

ASSESSING EFFORTS AND POLICIES RELATED TO THE
RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF MINORITY FACULTY AT
ACCREDITED AND NON-ACCREDITED JOURNALISM AND
MASS COMMUNICATION PROGRAMS

Final Report

Federico Subervi, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Professor
School of Journalism & Mass Communication
Texas State University-San Marcos
subervi@latinosandmedia.org
(512) 965-5267 cell

Tania Cantrell
Research Assistant
Doctoral Student
School of Journalism
University of Texas at Austin
tania_cantrell@mail.utexas.edu

November 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	3
II. Sample, Survey Procedures, and Response Rates	4
III. Findings	6
Comparisons Between Accredited and Non-Accredited Programs	6
<i>Avenues for recruiting minorities</i>	6
<i>Inducements for recruiting minorities</i>	8
<i>Structures, plans, or programs to retain minorities</i>	8
<i>Structures, plans, or activities to promote minorities</i>	9
<i>Day care/child care support</i>	10
Comparisons of Mass Communication Programs Based on Other Factors	11
IV. Discussion	13
V. Conclusions	14
VI. Limitations	15
Resource References	16
Endnotes	17
Appendix A: Word-file Version of the Internet-Based Survey	19
Appendix B: Examples of the e-mail Correspondence Related to the Survey	24
Appendix C: Word-file Version of the Internet-based 30-Second Survey	30
Appendix D: AEJMC-TFD Survey Respondents and Non-Respondents	31
List of Tables	
Table 1. Overview of number of schools contacted and responses	5
Table 2. Responses to the various types of recruitment avenues used regularly	7
Table 3. Responses to the various types of distinctive inducements to pursue minority hires	8
Table 4. Responses to the various types of structure, plan or program to retain minority hires	9
Table 5. Responses to the various types of structures, plans or activities to help promote junior faculty	10

Executive Summary

With financial support from the AEJMC, this study was developed because a major lacuna exists in understanding the continued paucity in the recruitment and retention of minority faculty in U.S. journalism and mass communication schools and programs. It builds on the assumption that the changing demographics and the social dynamics related to these require much more diversity among the faculty and in the academic programs of the nation's journalism and mass communication programs.

Three objectives guided this study:

1. Inquire which, if any, policies and practices related to recruitment and retention of minority faculty are available at a representative sample of schools of journalism and mass communication across the country;
2. Assess if among the sampled schools any significant differences exist in policies related to factors such as:
 - the schools' accredited vs. non-accredited status
 - the offering of graduate degrees in mass communication
 - the number of students (including both university size as well as a minority population)
 - regional location (considering state compositions)
 - program autonomy (department vs. a school or college); and
3. Highlight the factors that appear to contribute to policies or practices that enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty.

An Internet-based survey was sent during summer 2005 to a sample of 137 schools; the overall response rate was 45%.

Some of the key findings are:

- *Accreditation makes a difference*; statistically significant differences exist between accredited and non-accredited journalism or mass communication units (programs, departments, schools, colleges) and most of the items used to assess efforts and policies to recruit, retain and promote minority faculty.
- *Finances don't guarantee greater diversity practices*; while various differences may be related to financial resources available at or to the accredited versus non-accredited journalism or mass communication units, disparities are evident even in practices and policies that have little or no cost if implemented.
- *More—in terms of offering and control—is better for diversity*; in addition to the differences among accredited and non-accredited units, other factors, particularly the offering of graduate programs in mass communication and the potential administrative autonomy of the unit, are significantly (statistically speaking) related to effort and policy variations in recruiting, retaining and promoting minority faculty.

The AEJMC Task Force on Diversity urges the nation's programs, departments, schools, and colleges of journalism and mass communication to examine their recruiting, retaining and promoting minority faculty efforts and policies in light of these findings and to significantly enhance the mechanisms available and being used to increase the minority faculty in their respective units.

The AEJMC Task Force on Diversity also urges the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications to offer more directives in the efforts that journalism and mass communication programs should make to increase their respective ranks of minority faculty and to retain and promote them.

The Task Force also calls upon the AEJMC, the ACEJMC, the Commission on the Status of Minorities and the Commission on the Status of Women to work together on establishing and helping enforce those directives to enhance the diversity of the faculty members in the journalism and mass communication programs across the country.

