journalism administrators and ACEJMC members.

³⁵Kenneth Edwards, "Teaching Writing Skills," Editor & Publisher, 2 April 1983, p. 36.

. . . The study supports the uncomfortable conclusion that there is a substantial difference in the interpretation of the 25 percent rule today. The results suggest that some tightening of the guidelines, or at least a greater clarity of the guidelines, be considered.³⁶

William R. Lindley of the Idaho State University Department of Journalism agreed that accreditation has plunged journalism schools into a state of confusion. Lindley said in a Nieman Reports article that journalism education, with negligible guidance from accreditors, has become a concoction of faculty members with varying experiences, so-called "journalism schools" joined with other programs, and a lack of standards as to what students should be taught. A former Associated Press and newspaper employee, Lindley said because of a lack of accreditation directives, journalism education is likely to continue to be a system plagued by policies based on each school's "entrenched policies and tenured interests," not on what is in the best interest of the thousands of students.³⁷

Joining Lindley in questioning accreditation policy is Charles T. Duncan, professor and dean emeritus at the University of Oregon. He has wondered quite candidly just what purpose accreditation serves for both journalism

³⁶Gerald C. Stone, "Survey Reflects Disagreement on 25 Percent Accrediting Rule," Journalism Educator, Winter 1984, p. 16.

³⁷William R. Lindley, "Journalism Studies: Search for a Science," Nieman Reports, Winter 1983, p. 42.

education and the professional world. "The policy of accreditation . . . has serious flaws, I believe," Duncan wrote. "It can be (and I have known it to be) misleading to prospective students and employees alike, few of whom are sophisticated enough or care enough to discern its meaning and to judge accordingly." Thinking over how accreditation can effectively fit into the expanding interests that journalism students have, Duncan said:

The stated purpose of accreditation is "to promote excellence in journalism." . . . Journalism, however defined, is a profession only for those who make it so for themselves. Where then does accreditation fit into the melange that in the journalism-mass communication world of today--a world that has changed so dramatically in the past thirty years and will change even more in the next thirty? Accreditation of what and for whom?³⁸

Duncan raises a sensitive question about the role of accreditation, one that many newspaper professionals who hire journalism students perhaps have also pondered. Yet another problem with journalism education that newspaper professionals and educators have cited is students' lack of proper experience prior to entering the media marketplace for their first job. In the previously noted Brigham Young educators' survey of newspaper editors, respondents gave a high rating (3.92 mean out of 5.0) to a proposal that all journalism students should be required to fill a newspaper internship before graduation.

³⁸Charles W. Duncan, "Accreditation Issues Debated at 1983 AEJMC Convention: The Historical Perspective," Journalism Educator, Winter 1984, p. 8.

Representative of many respondents' feelings was this comment from an editor: "'Experience is the best teacher' continues to be the best advice, but so few graduates have much outside their school publications. They need to see the practical side along with the academics." Added another editor: "I firmly believe that an internship is the best training."³⁹

Journalism educators Jon Roosenraad and Donna Wares provided further solid evidence of the importance newspaper professionals attach to the role of professional experience in a student's background. The University of Florida educators, based on their survey of seventy-four editors, reported a majority of those editors put more emphasis on the experience a journalism graduate (or graduate of any major) has over that job candidate's educational background. "It simply isn't enough for would-be journalists to learn about the profession; they've got to get hands-on experience while they are still in college," the researchers wrote in reflecting on the conclusions drawn from their survey.⁴⁰

Another educator, Richard Femmel, described in an October 1978 Journalism Educator article the success that

³⁹Mills, Harvey, and Warnick, "Newspaper Editors Point," pp. 17-18.

⁴⁰Jon Roosenraad and Donna Wares, "Academics vs. Experience," Journalism Educator, Summer 1983, pp. 18, 30.

Wayne State University had achieved with its mandatory internship program. During the course of the program, students' internships were designed to fit the needs of the newspaper and other media sponsors that the students were to serve. The results of the program were exceptional: not only were the sponsors impressed by the students who served them, said Femmel, but many of the interns were offered permanent positions with their sponsoring publications upon graduation.⁴¹ Certainly, what this program at Wayne State shows is that students who couple relative media experience with their college education are viewed by many hiring media professionals as more attractive candidates than some of those students whose background is strictly education-intensive and does not contain prior experience.

Based on the discussion presented thus far, as well as the reasons mentioned as contributing to the gap between journalism educators and news professionals, it is still largely up to journalism educators to face the challenges before them and make their educational programs better reflect the needs of those in the media who do the hiring. Toward this end, journalism author John Tebbel wrote that professional journalism instruction must be more relevant to the contemporary world it intends to

⁴¹Richard Femmel, "Why Not Make Internships Mandatory for Everybody?" Journalism Educator, October 1978, pp. 17-19.

serve, and it is the responsibility of journalism schools to responsibly address this situation.⁴²

Journalism education "is suffering from that fashionable affliction, an identity crisis," noted Tebbel. "Those who want to isolate it from the real world of the media as an academic discipline unrelated to the professional performance will have little but sympathy to offer newspapers and broadcasters who are under attack from critics of every variety, and who hope to fight back by improving their product." Tebbel admitted the media are not without fault in this dilemma over how to prepare journalism students, but nevertheless added that journalism schools must mount the fight to make undergraduate journalism education a process which directly fulfills the professional quality expected of the working press. Doing anything less will be shortchanging the press as well as journalism education, he added.⁴³

Another educator, Melvin Mencher of Columbia University, posed this challenge to journalism schools in an Autumn 1982 Nieman Reports piece: "Can journalism schools monitor themselves and keep a creative tension between the established curriculum and the demands of the

⁴²John Tebbel, "Can Journalism Schools Improve the Press?" In Readings in Mass Communication: Concepts and Issues in the Mass Media (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972), p. 373.

⁴³Ibid.

new technology?"⁴⁴ It is this type of question with which many journalism schools apparently are grappling. It is also one the professional journalism community is increasingly forcing upon educators. Are satisfactory answers being found, however?

One educator, Ted Joseph of Washington State University, believes not. This "creative tension" Mencher talks of is not at all typical of the makeup of most journalism schools, Joseph charged in a Spring 1983 Journalism Educator article. Processes are needed in journalism education, he wrote, "to eliminate some of the pathetically sterile and destructive interactions which permeate many of our departments of (journalism) . . . institutions."⁴⁵

Making students better fit for today's competitive media, observed DeWitt C. Reddick, means journalism education must take into account the changes that have taken place in many aspects of the information industries, while at the same time continuing to stress the precious and indispensable fundamentals that the media require. The way to achieve this, he said, is to work with--and not in spite of--professional journalists. "The task can only be carried out satisfactorily with close cooperation

⁴⁴Melvin Mencher, "Agenda for Journalism Education," Nieman Reports, Autumn 1982, p. 47.

⁴⁵Ted Joseph, "The Need For Dialogue: We Might Try Harder," Journalism Educator, Spring 1983, p. 55.

between the professional fields of journalism and the educational effort," Reddick maintained. "Journalism education, by all logic, should be ahead of professional journalism in projecting changing approaches to the interpretation of news, for education is to prepare for tomorrow."⁴⁶ James Carey, meanwhile, implores all journalism educators to "reassert the university tradition" in their teachings and to be aware they are doing more than preparing students for the working world. He went on to say: "We must recognize that we are not merely training people for a profession or for the current demands of professional practice, but for membership in the public and for a future that transcends both the limitations of contemporary practice and contemporary politics."⁴⁷

Determining whether Michigan newspaper professionals agree with such society-focused assessments of the function of journalism programs was one intention of the study that was carried out in this master's thesis. But if the previously cited literature is any indication, it is necessary to recognize many of today's news professionals are probably more concerned that their entry-level employees can write and report than if they

⁴⁶Reddick, "From a Variety of Voices," p. 14.

⁴⁷Carey, "A Plea for the University Tradition," pp. 854-55.

are well prepared for membership in society. It is upon this foundation of discrepancies between journalists' expectations and educators' goals that the study undertaken for this master's thesis was formulated.

Background Assumptions

Based on the preceding review of the literature, a number of background assumptions were made about the state of the relationships between university-level journalism educators and newspaper professionals. Those assumptions were:

1. It was assumed there exists a gap between Michigan journalism schools' criteria for education in journalism and newspaper professionals' expectations from students who graduate from journalism schools.
2. Furthermore, it was assumed there are noteworthy differences between newspaper professionals and journalism educators as to the preparedness of journalism graduates for entry-level newspaper positions, with educators believing students are better prepared for those jobs than do newspaper professionals.
3. In addition, it was assumed newspaper professionals would have a more positive perception of the education that journalism students receive if they themselves had some input into journalism programs and if

they understand the educational processes that occur regularly in a university-level journalism program.

4. Also, it was assumed newspaper professionals believe a majority of students in journalism programs lack a broad base of training which includes necessary language, reporting, writing, editing, and other skills needed to step in and contribute immediately at an entry-level news-editorial position with a newspaper.

5. Finally, it was assumed newspaper professionals view previous professional media experience as constituting a significant portion of educational criteria for entry-level positions with newspapers.

Based on these assumptions, it was possible to develop extensive rationale for performing the study. First, there is an obvious dearth of recent systematic and empirical data in the field in which news professionals' perceptions of and attitudes toward the state of journalism education are measured. This readily apparent research gap is particularly evident in regards to Michigan's news media and journalism educators--with which the scope of this study concerned itself.

Studies have been conducted nationally and in a few other select states where editors of newspapers have been questioned for their ideas on how future news-editorial employees should be schooled and on how well this task is being accomplished. However, the same type of study had

not yet been conducted in Michigan. Given this void, a study of the state's newspaper professionals and journalism educators should be a welcome addition to the journalism scene in the state. This study could eventually lead to the formation of well-founded factors as to what the relationship actually is between journalism programs in the state and professionals with daily and weekly newspapers. Of course, it could also lead to the creation of a stronger, more mutually beneficial relationship between educators and news professionals that benefits both groups.

In addition, studies conducted to date in regards to newspaper editors' beliefs about journalism education and journalism graduates have not addressed in any magnitude what professional expectations the editors possess that may shape or correlate with their views of the journalism education process. Coinciding with this specific rationale, this study helped to bridge this so-called knowledge gap between journalism educators and what newspaper professionals statewide are thinking and feeling about the education that is being extended to journalism students in the state's universities. The reactions noted previously in the review of literature would lead an onlooker to believe that among a great many newspaper professionals, there is a definite lack of knowledge and understanding of the inside operations and goals of

journalism programs across the United States. This being the case, the information obtained in this Michigan-oriented study gives journalism educators and administrators a base upon which to attempt to construct stronger relations with journalism professionals across the state.

Besides bridging this formidable knowledge gap, the study also served as a means for developing suggestions for improving the standards of journalism education both in this state and across the nation. In the manner in which the study was formulated, it provided an effective tool for delineating where Michigan newspaper professionals stand today. It can help educators determine where journalism education in the state is deficient, where they believe it excels, how they think journalism schools can better serve the newspaper industry, and how they think the newspaper industry can also better serve journalism education.

The study also sought out the particular skills these newspaper professionals value most in the incoming news-editorial employees they hire. Also, it pointed out what skills to which those professionals do not attach great value. Specifically, it focused on the importance that newspaper professionals place on prior practical experience in their consideration of newly hired news employees.

While accomplishing all of these objectives, the study also looked into the background and personal characteristics of these newspaper professionals that perhaps coincide in some way with their beliefs about journalism education. Correlations found between these professionals and what they desire from journalism education programs at the university level will likely provide the educators with ideas on how they might improve the structure of their educational criteria or personal relationships with news professionals in order to better serve the state's newspaper industry. In the long run, these correlations may also help to build more creative and ultimately constructive cooperation between the educational and professional people in Michigan's journalism arena. And in turn, it might then be possible for both educators and newspaper professionals to use the study findings to enact ways of fostering more activities that allow for interactions between the groups. Without increasing the opportunities for these activities to exist, it is difficult to forecast any improvements in the journalism educator-news professional standing relationship.

It is also hoped the findings gained in the study will provide a theoretical basis which may be useful in predicting the nature of the relationship between educational criteria in journalism and Michigan newspaper

professionals' expectations from journalism graduates.
This could ultimately make possible the development of an
actual theory that could be applied across the entire
spectrum of these groups' relations.

II. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the findings highlighted in the literature regarding the journalism educator-journalism professional relationship, it would appear there is a most distinct possibility of building and testing some sound theoretical principles stemming from this relationship. Any theoretical proposition would have to be formulated in consideration of the perceptions and attitudes of both journalism educators and those people who work in the media.

The study of perception involves attempting to understand those aspects of observations of journalism educators and journalism professionals that depend on the nature of those groups as observers. Those perceptions, of course, are based on whatever type of interactions journalism professionals have had with journalism educators and vice-versa. Given the previously cited evidence in the literature review, it would be a fair assumption to say that when it comes to the relationship between journalism educators and professionals, neither

group has developed what could be called a positive perception of the effectiveness of the other's mode of operations. It is also quite possible that criteria of their relationship and each group's expectations may be valid, but these constituencies' mutual perceptions may nonetheless be faulty.

As has also been noted, news professionals have expressed strong disagreement with the processes transpiring in journalism schools and with the ultimate products of those schools--the journalism graduates who enter the media job market. These strong sentiments stem largely from the perceptions that news professionals have formed of journalism education as a whole. One observation made repeatedly by news people, as evidenced in the review of literature, is that graduates of four-year university journalism programs are generally not well-equipped to handle entry-level news-editorial positions. That is, from the interactions these professionals have had with journalism educators--much of it, perhaps, through the journalism students these professionals have encountered--they then form overall perceptions of journalism education. In the end, in a possibly more damaging development, these news professionals form even stronger perceptions of the institutions from which the journalism students have graduated.

In the meantime, educators seemingly perceive journalism professionals as lacking concrete concern for what they (the educators) are trying to accomplish, the literature has revealed. The educators' perception of the news media which became overtly apparent, with respect to journalism education, is that educators many times perceive their counterparts in newspapers, television, and radio as wanting to benefit from the fruits of journalism educators' labor without making any appreciable contribution to that educational process. Thus, these perceptions may create almost a defensive reaction among educators, many of whom feel they get little but criticism from journalism professionals and consequently lash back at the source of that criticism. The split these groups' negative views of each other has created is obviously harmful to the welfare of journalism education, and in the long run, to the quality of journalism. As will be seen, the theoretical evidence indicates that if a mutually satisfying state of harmony existed between journalism educators and news professionals, the interface could be more beneficial to both groups and journalism schools' curriculum would improve stand a better chance of marked improvements.

These perceptions, however well-founded, are particularly significant because they eventually become operationalized as attitudes. News professionals' and

journalism educators' attitudes toward each other and toward the discipline of journalism education are built upon continuously changing beliefs which constitute cognitive and affective properties that interact and reinforce one another. As for the perceptions of news professionals and journalism educators, one is initially led to theorize these constituencies do not have positive mindsets toward each other because they are not interacting in ways that they believe produce positive results. Moreover, the belief might be that the result of these groups' interaction is a reinforcement of the negative perceptions they already harbor.

Professional journalists want graduates who are able to handle on-the-job editorial responsibilities with a minimum of difficulty. Educators, on the other hand, want more constructive and useful input from the men and women in the media who do the hiring. Since the evidence appears to indicate neither journalists nor educators are attaining these objectives in a manner they find suitable to their own interests, there is a distinct (in fact, likely) possibility their attitudes toward each other are in need of tremendous improvement--a task that would seem not easily achieved when one considers the ongoing difficulties that have plagued this relationship. In summarizing the journalism educators' and news professionals' attitudes toward each other, then, it would

appear accurate to agree educators think news professionals do not take an active role in the journalism educational process. It would also seem accurate to assume news professionals think journalism educators --for a variety of previously cited reasons--are part of the entire core of problems that continue to beset students who obtain their learning and training through the nation's university journalism programs.

This brings the discussion of attitudes to these constituencies' attitudes toward journalism education itself. Here too the evidence makes it certain these groups differ strongly. Journalism educators by and large have emphasized they believe professionals in their field do a mostly satisfactory job of preparing students for media careers. News professionals, on the other hand, have oftentimes stressed journalism education does not provide what they consider is necessary preparation for news-editorial careers. These groups' attitudes toward the methods and results of journalism education indeed appear to represent a formidable obstacle.

Some of the factors responsible for the news professionals' unfavorable attitudes toward journalism education may include a lack of journalism coursework in schools' required curriculum, a lack of media experience among graduating students, a lack of training in basic skills for most students, a curriculum not always well-

planned, and others. But somewhere on down the line, because of the unfavorable attitudes many news professionals have developed about journalism education, the result may be that fewer and fewer journalism-educated students would be sought after by news professionals for employment on their news-editorial staffs. As a byproduct of this action, those people trained in other manners--such as trade schools, non-journalism university education, solely on-the-job experience, whatever--might then be considered more strongly by newspaper professionals.

While the news professionals are continuously forming and modifying attitudes toward journalism education, the same thing is occurring among those people responsible for educating journalism students. Educators, as was mentioned earlier, would appear likely to have a more favorable attitude toward the education their programs provide than do news professionals. This is not to say these educators are completely convinced they are providing flawless journalistic preparation for soon-to-be news-editorial employees. As the literature review indicates, some educators lament the weaknesses with the requirements, structure, and teaching processes that afflict so many journalism programs. Yet their attitudes in this area are not nearly as damning as those of news professionals.

Educators' approach toward journalism education, in conclusion, is that this education is far from what they want it to be. But many in this group are still convinced journalism education has made worthwhile improvements and consider it to be a dependable mode of readying students for the media workplace.

As an aside to this discussion about attitudes, a point that has to be recognized in noting these constituencies' preferential responses (be they favorable or unfavorable) toward each other and toward journalism education is that these attitudes do not occur in a vacuum. They are, rather, elicited within the framework of both groups' own social situations, about which they also have attitudes. Thus, the behavior which they exhibit is not only mediated by their attitudes toward each other or toward journalism education. Instead, it is mediated by a combination of these attitudes plus the attitudes that already exist in these people's own social situations. How they respond depends on what their predispositions toward journalism education are, and on how those predispositions are activated by what is happening in terms of this particular area of concern (journalism education). These predispositions are then coupled with these groups' own ongoing situations, the ultimate result being either positive, negative, or neutral.

This study also attempted to expose these groups' opinions. Through these outwardly expressed opinions about each other, educators and news professionals make known their knowledge of what the other is--or at least of what they believe the other is--after filtering that knowledge through their own perceptions and social situations.

What news professionals know about educators, the literature review leads one to reason, is seriously deficient--so much so that educators view it as a major contributor to what is wrong with journalism education today. Many news professionals, as has been observed, express similarly negative opinions about educators based on their own knowledge of that group. The primary knowledge they have of educators, it would appear, is through the journalism students they have come across. Hence, this results in the repeatedly expressed qualms with the journalism education processes. Whether or not what each constituency says it "knows" about the other is exactly true does not matter; what does matter is that these opinions exist and they have ramifications on how members of these two groups conduct their interactions, or choose not to conduct them.

Underlying all acknowledgement of how journalism educators and news professionals have formulated perceptions, attitudes, and opinions is the fact that

somewhere, somehow, each member of those groups has developed feelings about members of the other group. These feelings are not quickly developed, nor are they quickly modified. They are, instead, deeply entrenched in the background of each news professional and educator, coloring these people's perceptions and attitudes toward the other group.

In lieu of what the literature has already brought forth, one can almost sense a kind of "anti-journalism education" mentality existing in the feelings of many news professionals. It also seems these unflattering feelings are more intense than the sometimes-negative feelings journalism educators have expressed toward journalists in the field. Perhaps this perceived phenomenon exists because of what could be called a natural progression, with journalism schools preparing many of the students who fill the ranks of the media. This development may mean more media professionals are in more regular contact with journalism education (by way of these students) than educators usually may be with the media.

In any event, with the techniques utilized in this study, some significant, well-based statements have been made about the deeply rooted feelings of Michigan newspaper professionals toward journalism education, educators, and students. The direction of the research findings was such that one believes there may be some sort

of mentality among members of the media (and maybe even more so among newspaper people) in which disparity with journalism schools has long been in existence. These types of malcontent feelings are separate from perceptions or attitudes; they have long been an established norm in the background of news professionals and permeate all of their reactions to and interactions with journalism education.

What, then, is the weight of the theoretical evidence to be presented? As for news professionals, the realities of today's hectic media work world and the expectations of their readers, viewers, and listeners are integral components in determining how they view journalism programs and in looking at how they believe these programs should be developed. For many reasons--the most important being the expectations of their audience--news professionals want, need, and actually demand entry-level employees who can step into news-editorial positions with both feet on the ground, who require little or no coddling, and who immediately produce quality work with few disruptions.