I. Introduction

The changing demographics of the U.S.—and their social, economic, political, and cultural ramifications—have been a major factor in the debates on the importance of improving the ethnic/racial diversity of the faculty and student body of colleges and universities across the country.

The field of Journalism and Mass Communication has not been exempt from the debates and the innumerable efforts related to improving the ethnic/racial diversity as well as the number of women and of minority faculty and students in our schools. The discussions in our field have also addressed diversity issues in the curriculum of both the professional and the studies areas.

However, research documenting specific efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty remains elusive and indirect, discernable at best via partial data from surveys conducted for other purposes. With financial support from the AEJMC, this study was launched with three specific goals:

1. Inquire which, if any, policies and practices related to recruitment and retention of minority faculty are available at a representative sample of schools of journalism and mass communication across the country;
2. Assess if among the sampled schools there were any significant differences in such policies based on various factors such as the schools' accredited vs. non-accredited status, the offering of graduate degrees in mass communication, the number of students (including both university size as well as a minority population), regional location (considering state compositions), and program autonomy (department vs. a school or college); and
3. Highlight the factors that appear to contribute to policies or practices that enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty.

With mixed results in terms of response rate, this survey indicates that, among other points, stark differences exist between accredited and non-accredited journalism and mass communication programs across the nation in terms of their recruitment and retention policies toward minority faculty. This holds true regardless of state compositions, i.e., their Anglo and minority populations, university size and composition. Many challenges await our organization—or any faculty, student, administrator or news media—seeking to enhance the number and success of minorities in our field of mass communication. By success it is implied that the faculty members are able to conduct research and publish, excel in their teaching, earn tenure and advance in rank and stature in their areas of expertise.

II. Sample, Survey Procedures, and Response Rates

A total of 137 schools (69 accredited and 68 non-accredited) were selected for the survey. The sample was derived from the list provided by Lee Becker and resembles the one he has used a number of times for his assessments of minority faculty and students.

Questionnaire drafting dominated the first phase of the project. Lee Barrow, Barbara Reed, and Tania Cantrell (the research assistant) collaborated with Federico Subervi (the principal investigator)'s guidance in this effort.

Parallel, during April and May, 2005, the RA placed calls and sent e-mails to the selected schools to 1) verify the name and title (chair, director, dean) of the person in the unit (program, department, school, college) who should be contacted to respond to our survey, and 2) determine the best date and time the principal investigator could call to conduct a telephone survey.

During the process of obtaining the contact information and developing the questionnaire, three interrelated factors led to a change in the survey methodology. One was pushback the RA received while placing the initial calls; various points of contact and/or their assistants seemed suspicious of our inquiries. Another was obtaining the collaboration of Chana Moses, (evaluation specialist, College of Communication, University of Texas at Austin), who offered guidance for developing an alternative Internet-based survey that would significantly facilitate data gathering and its subsequent analysis. A third factor was feedback the PI received from a few colleagues regarding the challenges in conducting a telephone survey.

The first thrust to obtain survey replies entailed two steps. First, an e-mail letter was sent to pin-pointed unit directors informing them that 1) the Internet-based survey would follow soon, and 2) specific demographic data—the gender and race/ethnicity of their unit's faculty and student populations—should be at hand to successfully complete the forthcoming survey¹. Second, the Internet-based survey was pre-tested. For this, three accredited and three non-accredited units were contacted.

With the feedback from the pre-test, a minor adjustment was made to the questionnaire, which was then launched to the rest of the sample on June 28, 2005. Please see Appendix A for a Word-file version of the Internet-based survey.

The original deadline for completion was July 8. Even though the invitation letter to participate offered an incentive—it indicated that schools responding to the survey would be entered into a drawing for a free job placement advertisement (worth \$125) on the AEJMC Web site²—responses trickled in. Due to the slow rate of responses and additional feedback from some units, the deadline was extended twice, up to July 24. During that extension time, reminder emails as well as extension notices were sent, and the PI placed personal phone calls to practically each non-respondent's office to encourage survey participation. Details of the communications related to those emails are presented in Appendix B.

After the final deadline passed, an additional e-mail was sent to the schools that had not responded. That e-mail (dubbed a “30-second survey” in the subject heading) was a very brief questionnaire to inquire why they had not participated in the survey.

From that “30-second survey,” we learned that the most problematic issue (at least as expressed by the eight—17 percent of recipients—who had the courtesy to answer) was the lack of time and/or the limited access to the demographic statistics of minority faculty and students requested in one part of the Internet-based survey.

Following the advice and feedback received from the advance report shared at the AEJMC Convention in San Antonio (August 9-13, 2005), Texas, with the AEJMC Board of Directors and the members at the Task Force on Diversity, we attempted to increase the response rate one last time. Four (two accredited, two non-accredited) additional schools – who each had indicated in the 30-second survey that he/she would still be willing to participate in the study via a telephone interview – were contacted and interviewed. Their compliance closed the inquiry part of the study.

The number of schools contacted and the outcomes from accredited vs. non-accredited schools to the various efforts to elicit responses are summarized in Table 1. The first row shows the number of surveys sent out. The second row indicates the number of replies via the Internet, while row three reveals the number of replies received via alternative means.³ The fourth row shows how many additional respondents participated once the 30-second survey period closed. The fifth row connects all participants showing a 54% response rate for accredited schools, but only 35% for non-accredited schools. Combined, the overall response rate was 45%.

Table 1. Overview of number of schools contacted and responses

*	Accredited N	Non-accredited N	Totals N
Sent out	69	68	137
Internet replies	33	20	53
Print/phone replies	2	2	4
Post 30-sec survey interviews	2	2	4
Combined replies	37 (54%)	24 (35%)	61 (45%)
Declined participation	1	1	2
Brief follow-up inquiry	34	44	78
Responses to brief	4	4	8

Row six shows the number who explicitly declined to participate in the survey. The next two rows list, respectively, the number of administrators who received the brief follow-up inquiry, and the number who replied to it. Seven of eight administrators said they would consider answering our survey via Internet and/or phone, at least regarding the recruitment and retention policies. As previously noted, four of them eventually did (row four).

III. Findings

The first set of analyses, summarized in Tables 2-5 and the corresponding narratives, show the frequency distributions to questions response about the various tactics, inducements, structures, plans, or activities to either recruit, retain or promote minority faculty. On the tables, the numbers and percentages represent, respectively, a Yes (Y) answer—and on some tables also an Uncertain (U) answer—stated by each type of school.

Two major patterns can be summarized from these tables. First, some of the tactics, inducements, etc., to recruit, retain or promote minority faculty are available and used much more than others. This means that some of the potential avenues that could contribute to enhance the presence of minority faculty in journalism and mass communication schools and programs are being tapped into. Second, noticeable differences between accredited and non-accredited schools in the availability or use of those options definitely exist.

Beyond the frequency distributions for accredited vs. non-accredited programs, we also performed additional statistical analysis that (a) confirm these two basic patterns, and (b) document additional differences between types of schools. As discussed below, we tested for differences between programs that offer undergrad only or also graduate degrees, school size, the presence of minority populations, regional influences (i.e., minority-majority populations), and potential autonomy of the programs.

Before presenting those findings, we acknowledge that what is being done, or what can be done, at each particular program and university is contingent on many factors, especially the financial resources that would make some inducements feasible while others difficult if not impossible. Further, many programs indicated that they do not differentiate in their treatment of faculty and students; what they do for one, they do for all.⁴ Nevertheless, the data suggest that even in areas of minimal financial costs, journalism and mass communication programs varied and are not taking as much action as could be viable to recruit, retain or promote minority faculty.

Comparisons Between Accredited and Non-Accredited Journalism and Mass Communication Programs

Avenues for recruiting minorities

Table 2 regarding the avenues that within the last two years have been used regularly for trying to recruit minority faculty shows that 26 of the 37 (70%) accredited schools that responded stated that they advertise in minority publications, while 2 (5%) did not know if that was the case. In contrast, among the 24 non-accredited schools, only 13 (54%) stated they advertise in minority publications, while 1 (4%) was uncertain. Excluded from this and the other tables are the “no” answers. In this example, it means that 9 (25%) accredited schools and 10 (42%) non-accredited schools did not advertise in those publications.