One primary factor responsible for these emphatic demands is the economic structure of the media. News operations, most of which are financially lean operations, simply cannot afford employees on the payroll who are not adequately prepared to handle the rigorous workplace these

news operations most often present. These operations are, after all, a business.

Another factor includes a set of expectations: those of the public, which has come to expect a quality newspaper or newscast, regardless of the makeup of the staff which turns out that product. The public cares little if it is an entry-level news person on a news staff who was responsible for a poorly reported, edited, or written story. All those readers or viewers know--much to their disapproval--is the product is below the standards they have come to expect from this newspaper or television or radio station. The weight of the evidence here is clear: News professionals' expectations of and needs from beginning news-editorial employees-based on the realities of the marketplace-carry great weight in determining those professionals' perceptions of and attitudes toward journalism programs. If journalism students from those programs fill their needs adequately, they perceive the programs positively; if not, the perception is apt to be less positive.

Conversely, the perceptions and attitudes of those in journalism education programs is also crucial to how the educational criteria of those programs is established. A combination of what these educators deem important in a journalism student's total educational program, along with the educators' perceptions of what the marketplace wants

from these students, largely constitutes what university-level journalism schools' curricula contain. Here again, the importance of recognizing the educators' perceptions, attitudes, opinions, and feelings is apparent: Analyzing the sum of these elements gives the researcher a base of understanding the factors impacting the journalism curriculum decision-making process and allows for the creation of theories as to why the journalism educator-news professional relationship has evolved as it has.

Based on the previously discussed theoretical considerations and related background assumptions, a central proposition was set prior to conducting the study: There is an accumulation of relationships between journalism schools' criteria for education in journalism and news professionals' expectations from students who graduate from journalism programs, and these relationships are constantly evolving. The more positively the two constituencies interact, the better the designing of curriculum and the defining of core requirements would be for journalism education. However, this proposition first needs to be adequately tested.

To test the proposition, hypotheses were formed:

H₁. Weekly newspaper professionals in Michigan have less favorable attitudes toward journalism educators and journalism school-trained students in the state than do professionals who work for the state's daily newspapers.

H₂. Weekly newspaper professionals in Michigan are also less familiar with the operations of university-level journalism programs in the state than are daily newspaper professionals.

H₃. Those Michigan newspaper professionals who interact more regularly with the state's university-level journalism programs have more favorable perceptions of and attitudes toward those programs than do Michigan newspaper professionals who do not interact regularly with those programs.

H₄. Newspaper professionals in Michigan who have worked longer in their current profession are more likely to have less favorable attitudes toward journalism education and the relationship between newspaper professionals and journalism educators in the state than do newspaper professionals who have not been in that particular field for as long a time.

H₅. Michigan university-level journalism programs that make some kind of on-the-job experience part of their academic requirement for graduation are perceived by the state's newspaper professionals as better for preparing students for news-editorial positions than state journalism programs that do not have this requirement.

H₆. Michigan university journalism educators believe journalism students are better prepared for news-editorial work than do Michigan's newspaper professionals.

III. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The following question served as a statement describing the problem which was examined throughout this in-depth study: What is the relationship between educational criteria for the university-level journalism programs in Michigan and characteristics of Michigan newspaper professionals and their expectations of students who graduate from these universities with a journalism degree?

Specifically, the study proposed to achieve these objectives:

1. To delineate the nature and pattern of criteria for education in journalism at Michigan's universities and the state's newspaper professionals' expectations from journalism graduates.

2. To examine factors that may affect attitudes, opinions, perceptions, and feelings of Michigan journalism educators as well as newspaper professionals in developing journalism educational criteria

3. To identify indicators of the relationship between Michigan daily newspaper professionals' expectations and university-level educational criteria.

4. To generate some conclusions and generalizations, and to offer some suggestions pertaining to an improved interaction between Michigan's university journalism programs and a better education for students.

Factors with which the study concerned itself are:

1. The extent to which age, education, training, and other parts of Michigan newspaper professionals' backgrounds determine their perception of journalism graduates' preparation for the newspaper job market.

2. The extent to which Michigan newspaper professionals' attitudes toward, perceptions and opinions of, and feelings about journalism education determine their consideration of journalism graduates for jobs and other interactions with journalism education programs.

3. The extent to which the various structures of journalism education programs (skills taught, required courses, internships, instructors, etc.) determine Michigan newspaper professionals' perceptions of those programs.

4. The extent to which the level and frequency of interactions among educators who formulate journalism education criteria at Michigan university-level programs and the state's newspaper professionals who hold a

definite set of expectations from journalism graduates will determine these groups' perceptions of each other.

The method utilized in the execution of this study consisted of the techniques of a mail survey. This technique was selected because it customarily yields productive data at a low cost. With any survey technique, as stated by Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald Hursh-Cesar, many characteristics have to be taken into consideration to achieve maximum results.⁴⁸

These characteristics were closely adhered to in the design of the questionnaire.

First, the study followed a systematic format with a specific set of rules, and it followed an orderly logic of operations. It also was impartial (picking units of a population without prejudice or preference), representative (surveying representative units of a population), contemporary (that is, fact-finding and current more than historical), and replicable (allowing others to use the same methods in the same ways to get essentially the same results).

In addition, the survey was theory-based, with its operations guided by relevant principles of human behavior, and self-monitoring, with its procedures designed in ways that revealed unplanned or unwanted

⁴⁸Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald Hursh-Cesar, Survey Research, second ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981), pp. 3-4.

distortions that occur. Finally, the questionnaire was quantitative, with numerical values assigned to non-numerical characteristics of behaviors so there is uniform interpretation of these characteristics.

The survey was also formulated to comply with valid, reliable, and unbiased principles. Steps were followed in ensuring the survey measured the data that was intended to be measured. Also, to ensure reliability, data was gathered as consistently as possible with dependability of information from one respondent to another. Furthermore, to avoid bias--prejudicing or skewing the results of a measurement--concern was given to identifying and reducing all possible extraneous sources of bias.

As for the selection of mail surveys as the tool to gather data, questions have at times been raised about the reliability of this method. But, as sociologists William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt observed in their book, Methods in Social Research, mail surveys remain a useful technique in sociological research that when employed in proper research designs can be frequently rewarding.⁴⁹

To maximize the chances of success via this mail survey and achieve an optimal response rate, complete instructions were provided and a format was followed that spelled out the respondents' task and made it reasonably

⁴⁹William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952), p. 170.

easy to finish the questionnaire. Also, another step taken to increase the response rate was use of a stamped, self-addressed return envelop for each respondent.

As for sampling procedures, a stratified random sampling of Michigan newspaper editors was drawn to supply the names of those persons who received questionnaires. Few sampling considerations were made insofar as the newspapers were concerned since the survey included each daily and weekly paper listed in the Michigan Press Association's 1986 directory. Although the directory does not list every newspaper in the state (since some are not members of the association), it did provide virtual coverage of all papers in Michigan. Sampling considerations among the state's journalism education programs were also not strongly considered since an attempt was made to send a questionnaire to every journalism instructor at all colleges and universities that offer journalism degrees. To ensure complete coverage of instructors, each university's journalism or communications department was called for the names of current instructors in those programs. Programs included in the study were Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, Central Michigan University, Wayne State University, Western Michigan University, Grand Valley State College, Ferris State College, the University of Detroit, and Oakland University.

The questionnaire was constructed to translate the objectives of the study in measurable entities. With a mail questionnaire, the researcher must be aware of the special challenges that are presented. "Questionnaire design here must do everything--supply motivation, create communication, and win completion" by respondents, implore Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar. But a solid response rate can be achieved by designing the questionnaire intelligently and efficiently, they affirm, and by adhering to certain rules.⁵⁰

Therefore, white space was used as much as possible in this questionnaire, print was made easy to read, and the questionnaire was limited to six pages. The questionnaire was also broken down according to subject matter--journalism education criteria, respondents' perceptions and attitudes toward each other, demographic and psychographic information. According to Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar: "Respondents must believe they can complete it (the questionnaire) on the spot without significant effort or undue time."⁵¹ This point was also well-taken in devising the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also kept simple (proceeding from one question to the next), provided no variation in instructions, and had consistent page format. The survey tool used boxes and sectioning

⁵⁰Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar, Survey Research, p. 231.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 232-33.

when dividing pages into different types of content for different response problems. Also, no precodes were printed into the boxes, to avoid mistakenly suggesting to respondents that measures had high or low values.

Final measures used to help gain maximum response rates included making the mailing envelope appear as much as possible like a personal or business letter by using a first-class stamp (not metered postage), a typewritten (not labeled) address, and the name of the specific respondent on the envelope (not "occupant" or something similar). Each questionnaire was also accompanied by a personal cover letter addressed to each respondent by name.

The data processing and analysis for this study was conducted at the Michigan State University Computer Center. A descriptive and inferential statistical analysis was made with the data collected. All data was coded by Kenton Pfister and his wife, Sandra Pfister, who was trained in coding procedures.

IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

For the purpose of this report, the findings of this study of newspaper professionals and journalism educators in Michigan have been organized under the following categories: the demographic and psychographic background of the respondents, based on their responses; the frequency, significance, subject matter, and mode of the interaction between journalism educators and newspaper professionals across the state; indicators of the relationship between journalism educators and newspaper professionals; and generalizations and conclusions about that relationship.

Analyzing the Responses

A total of 143 people returned the questionnaire used as a tool to obtain data for this study. Insofar as the background of those 143 respondents is concerned, the findings indicate that 14 percent (N=20) were journalism educators while almost three-fourths (72.7 percent; N=104)

were newspaper professionals. However, interestingly enough, a little over 13 percent (N=19) of the respondents identified themselves as both journalism educators as well as newspaper professionals. As for a more specific breakdown of those participating in the survey, of those respondents who labeled themselves newspaper professionals or both newspaper professionals and journalism instructors, eleven (7.7 percent of all respondents) were metropolitan daily editors, twenty-four (16.8 percent of all respondents) were editors of "other" daily newspapers, and seventy-eight (54.5 percent) were weekly newspaper editors. Questionnaires were sent to the editors (or other highest ranking newsroom official) of the fifty-two daily newspapers listed in the Michigan Press Association's 1986 directory, meaning that 67.3 percent of all daily newspaper professionals who received questionnaires took the time to fill out and return them. Only those questionnaires that were completely filled out were used for the purpose of this study.