Table 2. Number (and percentage based on total responses within type of school) of affirmative (Y) and uncertain (U) responses to the various types of recruitment avenues used regularly

<i>Within the last two years, which if any of the following avenues have been used regularly for trying to recruit minority faculty?</i>	Accredited N=37				Non- Accredited N=24			
	Y	(%)	U	(%)	Y	(%)	U	(%)
Advertising in specialized minority publications	26	(70)	2	(5)	13	(54)	1	(4)
Advertising on the AEJMC newsletter	33	(89)	2	(5)	10	(42)	2	(8)
Mailing your job announcement to all AEJMC members	14	(38)	3	(8)	2	(9)	4	(17)
Mailing your job announcement to members of the Commission on the Status of Women, etc.	11	(30)	8	(22)	2	(9)	2	(9)
Advertising on a specialized minority listserv	21	(57)	5	(14)	10	(42)	1	(4)
Attending a minority-related job fair or conference to recruit faculty in person	7	(19)	7	(19)	3	(13)	1	(4)
Calling other schools to identify new minority graduates	25	(68)	4	(11)	9	(38)	-	-
Engaging the efforts of minority faculty even from other units on campus	26	(70)	4	(11)	10	(42)	1	(4)
Other types of networking	27	(73)	6	(16)	12	(50)	2	(8)

The most common recruitment approach of 89% of the accredited schools has been advertising in the AEJMC newsletter.⁵ Only 42% of the non-accredited schools used this conduit, which is a standard channel for general job postings. The table also shows that other than advertising in specialized minority publications, and with the one exception of “other types of networking,” fewer than half of the non-accredited schools used any of the options listed.

The option of calling other schools to identify new minority graduates, which is a low-cost, albeit labor-intensive effort, was used by slightly more than two-thirds of the accredited schools (68%) but by less than 40% of the non-accredited schools.

Interestingly, very few accredited or non-accredited schools (30% and 9%, respectively) use one of the most direct avenues to reach specifically minority faculty and women: direct mailings to the members of AEJMC’s Minorities and Communication Division, the Commission on the Status of Women, or the Commission on the Status of Minorities.

Inducements for recruiting minorities

What do journalism and mass communication programs do to pursue minority hires? Table 3 presents a list of potential inducements and how many responding schools used these. The least common inducement is salary supplements, which has been used by less than half of either accredited or non-accredited schools (49% and 42%, respectively). The most frequently used inducement for accredited schools (89%) is arranging affiliations with another department for interdisciplinary, collaborate opportunities. The vast majority of these schools also report ample use of each of the other distinctive incentives.

The same is not the case among non-accredited programs, where on-campus or off-campus spousal accommodations are an infrequent option (25%). In those programs, the most common recruitment inducement is the support to design a specialized course (75%)—certainly a low or no-cost option.

Table 3. Number (and percentage based on total responses within type of school) of affirmative (Y) responses to the various types of distinctive inducements to pursue minority hires

<i>Distinctive inducements</i>	Accredited N=37		Non-Acdt. N=24	
	Yes	(%)	Yes	(%)
Salary supplements	18	(49)	10	(42)
Guaranteed summer teaching 1 or more years	26	(70)	11	(46)
Summer research grants	31	(84)	11	(46)
Support to design a specialized course	31	(84)	18	(75)
On/off-campus spousal job accommodations	21	(57)	6	(25)
Joint appointment with another department	24	(65)	13	(54)
Arranging affiliation with another dept. for interdisciplinary, collaborative opportunities	33	(89)	13	(54)
Reduced teaching load to conduct, publish research	26	(70)	15	(63)

Structures, plans, or programs to retain minorities

Once a minority faculty has been hired, what structures, plans, or programs do the responding schools have in place to retain them? Again, Table 4 shows that the options and replies vary by type of school. At least 95% of the accredited schools and 83% of the non-accredited schools reported providing formal or informal mentoring for their faculty. More than 90% of both types of schools also offer professional development opportunities and allow faculty members to design a specialized course.

However, for both accredited and non-accredited schools, the least common option is the designation of funds to counter recruitment offers the faculty member may receive from another university. Such funds are available in 46% of the accredited schools and only 17% of the non-accredited schools. Another infrequent option is team teaching (46% to 42%, with accredited schools leading), which could reduce a professor's

teaching load or related pressures (when properly conducted). In about half of the non-accredited schools, it was also found that only about half reported they connected minority faculty with other minorities and/or the local community (46%), or just more than half promoted collaboration with other faculty for purposes of research or grants (54%). Neither of these latter two options requires much, if any, special funding to be implemented.

Table 4. Number (and percentage based on total responses within type of school) of affirmative (Y) and uncertain (U) responses to the various types of structure, plan or program to retain minority hires

<i>Structures, plans or programs</i>	Accredited N=37				Non- Accredited N=24			
	Y	(%)	U	(%)	Y	(%)	U	(%)
Formal or informal mentoring	35	(95)	2	(5)	20	(83)	2	(8)
Connecting minority faculty with other minorities in the university and/or the local community	28	(76)	6	(16)	11	(46)	8	(33)
Collaboration with other faculty for purposes of research or grants	31	(84)	4	(11)	13	(54)	4	(17)
Team teaching	17	(46)	4	(11)	10	(42)	3	(13)
Ability to design a specialized course	34	(92)	1	(3)	22	(92)	-	-
Professional development opportunities	34	(92)	1	(3)	23	(96)	-	-
Designated funds for counter offers	17	(46)	7	(19)	4	(17)	8	(33)
Other	3	(8)	18	(49)	-	-	15	(63)

Structures, plans, or activities to promote minorities

Closely connected to the matter of retaining minority hires is the issue of promoting them (see Table 5). At accredited and non-accredited schools, the most universal activities are the guidance to prepare for the promotion (97% and 88%, respectively) and the matching up/mentoring by senior faculty (87% and 75%, respectively). What is most surprising in this respect is that these activities did not elicit an affirmative response from 100 percent of the schools.

Table 5. Number (and percentage based on total responses within type of school) of affirmative (Y) and uncertain (U) responses to the various types of structures, plans or activities to help promote junior faculty

<i>Structures, plans or activities</i>	Accredited N=37				Non- Accredited N=24			
	Y	(%)	U	(%)	Y	(%)	U	(%)
Paid semester off after 3 years of teaching	6	(16)	4	(11)	1	(4)	-	-
Guidance to prepare for the promotion/tenure process	36	(97)	1	(3)	21	(88)	1	(4)
Matching up/mentoring by senior faculty	32	(87)	1	(3)	18	(75)	2	(8)
Matching up/mentoring by minority senior faculty	15	(41)	1	(3)	2	(8)	3	(13)
Plan to aid in the promotion of junior minority faculty to senior levels or administrative roles	5	(14)	-	-	4	(17)	-	-
Other	4	(11)	15	(41)	2	(8)	11	(46)

Paid semesters off after three years of teaching is not a common practice at either type of school (16% compared with 4%). Neither are there many schools that have plans that could aid in the promotion of junior faculty to senior levels or administrative roles, although non-accredited schools fared slightly better in their preparation (14% in accredited as to 17% in non).

Yet another contrast between accredited and non-accredited schools is observed in the arena of matching up/mentoring by minority senior faculty. The scarcity of this practice in the non-accredited schools (8%, compared with 41% in accredited) might be a reflection of the few senior minority scholars working at such colleges or at least in their journalism and mass communication programs.

Day care/child care support

For faculty who have or are planning to have children, the availability of on-campus day care can be a major inducement for considering accepting a job or staying at it. The same applies to having access to financial aid or receiving a subsidy for child-care services. In these two measures, differences were once again found among the respondents. Sixty-five percent of the accredited schools offer on-campus day care, but less than one third (32%) provide economic aid for it. Meanwhile, only 50% of the non-accredited schools offer the day care, and 21% provide financial support for it.

Comparisons of Journalism and Mass Communication Programs Based on Other Factors

The data presented up to this point highlight patterns of minority faculty recruitment, retention and promotion used by journalism and mass communication programs. The responses to most of the queries clearly show that disparities abound between accredited vis-à-vis non-accredited schools.

What has not been indicated is which of the differences are *statistically significant*, and whether or not other factors contribute to variations between journalism and mass communication programs' efforts to enhance the ranks of their minority faculty. To that end, instead of testing for each of the individual items, the answers to the items of the various measures were dichotomized and then summed to create seven indices: (1) recruitment, (2) inducement, (3) retention, (4) promotion, (5) child care, (6) group, and (7) summary. The only difference between the group and summary indices is the exclusion of the child-care index in the former and its inclusion in the latter.

The various indices were then tested for differences between:

- a. accredited versus non-accredited schools,
- b. the more autonomous units versus less autonomous units,⁶
- c. units that have graduate programs versus those that do not,⁷
- d. units in universities with the largest versus the smaller number of students,⁸
- e. units in universities with the largest versus the smaller number of minority students,⁹ and
- f. units in states that have predominantly White versus predominantly minority populations.¹⁰

While we did not start this data analysis with any hypotheses, we did expect to find statistically significant higher index scores among the accredited programs and journalism/mass communication units that 1) are more autonomous, 2) have graduate programs, 3) are in larger universities, and 4) are located in regions with a greater percentage of minority populations.