The response rate among the 172 weekly newspaper editors or other highest ranking newsroom person (again selected from the Michigan Press Association's 1986 newspaper directory) who were sent questionnaires was 45.4 percent. Meanwhile, twenty-nine (20.3 percent of the total number of respondents) were journalism educators; that was 56.9 percent of all educators who were asked to

participate in the study. Journalism educators were selected for participation based on telephone calls made to the journalism or communications departments of all universities in the state. Officials with those schools were then asked for the names and addresses of all faculty members who teach journalism courses. At universities where there is no journalism department per se (such as the University of Michigan), questionnaires were mailed to the faculty members who teach what are considered to be journalism courses.

Based on the return percentages--not the actual number of questionnaires returned--it appears daily newspaper professionals felt most compelled to return the survey tool. An explanation for this occurrence might be daily newspapers are quite frequently involved in the hiring of news-editorial employees--and in the case of smaller dailies, often hiring students from university journalism programs. It may also be accurate to surmise daily newspapers more regularly hire employees than weekly newspapers, whose staffs are smaller and perhaps less fluctuating. This situation, indeed, may point to another possible explanation for the lagging response rate among weekly newspaper publishers or editors: They may simply have little cause for interaction with journalism schools and thus may not have felt much of a need for or interest to participate in a study of this nature.

All this notwithstanding, it is necessary to point out that the weekly newspaper market is (and should be even more so) a major source of entry-level positions for recent journalism graduates seeking newspaper work. This being the case, journalism educators may want to strongly consider having the weekly newspaper professionals play a significant role in formulating journalism curriculum that best prepares students for all types of newspapering--daily and weekly. On the other hand, some daily newspapers--especially the larger metropolitan dailies--are probably not as likely to hire (or even consider hiring) the vast majority of journalism graduates churned out by universities. Instead, they may be interested in only a select few journalism students from the upper echelon of these programs. Despite this seemingly obvious scenario, a greater percentage of Michigan's daily newspaper professionals still returned questionnaires. Perhaps this less-than-half response rate among the weekly newspaper professionals is indicative of the gap that may exist between that group and the state's journalism education community.

In any event, the journalism educator return rate--which at more than 50 percent was respectable--might have been expected to be even higher than it was. A possible explanation for this is that that questionnaire was mailed in late May of 1986, when many educators had already

completed their school year and, in fact, left the campuses. Follow-up telephone calls with journalism/communications departments at participating schools confirmed that some school years had ended; however, every effort was made to forward the questionnaires to educators' summer addresses when possible. Indeed, some questionnaires were returned by journalism educators who were away from their universities and at summer addresses. Hence, this additional effort to reach educators had to be a positive factor in achieving such a respectable return rate. It should also be noted that the return rate among journalism educators does not take into account respondents who considered themselves both educators and journalists. But, suffice to say, some of these people hold integral positions on journalism schools' faculties and, if included among the ranks of journalism educators, would have pushed even higher the return rate for that group.

Demographic and Psychographic Findings

One demographic indicator of the questionnaire respondents--age distribution--was most revealing, as it was determined that more than three-fourths of the participants were thirty-one years of age or older. The age breakdown among respondents was: thirty-one to forty

years, 34.3 percent (N=49); forty-one to fifty years, 23.8 percent (N=34); fifty-one to sixty years, 18.9 percent (N=29); over sixty years, 4.3 percent (N=6). Only 4.3 percent (N=6) of the respondents were ages twenty-one to twenty-five and 13 percent (N=19) were twenty-six to thirty years. The data here indicate more than three in four of the responding newspaper professionals or journalism educators are over the age of thirty. And more than 58 percent of those responding were in the thirty-one to fifty age bracket.

As far as sex of the respondents is concerned, 79 percent (N=113) were male and 19.6 percent (N=28) were female (two respondents failed to answer this question). This finding, of course, is most noteworthy in that it indicates that more than three in four responding journalism educators and newspaper professionals from the state of Michigan were male. Therefore, more men who participated in the study are employed in decision-making capacities at newspapers and working as educators.

As for the longevity of respondents, forty-two people (29.4 percent of all respondents) reported working in their present profession for more than twenty years--a greater number than in any category of response to this question. However, four other categories each had more than twenty respondents: ten to fourteen years, 20.3 percent (N=29); five to nine years, 18.9 percent (N=27);

fifteen to twenty years, 15.4 percent (N=22); three to four years, 14.7 percent (N=21). Only one respondent said that he or she had been working in this profession for one or two years.

Are the questionnaire respondents settled in these positions? According to responses to this inquiry, many newspaper professionals and journalism educators are, but a good number of them still are not. Eighty-five people (55.4 percent) said they were settled in their jobs. Yet fifty-four (37.8 percent) said they were not settled in their jobs, while five people did not answer the question. Therefore, although 85 percent of all respondents have been in their profession for five or more years, not nearly as many say they are settled in that profession.

When it comes to the level of education among respondents, almost 60 percent (N=83) of all respondents--both educators and newspaper professionals--have only some formal college education or less, the survey responses revealed. Sixty-one respondents (42.7 percent) have some college education, while 11.2 percent (N=16) are only high school graduates and a surprising 4.2 percent (N=6) have only some high school education but are not graduates. In the meantime, 15.4 percent (N=22) are college graduates, 14 percent (N=20) have completed some graduate work, and 11.9 percent (N=17) have completed their graduate degrees.

Other demographical and psychographical questions posed in the questionnaire asked participants about their residence, family income, marital status, and membership in civic/political/religious/cultural groups or journalism organizations. The greatest number of respondents--sixty-five (45.4 percent of all respondents)--live in a small city. Thirty-three (23.1 percent) reside in what they consider a rural setting, twenty-five (17.5 percent) live in a suburb, fourteen (9.8 percent) live in a large city, and four (2.8 percent) failed to answer the question.

In addition, ninety-nine respondents (69.2 percent) said they were members of civic, political, religious, or cultural groups, while forty-two (29.4 percent) said they were not. Eighty-five respondents (59.4 percent) were members of journalism organizations such as the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Sigma Delta Chi, or the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, and fifty-four (37.8 percent) were not.

Of the 137 respondents who answered a question asking for their gross 1985 family income (six chose not to answer), thirty-seven (25.9 percent) had an income over \$50,000. Another twenty-seven respondents (18.9 percent) have family incomes in each of the \$20,000 to \$30,000 and \$40,000 to \$50,000 categories. Twenty-five respondents (17.5 percent) have incomes between \$30,000 and \$40,000,

while twenty respondents (14 percent) have incomes from \$10,000 to \$20,000. Only one person said that he or she has an income under \$10,000.

Finally, a majority of those persons answering the questionnaire are married. In all, 106 people (almost three-fourths of all respondents) were married, while eighteen (12.65 percent) were single, eleven (7.7 percent) were divorced, three (2.1 percent) were separated, and one (.7 percent) was widowed.

Interactions Between Respondents

The findings regarding the frequency, significance, subject matter, and mode of interaction between journalism educators and newspaper professionals are extremely significant in deciphering the relationship between the two groups. As for the frequency of their interaction, 38.5 percent of the respondents (N=55) said they interacted occasionally with members from the other group. Another 21.7 percent (N=31) interacted seldomly, 21 percent (N=30) interacted frequently, 10.5 percent (N=15) interacted rarely, and 7 percent (N=10) never interacted. So while the largest number of respondents said they interacted occasionally with those from the other group, virtually as many said they seldomly interacted as did those who said they frequently interacted. In addition,

almost as many said they interacted rarely or never with members of the other group. Thus, for two groups whose missions would seem to be closely intertwined, interaction is apparently not a commonplace occurrence. In view of this wide variance in answers, these frequencies of interactions would appear to be important determinants in the state of the relationship between Michigan's newspaper professionals and journalism educators--a fact that was borne out in the data, as will be alluded to later in this report.

Seven categories of discussion topics were offered to respondents, with three answers dominant. The topics attempted to take into account those areas in which educators and newspaper professionals might more often have discussions. Ninety people (62.9 percent of all respondents) said that when they interacted with members of the other group, the discussion focused on general discussion of the media. Eighty-nine respondents (62.2 percent) interacted when dealing with the hiring of students, and the same number said they engaged simply in general discussion with those from the other group. Other less frequent topics of interaction, according to the responses, were journalism trends, 45.4 percent (N=65); journalism technique, 38.5 percent (N=55); criticism of each other, 21 percent (N=30); and journalism curriculum planning, 18.2 percent (N=26). Respondents were able to

choose as many topics as they wished, and were also asked to offer any other topics not included in the questionnaire.

These totals are evidence of the nature of the interactions between these two groups, with general discussion topics and, not surprisingly, student hiring being more common points of interaction. Student hiring is certainly one area in which the two groups are likely to be drawn together because one of the groups (educators) is training many of those students whom newspaper professionals consider when filling jobs on their staffs. The focus of contention--on which much of the rationale for this study was based--is whether journalism schools are still considered a primary training ground for newspaper employees.

Unfortunately, the responses show interaction is noticeably lacking in some crucial topics upon which a relationship between educators and newspaper professionals could be developed. With fewer than one in five respondents saying they interact on the subject of journalism curriculum planning, for example, it is apparent Michigan's journalism educators and newspaper professionals are not working closely and seeking each others' viewpoints when it comes to the formulation of university curriculum for journalism students. This lack of contact on such an important matter to both groups'

interests is an undeniable indicator that the journalism education and newspaper professionals in this state have not been making advances toward each other in terms of perfecting educational tools--and, worse still, may not be particularly concerned about doing so.

V. INDICATORS OF THE RELATIONSHIP

Based on the data accumulated from returned questionnaires, there is reason for close analysis of the possibility that weekly newspaper professionals in the state of Michigan are more dissatisfied than publishers and editors of daily papers with the processes within journalism education programs and the instructors at the state's universities. Prior to conducting this study, it was generally assumed Michigan's weekly newspapers have somewhat more at stake when it comes to journalism education because weeklies have positions that provide smaller salaries and a wider variety of responsibilities. Given this, it is weekly newspaper professionals who may be more likely to consider journalism-educated students as employees, filling their papers' important jobs (but less lucrative than major daily positions) with more inexperienced graduates straight from college. At the same time, many daily newspapers might not even be exposed to these so-called "raw" products of journalism programs. Instead, they hire these people only after they have had

extensive professional seasoning--many times with weekly newspapers.