The results, based on a non-parametric correlation analysis,¹¹ can be summarized as follows:

All index scores were significant in units with graduate programs¹². Most indices were significantly related with accredited schools,¹³ those with the most autonomy (schools and colleges of journalism/mass communication)¹⁴ those that had the largest student populations (more than 17,000 students),¹⁵ and schools with large minority populations.¹⁶ However, no differences were found in the relationships between units in states with a greater percentage of minority populations and any of the indices.

In addition to those findings, we addressed three complementary questions that provide important contexts about the sampled programs.

First, we wanted to check if a statistical relationship existed between accredited versus non-accredited units and their location, i.e., in states with predominantly minority versus non-minority (predominantly Anglo/White) populations. The answer is no.¹⁷ This means that any differences between accredited or non-accredited schools is not related to state demographic composition.

Second, we also wanted to know if university size and its minority student enrollment were related. The relationship was significant and strong.¹⁸ Larger universities and, by extension, journalism and mass communication programs had larger minority populations. This means that journalism/mass communication units in larger universities serve a larger number of minority students.

Finally, we addressed the question regarding the relationship between the demographic classification of the states where the units are located and the number of minority students at schools. A significant and moderate relationship does exist; states with a predominantly larger number of minority populations also have a greater number of minority students.¹⁹

An implication of the last two complementary findings is that in large universities and those that are in states with predominantly minority populations the journalism and mass communication units will be called upon to serve a larger number of minority students in those programs.

IV. Discussion

This study was developed because a major lacuna exists in understanding the continued paucity in the recruitment and retention of minority faculty in U.S. journalism and mass communication schools and programs. It builds on the assumption that the changing demographics and the social dynamics related to these require much more diversity among the faculty and in the academic programs of the nation's journalism and mass communication programs.

The data collected reveal major differences between accredited and non-accredited journalism or mass communication units (programs, departments, schools, colleges) in the responses to most of the items assessing efforts and policies to recruit, retain and promote minority faculty. On most accounts, accredited schools outperform non-accredited schools.

Although it cannot be ascertained that accreditation is the main causal factor in the differences with respect to various efforts and policies, it is undoubtedly a major variable related to enhance the diversity of the nation's journalism and mass communication programs.

Across all types of schools, various differences in efforts and policies reflect effects of access to financial resources available at or to the journalism or mass communication units. However, disparities are evident even in practices and policies that have little or no cost if implemented.

In addition to the differences among accredited and non-accredited units, other factors significantly affect variations in the efforts and policies to recruit, retain and promote minority faculty. Journalism and mass communication programs that offer graduate degrees, those that potentially have more autonomy, and those in universities with large minority populations do better than their corresponding counterparts. However, units in states with a larger percentage of minority populations do not outperform units in states with low percentages of minority populations.

Finally, no statistically significant differences exist in the recruitment and retention efforts and policies across units located in states where a very large segment of the population is minority compared with more Anglo-populated states. However, those demographics do have indirect bearings on the issues at hand. For example, states with a predominantly larger number of minority populations also contribute to a greater number of minority students to their universities, especially to the largest institutions. By extension, the journalism and mass communication programs in such universities have larger minority students, too. To better serve those minority students it is imperative for those units to enhance their efforts to recruit, retain and promote minority faculty who can contribute to the education of their more diverse student bodies. At the same time, states with less diversity in their populations and universities must also make concerted efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty.

V. Conclusions

This first Internet-based survey on the efforts and policies related to the recruitment and retention of minority faculty in a sample of journalism or mass communication units (programs, departments, schools, colleges) across the country reveals some definitive patterns. Overall, accredited units seem to be doing a better job than non-accredited units in such matters, even regarding activities that require little or no financial expenditures.

Differences among journalism or mass communication units are related to other factors aside from accreditation. Chief among these is the offering of graduate programs in mass communication and the potential administrative autonomy of the unit; both these characteristics are related to recruitment, retention and promotion indicators.

Demographic factors, particularly the minority populations in the state and university have direct or indirect bearing on matters related to the importance of having minority faculty in the journalism and mass communication units across the country.

As revealing as the report is, the data have not been scrutinized to the fullest. Additional analyses may reveal findings about the relationships between the policies and the minority faculty of different ranks, and between these two and the number and patterns about the ethnic/racial background of minority students. Such analyses were not performed for this report due to time limitations of the authors. Also, the numbers of minority faculty and students in the schools are so low that very restricted statistical analyses are possible. Even without such analysis, the report speaks strongly to suggest specific policy actions.

The AEJMC Task Force on Diversity urges the nation's programs, departments, schools, and colleges of journalism and mass communication to examine their recruiting, retaining and promoting minority faculty efforts and policies in light of these findings and to significantly enhance the mechanisms available and being used to increase the minority faculty in their respective units.

The AEJMC Task Force on Diversity also urges the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication and the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications to offer more directives in the efforts that journalism and mass communication programs should make to increase their respective ranks of minority faculty and to retain and promote them.

The Task Force also calls upon the AEJMC, the ACEJMC, the Commission on the Status of Minorities and the Commission on the Status of Women to work together on establishing and helping enforce those directives to enhance the diversity of the faculty members in the journalism and mass communication programs across the country.

VI. Limitations

As is the case with any study, this analysis is not free from limitations. Technology incompatibilities forced a tweaking of certain survey methodologies, for example, performing telephone surveys on an individual basis on a number of occasions and/or e-mailing a Word-file form of the survey to willing participants. The time of the year also presented its own set of challenges. For example, while the contact information for the surveys was gathered in spring, the actual survey was launched during the summer and too close to the Fourth of July holiday. This is a time when many university administrators and staffs are on recess. Thus, previously established points-of-contact who may have been accessible at other times may not have been able to respond, especially if they had limited e-mail access. The deadline extensions aided in the increased subsequent response, and the final outcome was within the parameters of those produced by other Internet-based surveys.

Another limitation was with the wording of some survey questions. A number of respondents indicated that what they do to try to hire and retain a minority faculty is the same as what they do for any faculty member. In other words, they found it difficult to differentiate their recruitment and retention policies for minorities from other practices they follow for non-minorities. Also, while the survey does distinguish between undergraduate and graduate program offerings, it does not do so between professional and research track programs. Questions generally try to incorporate both perspectives. However, information is lost in that comparison alone. Although the survey had been pilot-tested to hone such wording, and open-ended response categories were provided to allow for more individual response, these challenges remained.

Given these shortcomings, findings of this study offer a unique snapshot of the current status of efforts and policies to recruit, retain and promote minority faculty in the country's journalism and mass communication programs. Moreover, regardless of whether or not policies are used exclusively for minority faculty members or if the units offer academic versus professional programs, the study reveals that wider use of some practices along with less use of others must occur to achieve greater diversity. Also, significant variations exist among different types of journalism and mass communication units.

Resource References

- Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (2003). Diversity: Best Practices. A handbook for Journalism and Mass Communication Educators. Lawrence, KS: ACEJMC.
- De Uriarte, Mercedes, with Bodinger-de Uriarte, Cristina and Benavides, José Luis (2003). Diversity Disconnects: From Class Room to News Room. Report funded and submitted to the Ford Foundation. New York.
- Gao. (2004). Gender Issues: Women's Participation in the Sciences Has Increased, but Agencies Need to Do More to Ensure Compliance with Title IX. United States Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters.
- González, Juan and Torres, Joseph (2004). How Long Must We Wait? The Fight for Racial and Ethnic Equality in the American News Media. Report presented to the UNITY 2004 Journalists of Color Convention. Washington, DC.
- Nelson, Donna J.; and Rogers, Diana C. A National Analysis of Diversity in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities.
- Riffe, Daniel; Salomone, Kandice; and Stempel, Guido H. III (1999). Journalism Educators Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. Report to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Columbia, SC: AEJMC.
- Ruggles, Robert M. (December 5, 1998). Diversity Ain't Affirmative Action. Speech presented at the Freedom Forum Journalism Administrator of the Year. San Antonio, TX.
- Rush, Ramona R.; Oukrop, Carol E.; Sarikakis, Katharine; Andsager, Julie; Wooten, Billy, and Daufin, E-K. (2005). Junior Scholars in Search of Equity for Women and Minorities. Journalism Communication Monographs, 6: 4.