But theories and speculation aside, the negative views of journalism education must be diagnosed for true indicators of where the relationship stood at the time that this questionnaire was disseminated across the state. Toward that end, first, it appears that newspaper professionals who work for the state's weekly newspapers are significant predictors of several meaningful relationships between journalism educators and newspaper people. One hypothesis established prior to sending the questionnaire to educators and newspaper professionals was that those people who work for Michigan's weekly newspapers have developed less favorable attitudes toward journalism educators and journalism school-educated students than those newspaper professionals who work for daily newspapers (particularly larger daily papers). The data appear to support this hypothesis, as evidenced by newspaper professionals' responses to a statement on the practicality of journalism educators' instruction.

Among all newspaper professionals who were asked for their feelings toward the statement "journalism educators have impractical ideas about newspaper operations that don't work out in practice," this hypothesis regarding weekly newspaper professionals' attitudes toward journalism educators and students was tenable. As Table 1

indicates, of the seventy-five weekly newspaper professionals who responded to this statement, forty-five --or almost two-thirds of this group--agreed that journalism educators have impractical ideas about newspaper operations, while only seven weekly newspaper respondents (or less than 10 percent from that group) said they disagreed--meaning they were the only respondents among weekly newspaper professionals who believed journalism educators had realistic views of the way a newspaper functions.

Table 1--Daily/Weekly Beliefs on J-Education Practices

Statement: Journalism educators have impractical ideas about newspaper operations that don't work out in practice.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/description of workplace

	Daily	Weekly
Response:		
<u>Agree</u>	8 (29%)	45 (60%)
<u>Neutral</u>	11 (39%)	23 (31%)
<u>Disagree</u>	9 (32%)	7 (9%)
<u>Total</u>	28	75

$\chi^2=10.246$ 2 degrees of freedom $P=.031$ $C=.331$

This finding may possibly be explained in terms of these weekly professionals' lack of meaningful discourse with educators. It may also be explained by adhering to a

perception among weekly newspaper professionals that journalism students lack training to handle the work expected of them as they enter a weekly news-editorial position. In addition, there is a hunch that these professionals with weekly newspapers believe journalism students are not fulfilling the needs and expectations when those papers have entry-level positions to staff.

Along these same lines as this first finding, a second hypothesis offered going into this study was: Michigan's weekly newspaper professionals are less familiar with the operations of journalism schools in the state than are daily newspaper professionals. This hypothesis also was borne out in the data, as indicated in Table 2.

Table 2--News Professionals' Understanding of J-Schools

Statement: Newspaper professionals generally have a good understanding of journalism school operations.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/description of workplace

	Daily	Weekly
Response:		
Agree	11 (39%)	14 (18%)
Neutral	4 (14%)	31 (41%)
Disagree	13 (47%)	31 (41%)
Total	28	76

$\chi^2=6.09$ 2 degrees of freedom $P=.052$ $C=.288$

This development could very well be explained by agreeing with the belief that weekly newspaper professionals in this state are not compelled to become more familiar with journalism schools or educators. Furthermore, it may also be widely held that Michigan's journalism educators do not even work toward a goal of fostering a relatively positive and worthwhile relationship with newspaper professionals in their same state, instead concentrating their conciliatory efforts more on the daily newspaper world or on other communications fields such as broadcast news, public relations, or advertising. These other fields, in turn, would probably represent areas in which greater numbers of journalism students are expressing interest as careers. For a number of reasons--among them being lower salaries, lack of prestige, poor working conditions, working in rural locations, and long work hours--weekly newspapers would seem unlikely to be a primary career objective for a majority of journalism students. Thus, it is not overly surprising that to see this apparently distant relationship between journalism educators and weekly newspaper professionals. This, of course, does not dismiss this problem; it only serves as well-founded insight into why the problem exists.

As Table 2 indicates, more than 40 percent (N=31) of the seventy-six responding weekly newspaper

professionals flat-out disagreed with the statement "newspaper professionals generally have a good idea about the operations of journalism schools." Another thirty-one weekly newspaper respondents were neutral toward the statement. Therefore, not only do many weekly professionals believe journalism educators have impractical ideas when it comes to newspapers, many also agree that they themselves are woefully lacking in knowledge of just what is transpiring in journalism schools nowadays. So, according to these weekly newspaper professionals around the state, the cause of negative relationships between themselves and journalism educators appears to be rooted in both groups of professionals.

This realization by weekly newspaper professionals should be interpreted positively when looking for solutions to lessening the gap that apparently exists between the journalism education and weekly newspaper professions. Many weekly newspaper people, it would seem, do not affix "blame" solely to themselves or to journalism educators (or, for that matter, to students of journalism schools). Instead, they see the situation as a mutual problem that is best addressed through mutual attention. This status obviously bodes well for improving this relationship.

Another hypothesis brought forth prior to conducting the study was that those newspaper professionals who

are more familiar with the state's university journalism programs have more favorable attitudes toward these programs and the journalism-trained students than do Michigan newspaper professionals who have not become more familiar with journalism education at the university level. Among the newspaper professionals who responded to a statement about journalism students' preparedness for news-editorial jobs, a positive correlation was found between the extent of newspaper professionals' interactions with journalism educators and those professionals' perceptions of journalism education. Thus, the hypothesis in this regard was tenable, as seen in Table 3.

Table 3--News Professionals' Beliefs About J-Students

Statement: Journalism students are prepared to handle news-editorial jobs.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/frequency of interaction with journalism educators

	Frequently/ Occasionally	Seldom	Rarely/ Never
Response:			
Agree	32 (63%)	9 (35%)	4 (16%)
Neutral	13 (25%)	7 (27%)	11 (44%)
Disagree	6 (12%)	10 (38%)	10 (40%)
Total	51	26	25
$\chi^2=18.603$	4 degrees of freedom	$P=.0009$	$C=.393$

Table 3 shows of the fifty-one newspaper professionals who said they frequently or occasionally interacted with journalism educators, about two-thirds agreed journalism students are indeed prepared to handle news-editorial jobs. Another twenty-six newspaper professionals said they seldomly interact with journalism educators, and of that group ten (about 40 percent of those educators who answered "seldom") disagreed with the contention that journalism students are prepared for the world of newspapers. Another seven from this group were neutral toward this statement. Still another most enlightening finding came from the twenty-five newspaper professionals who said they rarely or never interact with journalism educators, where 40 percent of those professionals disagreed that journalism students are ready to step right into today's newsrooms and another 44 percent were neutral. From this data, there appears to be a positive relationship between a newspaper person's degree of familiarity with journalism educators/education and how the newspaper person views the educators/education. The greater the level of familiarity, it stands to reason, the better the reaction toward journalism education in the university setting and how that education prepares a student for newspaper work. Additionally, one may assume, the more familiar the newspaper person is with the processes of journalism

education, the more accurate his or her view is of that education.

In the meantime, this hypothesis regarding newspaper professionals' familiarity with journalism education and the correlation with the professionals' attitudes toward journalism educators and students was also tenable based on these professionals' responses to whether educators have a good understanding of newspaper operations. As seen in Table 4, a respondent's amount of interaction with journalism education seems to have some correlation with his/her feelings on educators.

Table 4--News Professional/J-Educator Interactions

Statement: Journalism educators generally do not have a good understanding of newspaper operations.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/frequency of interaction with educators

	Frequently/ Occasionally	Seldom	Rarely/ Never
Response:			
Agree	14 (27%)	15 (60%)	13 (54%)
Neutral	22 (43%)	6 (24%)	7 (29%)
Disagree	15 (30%)	4 (16%)	4 (17%)
Total	51	25	24
$\chi^2=9.27$ 4 degrees of freedom $P=.054$ $C=.291$			

Of the fifty-one professionals who said they frequently or occasionally interact with journalism

educators, almost half were neutral toward the statement and almost one-third disagreed. However, 60 percent of those who seldomly interact with educators agreed with the statement, and more than half of those who rarely or never interact with educators also agreed.

What these responses--correlated with the newspaper professionals' level of interaction with journalism educators--give cause to believe is that there appears to be formidable ties between newspaper professionals' relationships with journalism educators and how those educators are viewed. If newspaper professionals are more familiar with their counterparts in journalism education, they will be more likely to perceive favorably those educators and the students schooled in journalism programs. Conversely, it is also apparent that newspaper professionals who do not have regular interactions with journalism educators will hold more negative views toward those educators, their students, and the quality of education taking place in university journalism programs throughout Michigan.

In addition to the already-highlighted points, it was hypothesized before the study that Michigan newspaper professionals who have worked in their current profession for a greater period of time have less favorable attitudes toward journalism education and toward the relationships between newspaper professionals and journalism educators

than do those newspaper people who have not been in that particular field for as long a period of time. Among those professionals who responded to a statement asking if they are being sought out by journalism educators for curriculum planning, this hypothesis was tenable. Table 5 brings this finding into focus.

Table 5--News Professionals' Beliefs on J-Curriculum

Statement: News professionals are a source of which journalism educators are not making good enough use in developing journalism curriculum.

Respondent: News professional/years worked in present profession

<u>Years</u>	<u>0-4</u>	<u>5-9</u>	<u>10-14</u>	<u>15-plus</u>
Response:				
<u>Strongly Agree</u>	2 (11%)	6 (30%)	7 (30%)	9 (21%)
<u>Agree</u>	12 (63%)	6 (30%)	15 (65%)	30 (71%)
<u>Neutral/Disagree</u>	5 (26%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	3 (8%)
<u>Total</u>	19	20	23	42
$\chi^2=18.51$ 6 degrees of freedom $P=.005$ $C=.389$				

As can be seen, among the forty-two newspaper professionals who responded to this statement and who have worked in that profession for fifteen or more years, nine strongly agreed with the statement and another thirty agreed. However, only three of these professionals disagreed with the statement. This ultimately is an overwhelming indication from veteran newspaper

professionals that they feel a good deal of detachment from journalism education and believe they are underutilized as a source in the development of journalism courses at the university level.

At the same time, of the twenty-three newspaper professionals who had worked in their jobs from ten to fourteen years, seven strongly agreed that journalism educators are not making good enough use of newspaper professionals' expertise in developing well-rounded journalism curriculum and another fifteen agreed with this statement. Only one respondent from that group disagreed, meaning another strong majority of newspaper people with a good deal of experience believed they are being overlooked as a source of information by journalism educators as they develop curriculum.

Taking this correlation a step further, of the thirty-nine newspaper professionals who said they have worked in that line of duty for zero to nine years, thirteen--or one-third of that group--were neutral toward the statement or disagreed with it. This represents a much smaller percentage of respondents in agreement with the statement than was the case with those respondents who had a greater number of years in this field. Therefore, it would stand to conclude a newspaper person's experience coincides to some degree with his/her detachment from journalism programs.