Endnotes

1. This preliminary step also served to verify yet again that correct points of contact at each university would receive the survey.
- 2 For this prize, gratitude is extended to Jennifer McGill, executive director of AEJMC. All schools that responded to the survey by July 24 were assigned a number and had an equal chance of being selected. The winner was randomly selected by pulling from a hat a piece of paper with a number representing the school name. Kent State's School of Journalism, whose survey was returned by Professor Jeff Fruit, won the ad.
3. One was via telephone and three came via e-mail with attached word documents due to technology incompatibilities with the program used for the Internet-based surveys (PhP Surveyor, v. 98).
4. While this may be a shortcoming of the survey in terms of being able to conclude what is being done *exclusively* for faculty of color, the data do shed light on practices and policies that directly affect the target population of this study.
5. Among AEJMC's 3,551 members, roughly 2/3 provide information on their ethnicity; 12% of those who share that data are ethnic/racial minorities. It is possible that many minorities in this field are not members of this organization.
6. The more autonomous units were assumed to be the colleges and schools of journalism or mass communication, while the least autonomous units were assumed to be those that are either departments or programs of journalism or mass communication.
7. For this measure we dichotomized programs as those that had undergraduate programs only versus those that had higher degree programs including Masters, MFA, and/or doctoral programs.
8. The universities that had the largest student populations were considered those with more than 17,000 students. This cut-off point was derived from the median number from those that the respondents provided upon answering the questionnaire item about the population size of their respective universities.
9. The universities of the studied sample easily divided into two categories: 30 units, or 49%, were part of universities that had a small minority population of 3,000 or less, while 31 units, or 51%, were in universities that had a larger minority population of 3,400 or more. (None of the schools indicated a population between 3,001 and 3,399.)
10. For this measure, states were classified by using U.S. Census Bureau data available at <http://quickfacts.censur.gov/qfd/>. States with a population of 67% and above of "white persons, not of Hispanic/Latino origin, percent, 2000" were classified as "white majority" states. States with a population of 66% and below of the same

categorization were listed as “minority majority” states. Thirty-five, or 58%, of the states were the former, while 25, or 42%, were the latter state classification, respectively.

11. Non-parametric correlation analysis was used to analyze ordinal- and nominal-level data. In addition, the sample was not randomly selected; therefore, parametric statistics, such as a Pearson's R correlation, are inappropriate for this study.

12. The statistical significance of the correlations was $p < .05$ for the child-care index ($\tau = .248$), $p < .001$ for the recruitment index ($\tau = .525$), and $p < .01$ for the inducement, retention, and promotion indices (respectively, $\tau = .334$, $.392$, and $.311$). The grouped and summary indices were also significant ($p < .001$ and $\tau = .495$ in each instance).

13. Significant relationships were evident in four individual indices, namely the recruitment index ($p < .001$), the inducement index ($p < .01$), the retention index ($p < .01$), the promotion index ($p < .05$), the combined index without the child-care items ($p < .001$), and even in the index with those items ($p < .001$). However, taken separately, the significance did not hold for the childcare index ($p > .05$). The corresponding Kendall tau correlation coefficients were moderate: $-.449$, $-.307$, $-.300$, $-.290$, $-.435$, $-.435$, respectively.

14. The statistical significance of the correlations was $p < .001$ for the recruitment, inducement, and retention indices ($\tau = .415$, $.452$, and $.424$, respectively), and $p < .05$ for the promotion index ($\tau = .290$). The grouped and summary indices were also significant ($p < .001$ in both cases, with $\tau = .487$ and $.483$, respectively). No relationship existed with the childcare index.

15. The statistical significance of the correlations was $p < \text{or} = .001$ for the recruitment, inducement, grouped and summary indices ($\tau = .468$, $.365$, $.442$, and $.436$, respectively), and $p < .05$ for the promotion and retention indices ($\tau = .369$ and $.239$, respectively). No relationship existed with the childcare index.

16. The statistical significance of the correlations was $p < .05$ for recruitment ($\tau = .235$), childcare ($\tau = .248$), group ($\tau = .226$) and summary ($\tau = .239$) indices. No significance exists in regard to the promotion activities index.

17. A chi-square measurement of the two variables showed no significant relationship between accredited status of the unit and its state's demographic classification ($p > .05$).

18. $X^2 = 15.779$, d.f. = 1, $p < .001$, Kendall's $\tau-b = .509$.

19. A chi square test between the state's demographic characteristic, as previously described, and the number of minority students at schools showed a significant and moderate relationship ($p = .050$, Kendall's $\tau-b = .251$).