Another interesting finding that casts more light on this hypothesis was found when looking at the correlation between newspaper professionals' years in that job and their responses to a statement about journalism educators' lack of understanding of newspaper operations. This development is apparent in Table 6.

Table 6--J-Educators' Understanding of Newspapers

Statement: Journalism educators generally do not have a good understanding of newspaper operations.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/years worked in present profession

<u>Years</u>	<u>0-4</u>	<u>5-9</u>	<u>10-14</u>	<u>15-plus</u>
<u>Response:</u>				
<u>Agree</u>	7 (37%)	6 (32%)	10 (43%)	20 (49%)
<u>Neutral</u>	9 (47%)	3 (16%)	11 (48%)	12 (29%)
<u>Disagree</u>	3 (16%)	10 (52%)	2 (9%)	9 (22%)
<u>Total</u>	19	19	23	41

$\chi^2=14.957$ 6 degrees of freedom $P=.020$ $C=.358$

Here, of the forty-one newspaper professionals with fifteen or more years in this profession, twenty agreed with the statement and another twelve were neutral. Meanwhile, only nine of these veteran news people disagreed. Moving along, those with ten to fourteen years in this field yielded similarly noteworthy results, with ten of the twenty-three respondents in this category

agreeing with the statement and eleven holding neutral views. Only two respondents here disagreed with the assumption that journalism educators have a poor understanding of newspaper operations. Intriguingly enough, of the thirty-eight newspaper professionals who had logged between zero and nine years in this line of work, the responses were split about evenly among those agreeing with the statement, neutral toward it, or disagreeing with it. The conclusion reached from these answers is this: There appears to be a correlation between the years a person has spent in the newspaper business and his or her attitudes toward journalism education. The more experience one has, the more likely he or she is to view this education negatively.

A positive explanation for the findings in these correlations may be that people with more experience in that profession have become further removed from the circles of journalism education than newspaper professionals with fewer years' experience. These persons with less experience, it could then be assumed, are not as distantly removed from their college years; surely many of those people went to journalism school. Thus they are perhaps more likely to maintain more regular and/or meaningful communication with journalism schools and educators than those newspaper professionals who have been working in the same line of work for an extended period.

Along these same lines, one might also be able to surmise that more of those professionals with a greater number of years in this field did not have formal college education--or certainly did not have formal journalism education at the university level. Not having gone through the four years of more of schooling in journalism or another field, these professionals may be more skeptical about the worth of such education than those professionals with more recent exposure to the rigors of a formal journalism education. It is, admittedly, a far-reaching assumption to say that one with more years in newspaper work might be more likely to have no college education and thus view that education in a more negative vein. Yet, particularly with weekly newspaper veterans, it is not in error to recognize college training has not been part of many of their backgrounds. This being the case, journalism school then may not be viewed as a necessary route of preparation by many of those professionals. In fact, as the previously stated data expose, journalism education apparently is looked upon with apathy by substantial numbers of newspaper professionals--especially those who have a greater number of years' experience in that field.

Another hypothesis made prior to the study was that weekly newspaper professionals are more likely than daily professionals to believe it is important journalism

students are familiar with newspaper operations and possess the skills required in day-to-day news-editorial work. From the questionnaire responses, a correlation was found between the type of newspaper for which a professional works (daily or weekly) and the professional's beliefs about journalism students' skills. As shown in Table 7, these professionals were asked to rank as a high, medium, or low priority how important they believe it is that journalism students are knowledgeable about newspaper operations. The findings from the responses to this statement proved the hypothesis to be tenable.

Table 7--J-Students' Knowledge of Newspaper Operations

Statement: It is important that journalism graduates are knowledgeable about newspaper operations.

Respondent: Newspaper professional/description of workplace

	Daily	Weekly	
Response:			
High Priority	0 (0%)	12 (16%)	
Medium Priority	18 (64%)	54 (72%)	
Low Priority	10 (28%)	12 (16%)	
Total	28	75	
X ² =15.08 2 degrees of freedom P=.009 C=.338			

As noted in this table, of the seventy-five responding newspaper professionals, twelve (or about one in six) said it was a high priority to them that journalism students have a good understanding of newspaper operations, while more than two-thirds of those professionals said it was a medium priority. In the meantime, among the twenty-eight daily newspaper professionals who responded to this question (with both metropolitan and other daily professionals combined), eighteen said students' familiarity with newspaper operations was a medium priority and ten said it was a low priority. Not a single daily professional, however, described as a high priority journalism students being familiar with newspaper operations.

What these findings allude to is a distinct possibility that weekly newspaper professionals have a stronger need than daily professionals for new employees who are already familiar with newspapers. This phenomenon may be explained by examining the positions weekly newspaper professionals have to fill on their staffs. First, those staffs are obviously smaller than the staffs of dailies, which because of their frequency of publication and other factors require a larger news-editorial presence. Additionally, the positions on weekly papers into which students are hired require a staff member to perform a variety of functions, even if this

person is an entry-level employee--which is most often the case on weekly newspapers. This is vastly different from daily papers, where in many instances an employee's duties are well-defined and less all-encompassing than on a weekly. Because of the nature of the jobs with weekly papers, it is apparent these professionals require employees with a broader knowledge of newspaper operations. Still, as earlier-discussed findings pointed out, these professionals apparently are not satisfied with the quality of the journalism graduates they encounter.

Suffice to say, the requirements of newspapers differ markedly based on the stature and market of the newspaper, and those requirements were reflected in the Michigan survey respondents' answers.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Through this survey of Michigan newspaper professionals and journalism educators who teach at the state's universities, some well-founded and even striking generalizations can be made about the nature of the relationship between these two groups. Those generalizations may be worthwhile in understanding what must be termed as weaknesses in journalism teaching programs at Michigan's universities--particularly as they pertain to preparing students for newspaper careers. They could also lead the way to highlighting characteristics of newspaper professionals that coincide with their attitudes toward and beliefs about journalism educators and the students these educators train. The conclusions and generalizations also bring to the forefront suggestions for ways the apparently less-than-optimal relationship between the state's newspaper professionals and journalism educators could be improved.

One primary conclusion that can be made is weekly newspaper professionals in Michigan by and large are more

dissatisfied with the status of journalism education at the university level than are newspaper professionals with dailies. The dissatisfaction is apparent based on weekly professionals' widely expressed unhappiness with journalism educators as well as the professionals' frequent negative reactions toward students who graduate from journalism schools. A sampling of comments to open-ended questions asked of all questionnaire respondents turned up vivid remarks from weekly newspaper professionals about the discrepancies they believe exist today between what and how journalism students are taught and the demands placed upon these students when they enter the workplace.

For instance, one weekly editor pleaded with journalism educators:

Please, please, please teach writing skills, i.e. grammar and punctuation. All journalism schools in this state have been remiss in this responsibility. It is inconceivable to me that a school alleges to turn out writers and never teaches them writing. This is an extremely sore point with me. I believe students should sue journalism schools for telling them they can go out and be a reporter without having taught them the basics of good writing. . . . Journalism professors do students a grave injustice by creating the impression that weekly newspapers are somehow inferior to dailies. This creates attitudinal problems about journalists entering the profession. . . . Teach students how to punctuate and how to use proper grammar.

Many weekly professionals emphasized what might be termed the unrealistic views of the newspaper profession they believe journalism schools too frequently possess--

or, at least, the views of the profession that the products of these schools (the journalism-trained students) appear to have as they enter the working world. "Entry-level journalists haven't been prepared for the less pleasant side of the business--short deadlines, long drives in nasty weather, etc.," wrote one matter-of-fact weekly professional, showing the unglamorous world of weekly journalism. "Newspapering doesn't happen in a clean, brightly lit newsroom between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m."

Underlying the many comments rendered by weekly newspaper professionals was a widespread theme that journalism education simply does not instill in students and then hone the skills required if and when one takes on the responsibility of working for a weekly newspaper--or, for that matter, a daily. Challenged one weekly editor, voicing obvious displeasure with the lack of regimentation to which journalism students have been exposed during their years on a college campus:

Be real with the kids. Let 'em get their nails dirty ASAP because the profession is HARD, EXCRUCIATING work with an inordinate number of pitfalls. It's also a profession into which only the best and brightest should be allowed. We need more intellectual, sensitive, articulate, educated journalists. So far, I've met mostly inarticulate people who don't know their stylebook rules and have a vocabulary of an embryo. . . . Allow only those who love language, respect it, and read incessantly to graduate. We don't need no more morons, ya know.

This strongly voiced opinion on the lack of weekly newspaper orientation in Michigan journalism schools'

curricula focuses on a crying need for further study into and understanding of the weekly newspaper community in this state. What, specifically, are the requirements of weekly newspapers? What do journalism schools need to do to better meet those requirements? Is a massive restructuring necessary? Is it even worth journalism schools' effort to improve their programs in this manner? Is there enough student interest to warrant these changes? These are stern questions that deserve to be answered, and those answers are best gained through more detailed study.

Through a study of this nature, curriculum could be improved so journalism programs are better equipped to provide the type of education many newspaper professionals feel is lacking. Toward this end, weekly newspaper professionals could be surveyed to determine exactly the coursework they believe is needed to best prepare students for careers in weekly newspapers. In fact, this is one recommendation that can be made based on the emphatically-voiced findings: Michigan's weekly newspaper community apparently feels grossly unrecognized and largely disregarded when it comes to the manner in which journalism schools teach students. Whether journalism educators themselves believe their curricula is weak in terms of newspaper education is immaterial (and the belief is that journalism schools do lack an emphasis on weekly newspapers); since weekly professionals perceive this to

be the case, a most constructive approach to follow is to try to deal with these perceptions straightforwardly, recognize they exist, and begin making the decisions that can bridge this ever-widening and harmful gap that weekly newspaper professionals cited.

Admittedly, weekly newspapers are an important force in this state, as shown by the fact that more than half of the survey respondents were weekly journalists. For much of the state's rural population--and, to a large degree, even in larger communities--weeklies are a major source of local information. Thus, their worth to the people of this state is obvious. As a review of journalism education literature yielded, there are universities in this country that, in recognition of the significance of weekly newspapers, have established so-called "community journalism" sequences whose primary purpose is to prepare students who are committed to such a career. A program such as this at Michigan's universities, one can assume, would be welcomed with open arms by the state's weekly newspaper community.

Based on this less-than-sterling state of affairs between journalism educators and weekly newspaper professionals throughout Michigan, it is recommended that an in-depth study of the state's weekly newspaper professionals be performed to determine ways in which they believe their interests could be better served by

journalism schools. In the same study--or perhaps a separate one--journalism school administrators across Michigan (or nationwide, to obtain a larger sampling) could also be questioned to determine specifically what their programs are doing (or not doing) to meet needs and expectations of weekly newspapers. These administrators should also be asked to suggest viable and achievable ways they believe their programs can alter or update their curriculum to assist the weekly newspaper industry. From these studies, information could be collected that would be most telling in possibly restructuring journalism curricula to provide more relevant and worthwhile training for students who pursue editorial work with weekly newspapers.

Another conclusion drawn from the findings based on Michigan newspaper professionals' and journalism educators' responses is that it is essential for the two groups to work more closely and become more familiar with one another. As the data indicate, the more familiar newspaper professionals said they were with journalism schools and the teaching that goes on in those schools, the more likely they were to perceive those schools in a positive manner. Because of this, it can be observed generally that interaction between educators and newspaper people is an encouraging development and leads to more positive relationships between the two groups. This then

means the more familiar newspaper professionals are with the state's university journalism educators, the more apt those professionals are to be satisfied with the educational processes that occur in journalism programs. As was seen in the responses, those newspaper people who had not maintained closer relationships with journalism schools and educators were more likely to express negative views of those schools' performance. Therefore, it is recommended a study be conducted where educators and newspaper professionals share ideas and opinions about how to build a mutually beneficial relationship.

How this activity might be conducted is this: Members of both groups could be questioned for their beliefs and opinions on whether it is necessary they are familiar with the other groups. Responses could also be elicited as to ways familiarity between the groups should be developed and improved, and as to how both groups can work to better accommodate productive interactions with each other. As things currently stand, based on the data collected and the general tone of the open-ended responses to questions, there does not appear to be an overriding impetus for a majority of Michigan newspaper professionals or journalism educators to build a stronger working relationship with one another. Given this, it may be worthwhile to work toward creating a mechanism (perhaps a study, or even a common-interest form of sorts with

members from Michigan's journalism education and newspaper communities) to help these individuals work more closely together. It is apparent that any method aimed at strengthening the ties between the journalism educators and newspaper professionals in Michigan should not only be recommended but also vigorously pursued. Such a mechanism would be particularly valuable if it delved into actual processes by which both groups believe this interaction between them should be carried out. In turn, the results of any "cross-pollination" between the educators and newspaper people could then be widely shared across the state as a starting point for creating a more constructive atmosphere in which both professions work toward common goals. Unfortunately, as this study has revealed, such a goal is not close at hand--and probably will not exist for some time unless some thawing takes place among factions of the state's university journalism programs and newspaper industry.

Based on this study, it must be generally assumed that weekly newspaper professionals across Michigan interact with journalism educators on a less frequent basis than do professionals with the state's daily newspapers. This lack of interaction spills over into weekly newspaper professionals' attitudes toward journalism educators, journalism students, and the entire educational process.

A reasonable explanation for this development could very possibly focus on journalism schools' lack of orientation toward the weekly newspaper industry. Since weekly newspaper professionals in Michigan are apparently more often dissatisfied with journalism schools' training of students, it stands to reason one primary cause of this development could be that the needs of weekly newspapers are not being filled by students who are graduating from journalism programs. Newspaper training, as was pointed out, has declined as an emphasis in many journalism schools' curriculum, and most of the newspaper-oriented education that does exist would seem to be aimed at readying students for work on dailies while weeklies are largely ignored.

Where this leaves the weekly newspaper community is plain to see. Of course, some of the education a student receives in journalism school is appropriate for the world of weekly newspapers. However, there would appear to be an unsettling sentiment among the state's weekly newspaper professionals that a definite void exists; from their point of view, the pervasive education that provides the all-around grounding required for weekly staff members is lacking from today's university journalism programs. These newspapers, hence, are turning their hiring attention to other venues when seeking out news-editorial talent. This signifies an entire segment of an industry

which should benefit from its relationship with journalism education is not finding this to be the case. It is a situation that should alarm journalism educators in Michigan and cause them to re-examine their priorities to some extent.

Additionally, this development is one that lends itself to some well-warranted and potentiall telling possibilities for further study. First, there is need for an in-depth study dealing specifically with the concerns and expectations of weekly newspaper professionals in Michigan--as well as weekly professionals nationwide, for that matter. No studies of this nature have been conducted in Michigan, and relatively few analyses of the educational needs of weekly or "community" newspapers across the United States currently exist. While the questionnaire used in this study allowed all respondents--weekly and daily newspaper professionals and journalism educators alike--to voice their sentiments on the journalism educator-newspaper professional relationship, it was not designed to specifically capture measurable results that focused on one particular segment of those groups. Because of this broad focus, there remains an extensive opportunity for designing a study revealing the backgrounds of Michigan's weekly newspaper professionals and providing an accurate and thorough assessment of their requirements.

Based on the unabashed comments offered by many respondents, weekly newspaper professionals throughout Michigan are deeply concerned about the education they view as necessary to prepare would-be weekly journalists, and they would welcome the chance to be the subject of such a study. For instance, one weekly editor offered this reply to an open-ended question that asked what journalism education lacks in properly preparing students for work on newspapers: "More emphasis should be placed on small-town newspaper needs, such as covering high school sports, county zoning laws, court procedures, and environmental issues."

Numerous other responses echoed this editor's feelings; indeed, weekly newspaper people seem to feel their profession is largely unrecognized by journalism students. Some reasons for this lack of recognition have been noted--small-town work locations, lack of prestige, limited salary opportunities, hard working conditions. By the same token, though, it is also possible students are not greatly exposed to the possibilities of working in community journalism-type positions. And those few students who do venture toward the world of small newspapers are ill-prepared to succeed, according to those who do the hiring. In any event, a wedge has been driven between Michigan's weekly newspaper community and the state's journalism educators at the university level.

This relationship signals a need for closer scrutiny of the state's weekly newspapers and of others who are responsible for the future of this industry.

In addition to obtaining a more all-encompassing understanding of the requirements of the weekly newspaper industry, another study that may be recommended to better discover the cause of problems in this area would involve journalism educators. This study would focus on why community newspapers (weeklies and smaller dailies) do not receive the emphasis some people believe they deserve. Such a study would be made up of specific questions to substantiate, from the educators' point of view, why the educational spotlight has shifted away from smaller newspapers.

To capsulize the study findings, throughout this attempt to highlight indicators of the relationship between journalism educators and newspaper professionals in Michigan, and the impact that those indicators have on the success or failure of those relationships, the responses to the queries posed have yielded some identifiable trends as to the manner in which these groups perceive one another. Type of workplace (particularly weekly, small daily, or large daily newspaper), years in a particular field, amount of interaction with members of the other profession: All are variables that, according to the data gathered, seemingly play an important role in

sculpting the relationships between newspaper professionals and journalism educators in the state. If this is the case, then these findings should be taken into full account and consciously adapted to by members of both groups if they intend to construct a more beneficial interaction.

Besides being aware of the indicators involved in the relationships between these groups, what is also essential is realizing that each person's feelings about and opinions toward the other group are on an ever-changing continuum. This continuum is such that every interaction a person has with the other group--and every related experience he or she undergoes with someone from that group--has an impact on his or her perceptions toward that group, its members' expertise, and the work that those members perform. These experiences are continuously evolving and gradually affecting--be it positively or negatively--the manner in which the entire group is perceived. This phenomenon, in turn, becomes externalized in attitudes and actions (or lack of actions) toward that group. For newspaper professionals, this could mean not seeking to hire journalism graduates; for journalism educators, it could mean not tailoring their curriculum toward a segment of the communications world.

Because of this ever-evolving set of circumstances, it can be concluded that the variables disclosed in

deciphering the status of the relationship between journalism educators and newspaper professionals in Michigan are in some way positively correlated. This means when a certain circumstance (or set of circumstances) exists--for example, a newspaper professional has been in that job for, say, twenty years and very rarely interacts with journalism educators--it will more likely have some correlation with that individual's perceptions toward journalism education. In this example, the professional's years of service and lack of interaction with journalism education could possibly correlate with a negative perception of journalism educators, students, and the entire journalism educational process. Based on the findings of the study, a similar generalization can be arrived at for weekly newspaper professionals, who on the whole seem to interact less frequently with journalism educators and, therefore, may be more likely to have unfavorable perceptions of university-level journalism education. This perception and others ultimately may be reflected in a lack of hiring of journalism students and perhaps a breakdown of relations between certain individuals in the industry and journalism educators.

Similar correlations can be found between the other variables that have been previously discussed in arriving at a more concise understanding of the relationship

between Michigan's journalism educators and newspaper professionals. A thought that must be emphasized, though, is that all of these factors mesh together--in both professional and social settings--with other stimuli to result in positive, negative, or indifferent perceptions that educators and newspaper professionals have of one another. As in all relationships, there is no way the perceptions, feelings, opinions, and attitudes can be manipulated; they simply exist as they are, constantly subjected to the relevant experiences that one undergoes.

However, a clearer picture of the possible causes and effects of the Michigan newspaper professional-journalism educator relationship was painted thanks to this study, and this alone gives members of both fields a foundation from which they may wish to build upon in future dealings. It should be noted, in addition, that this study yielded more conclusive findings about Michigan newspaper professionals' perceptions of and attitudes toward journalism educators and the relationship between the two groups than it did of journalism educators' perceptions and attitudes. The major thrust of the statistically significant data was gained from the population of those Michigan newspaper professionals who responded to the questionnaire. This occurred primarily because the number of respondents from that group was large enough to produce results that not only said something concrete and valuable

about the relationship between journalism educators and newspaper professionals, but the findings were also statistically sound. Because of this experience, it should be kept in mind by those conducting further studies of these professions within a particular state that a high questionnaire return rate--or a large enough population which to survey--is required in order to produce results that will be acceptable on a widespread basis.

As a final footnote, based on the findings presented from the study, an assessment that deserves to be provided is despite the many problems respondents claim exist between newspaper professionals and journalism educators in Michigan, there still remains great interest among both groups in maintaining ties and building a more viable relationship. Michigan's journalism educators, notwithstanding the already noted decline in student interest in newspapers as a career path, continue to place emphasis on news-editorial training in their curricula. Some schools do this far more than others, but newspapers surely are still a primary focus of training for journalism educators. At the same time, the state's newspaper professionals, although alluding to many deficiencies with journalism schools, educators, and students, continue to be concerned with the welfare of the state's journalism institutions. They seem to recognize that regardless of the many shortcomings of journalism

schools, these schools remain a sought-after method for preparing students for work in the media. Newspaper professionals, the study found, are still largely aware of the value of a journalism degree at a reputable university and of what that degree--can mean to a news organization.

Still, this relationship between the state's newspaper people and journalism educators cannot be taken for granted. As shown by the responses to the questionnaire, instances have taken place where newspaper professionals are bypassing journalism schools when hiring employees--even for entry-level positions. Plus, many newspaper people (especially among the weekly newspaper community) are becoming more and more remote from journalism schools. Many newspaper people will argue that the same can be said of journalism educators when it comes to the extent of their interactions with practicing journalists. At any rate, the mere interest level among respondents to this study's questionnaire indicates there is concern over problems that have beset the relations between these groups and the direction which future interactions should follow.

Some might say it is not essential there be a constructive working relationship between educators and newspaper people. But, as more than one respondent advocated, it should be in the interest of educators and newspaper professionals (and, ultimately, students) that

regular contact between the two groups be sustained. This conclusive statement must be re-emphasized and, more importantly, acted upon.

Consider this sampling of statements from survey respondents: "Why not call groups of publishers in for annual discussions about the state of journalism and journalism education?" "I suggest contact be made by a J-school with a nearby small and large daily and a weekly newspaper to discuss what newspaper management is looking for in J-school graduates." "Have faculty members meet with representatives of all sectors of the profession--weeklies as well as dailies--since weeklies do offer the majority of entry-level jobs." "Department heads should meet periodically with publishers and news executives from all sizes of newspapers."

Comments such as these stand on their own merit. There is obvious interest on the part of Michigan educators and newspaper professionals in building on the foundation that constitutes their relationship. It should behoove both professions to recognize that interest in cultivating and improving their relations remains a priority among many of their associates. Now that some indicators of these relationships have been brought into the open, both groups should challenge themselves to use this information and to foster improvements. When and if this occurs, the actions should provide encouraging

results--for newspapers, educators, students, and readers of newspapers across the state. Should greater cooperation not take place, however, the result could very likely be a further deterioration of a relationship that is already on shaky ground. For the welfare of all Michigan residents, the charge is readily apparent: Seek out ways to work together, educators and newspaper professionals, and positive trends can develop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Backstrom, Charles H., and Hursh-Cesar, Gerald. Survey Research, second ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.
- Becker, Lee B., Fruit, Jeffrey W., Caudill, Susan L., and Blood, R. Warwick. "The Development of Professional Values of Journalists." Paper presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, Fla., August 1984.
- Becker, Lee. B, Sobowale, Idowu A., and Cobbey, Robin E. "Reporters and their Professional and Organizational Commitment." Journalism Quarterly 56 (1979):753-63, 770.
- Berkman, Dave. "Student Quality Fall Affects J-Schools." Journalism Educator, Winter 1985, pp. 33-37.
- Bourland, Pamela. "A Survey of Arkansas's Editors' and PR Practitioners' Attitudes Toward Their Relationship." Journalism Abstracts, 1982, 20:36.
- Bowers, Thomas A. "Student Attitudes Toward Journalism as a Major and a Career." Journalism Quarterly 51 (Summer 1974):265-70.
- Brown, Robert U. "Don't Lobotomize My Kids." Editor & Publisher, 29 November 1980, p. 40.
- Burgoon, Judee K., Burgoon, Michael, and Atkin, Charles K. Report on working journalists conducted for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, East Lansing, Mich., May 1982.
- Carey, James W. "A Plea for the University Tradition." Journalism Quarterly 55 (Winter 1978): 846-55.
- Carter, Roy E., Jr. "Field Methods in Communication Research." In Introduction to Mass Communications Research, pp. 78-121. Edited by Ralph O. Nafziger and David M. White. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.

- Christians, Clifford G., and Covert, Catherine L. Teaching Ethics in Journalism Education. New York: The Hasting Center Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences, 1980.
- DeMott, John. "We're Doing a Better Job Than Ever." The Quill, September 1975, pp. 16-19.
- Dorfman, Ron. "A New Deal for Journalism Education." The Quill, February 1984, pp. 17-19.
- Duncan, Charles W. "Accreditation Issues Debated at 1983 AEJMC Convention: The Historical Perspective." Journalism Educator, Winter 1984, pp. 3-8.
- Edwards, Kenneth. "Teaching Writing Skills." Editor & Publisher, 2 April 1983, p. 36.
- Einstoss, Ronald H. "You're Still Short of the Mark." The Quill, September 1975, pp. 20-22, 24.
- Fedler, Fred, and Taylor, Phillip. "Does Journalism Attract Quality Students?" Journalism Quarterly 53 (1976):522-27.
- Fowler, Gilbert L., Jr. "Community Journalism Program Responds to Specific Needs of State's Weekly Press." Journalism Educator, Winter 1983, pp. 39-41.
- Gaddis, Haskell O. "Journalism Career Preparation: Opinions of Selected Newspaper Editors Versus Those of Heads of ACEJ-Accredited News-Editorial Journalism Sequences." Journalism Abstracts. 1980, 18:11.
- Gaddis, Woody. "Editors, Educators Agree on Many Key J-Education Issues." Journalism Educator, July 1981, pp. 26, 46.
- Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul K. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
- Gordon, Gregory. "A Status of Journalism Education and Mass Media Communication Education in Michigan Secondary Schools." Journalism Abstracts, 1973, 11:113.
- Haroldsen, Edwin O., and Harvey, Kenneth E. "Frowns Greet New J-Grads in Magazine Job Market." Journalism Educator, July 1979, pp. 3-8, 26.
- Hasse, Edmund, and Shaheen, Jack. "New Internships Erase Skepticism Among Media Pros." Journalism Educator, October 1972, pp. 13-15.

- Hornby, William H. "Editor Calls on J-Educators to be Inspirational, Critical." Journalism Educator, October 1973, pp. 6-7, 38.
- Hulteng, John L. "The J-Graduate--How Well Prepared: Educators and Editors Don't See Eye to Eye." The Quill, April 1972, p. 16.
- Johnson, James. "The Value of a J-School Degree." Editor & Publisher, 12 February 1983, p. 44.
- Johnstone, John W.C., Slawski, Edward J., and Bowman, William W. The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1976.
- Joseph, Ted. "The Need For Dialogue: We Might Try Harder." Journalism Educator, Spring 1983, pp. 56-57.
- Krieghbaum, Hillier. "J-School Training Criticized in ANPA-AEJ 'Rap' Sessions." Editor & Publisher, 10 November 1973, pp. 13-, 72.
- Lawhorne, Clifton O. "Editors of Smaller Newspapers See Weaknesses in J-Education." Journalism Educator, April 1976, pp. 3-6, 60.
- Lindley, William R. "Journalism Studies: Search of a Science." Nieman Reports, Winter 1983, pp. 41-42.
- McLeod, Jack M., and Hawley, Searle E., Jr. "Professionalization Among Newsmen." Journalism Quarterly 41 (1964): 529-39.
- Mencher, Melvin. "Agenda for Journalism Education." Nieman Reports, Autumn 1982, pp. 47-48.
- Merrill, John C. "Upside Down: Another Look at a J-Education First Proposed in 1975--But Now with Modifications." Journalism Educator, July 1980, pp. 20-22.
- Mills, Gordon, Harvey, Kenneth, and Warnick, Leland B. "Newspaper Editors Point to J-Grad Deficiencies." Journalism Educator, July 1980, pp. 12-19.
- Mokrycki, Michael, "Provisional Accreditation Rejected by Boston University." Editor & Publisher, 12 February 1983, p. 14.
- National Conference of Editorial Writers Journalism Education Committee. "Editorial Writers Propose Changes in J-Education." Journalism Educator, April 1977, pp. 4-5, 152.

- Nickless, Judith. "Journalism Instruction and Activity in Michigan Public Community Colleges." Journalism Abstracts, 1964, 2:115.
- Norton, Edward C. "Journalism: Taught or Caught?" Nieman Reports, Winter/Spring 1978, pp. 28-30.
- Norton, Wayne A. "A Comparative Study of Journalism Education at the Undergraduate Level in Ohio." Journalism Abstracts, 1964, 2:115.
- Peterson, Paul V. "Survey Indicates No Change in '83 Journalism Enrollment." Journalism Educator, Spring 1984, pp. 3-7.
- Powell, Fredric A. "Training Students More Realistically Through a Work-Setting Approach." Journalism Educator, Spring 1983, pp. 52-55, 57.
- Reddick, DeWitt C. "From A Variety of Voices, A Myriad of Grays: Introduction." The Quill, September 1975, pp. 13-15.
- Roepke, William J. "Educators Ponder Shifts in Student Career Goals." Journalism Educator, October 1981, pp. 3, 6.
- Roosenraad, Jon, and Wares, Donna. "Academics vs. Experience." Journalism Educator, Summer 1983, pp. 17-18, 30.
- Ruffner, Michael. "An Empirical Approach for the Assessment of Journalistic Writing." Journalism Quarterly 58 (1981):77-78.
- Sitton, Claude. "Accreditation Issues Debated at 1983 AEJMC Convention: An Editor's Perspective." Journalism Educator, Winter 1984, p. 9.
- Stone, Gerald C. "Survey Reflects Disagreement on 25 Percent Accrediting Rule." Journalism Educator, Winter 1984, pp. 13-16.
- Talevich, Tim. "Liberal Arts Tradition Backed at J-Education Summit." Presstime, February 1984, pp. 38-39.
- Tebbel, John. "Can Journalism Schools Improve the Press?" In Readings in Mass Communication: Concepts and Issues in the Mass Media, pp. 369-73. Edited by Michael C. Emery and Ted Curtis Smyth. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1972.
- Trayes, Ed. "Degree is Requirement for Hiring Beginning

Newsman on About Half of Newspaper." Journalism Educator, 1970, pp. 4-7.

Watkins, Beverly T. "Many Journalism Schools at Universities Reported to be 'Nearly Stagnant.'" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 5 July 1984, p. 9.

Williams, Herbert Lee. "Which Are The Toughest J-Courses to Teach . . . And Why?" Journalism Educator, Winter 1983, pp. 12-14.

Wilson, Quintus C. "Community Journalism Makes Curriculum Gains." Journalism Educator, January 1979, pp. 9-13.

Wirt, Wilma Hudnall. "National Performance of College Journalism Students on the Independent Study in Grammar Tests." Journalism Abstracts, 1978, 16:113.