A STUDY OF MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH PUBLISHED IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1989

By

CHIUNG-PI SU

Bachelor of Law
Fu-Jen Catholic University
Taipei, Taiwan
1986

Master of Education
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma
1988

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1990

A STUDY OF MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH PUBLISHED IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1989

Thesis Approved:

Charles A. Fleming
Thesis Advisor

Don Nelson

Philip E. Paulin

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Charles A. Fleming for his patience, encouragement and advice not only throughout the study but also throughout my graduate program. Many thanks also go to Dr. Marlan Nelson, and Dr. Ed Paulin for serving on my graduate committee. Their suggestions and support were very helpful.

I also extend sincere thanks to Liz Schillinger for her valuable suggestion to the study, to Mr. Chen for his suggestions for serving as my independent coder, and to Lisa John for her encouragement and friendship throughout my stay at Oklahoma State University.

Thanks to my parents, Ying-yuan and Li-zu Su, for their encouragement and support throughout my entire study in the United States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General

Mass communication research is an enterprise on the move, examining the processes and effects of mass and small media in areas such as global communication, technology, and social-environmental impact. To make mass communication more effective, credible and successful in the future, scholars are responding to a need to evaluate the past and examine the present. In the past decade, because of the development of mass media industries and the rapid changing media brought about by new technology, media studies have become more important than ever before, and mass communication research has been expanded by both academia and the media professions.

Background

Research about the mass media comes in two streams--public or proprietary, and basic or applied research (Dennis, 1986). Proprietary research, carried out by commercial firms, is usually applied to specific interests and problems, and the results are not usually available to

the general public. University-based and government-funded research produces more published information in the field, especially on basic research designed to foster understanding of mass communication (Rogers, 1986; Dennis, 1986).

Hence, mass communicaton research from colleges and universities, supported by government and some public foundations, has more visibility and thus more influence than that conducted within the mass media industry. Researchers in the media industry tend to have different research emphases than those in academia. The gap between those in professional communications research and those involved in similar research on the nation's campuses is apparent to some experts in the field. For example, at a conference at Syracuse University in December 1985, David H. Weaver, media scholar and researcher, commented,

> Many of the milestones in the U.S. mass communication research-- be they academic or industry-based-- are problem-oriented although it is fair to say that the academicians have been more concerned with the effects of various media and that those in the media industries have concentrated more on the uses of these media (Yu, 1988, p.21).

Also, mass communication research, whether academic or industry-based, has been criticized for lacking application to important social and scholarly issues, neglecting programs of research where studies build upon each other, being weak in theoretical referents, and containing a great deal of trivia (Yu, 1988; Davison and Yu, 1974).

Frederick T. C. Yu, now acting dean of Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, pointed out:

> Much communication research lacks direction, much of it is neither intellectually exciting nor socially useful, or enjoys wide support from the profession of journalism (Yu, 1988, p. 42).

Another scholar suggested that mass communication researchers should decrease emphasis on the isolated individual, and increase emphasis on the information environment as a whole where more team research, cumulative efforts over long periods of time, and broad theorizing bases are called for (Davison and Yu, 1974).

Because in the Information Age citizens need to understand what mass communication can and cannnot do, it is critical for the media researchers to identify current trends (Sharp, 1988). Likewise, research should meet the needs of people in mass communication industries. One mass media researcher asked of media practitioners:

> What social impacts are you interested in having research done about? What aspects of the structure of your organizations would you like to know something about (Sharp, 1988, p. 73)?

Multiple research methodologies, collaborated research teams efforts and industry-funded projects were among suggestions from media scholars and experts.

Statement of the Problem

Concerning these apparent problems and suggested remedies for mass communication research, an overview of

recent published communication research is needed. Such a research summary should verify what has been done in the past, identify trends and present future researchers with a baseline for future undertakings.

Although mass communication research has grown in volume and scope over the past 10 years, it has been criticized for its irrelevancy, insignificance and inadequate execution. This study will identify the content, focus, methodology and institutional origin of that research.

Purposes of the Study

The author sought to discover what problems in mass communication research were addressed by researchers in the 1980s in the context of published research articles in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts. Journalism Quarterly contains most of the mass communication research published; Dissertation Abstracts, on the other hand, includes most of the dissertations from major research universities in the United States (Katz, 1989).

More specifically, the research questions the author attempted to answer, within the context of these two research sources, were:

1) What are the trends of mass communicaton research in terms of research topics, types of media researched, and

research methodology in the United States from 1980 through 1989?

2) Does the content of the research fit the needs of the mass communication industry or of society as identified by mass communication scholars?

3) Is there a difference in research topics, methods and types of media among the universities the researchers represent?

4) Is there a difference in topics, methods and media types between the research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and those published in Dissertation Abstracts?

The author randomly selected research articles from Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts, from January 1980 to December 1989. The articles were categorized according to topics, methodologies, types of media researched, research universities represented, publication source and year of publication. Statistical analyses were performed to examine differences and relationships.

Significance of the Study

The study will examine recent mass communication research and how it has changed over time.

The findings of the research will benefit:

1) Mass communication researchers. The study will provide a foundation for prospective researchers in mass

communication to know the trends of topics studied and yet to be studied. The findings may enable researchers to produce more relevant studies than in the past that better serve the needs of the mass media as a whole.

2) Mass communication educators. This study will help educators plan curriculum and instruction, and will indicate a direction for mass communication research education in the future.

3) Mass communication students. The results can serve as an introduction to research for students who are pursuing graduate study in mass communication. The results of this study will provide a basic idea about what are the research trends in mass communication and what research has been published, as well as what areas need to be explored.

4) The general public. Ultimately and ideally, they will realize the benefits of a more effective and efficient mass media industry.

Limitations

The lack of access to proprietary mass media research, because of its in-house purposes, limits this study. The author's inquiry is confined to articles published in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts. In some cases, it is known only when a study was published, not when it was actually done.

Also, articles written by more than one author were

excluded from the proportion tables with "School" as one of the variables because it was impossible to determine the extent of contribution by each author to the articles, as well as to give credit to the universities they represented.

Plus, articles published in Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly are only part of the total research activity. Besides these two publications, there are convention papers, monographs, books and chapters in books which are not included in this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II traces the history of mass communication research in the United States, and discusses mass media experts' and scholars' opinions on what should be done and what has not been done with respect to research topics, research methodologies, types of media studied in the field of mass communication, and establishes the need for such a study.

Chapter III discusses the research design, selection of the sample, data collecting and coding processes, research methodology, and statistical analysis to be used.

Chapter IV presents, interprets and analyzes the research findings.

Chapter V summarizes the study, presents conclusions and makes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This thesis examines through content analysis the 1980-1989 mass communication research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and in Dissertation Abstracts. It seeks to find the trends in mass communication research published in these journals in terms of research topics, research methodology, media type, and research colleges and universities for the period January 1980 to December 1989.

Few such overviews of mass communication research were located by the researcher recently. However, there have been many studies which have addressed the problems and needs of mass communication research.

This chapter first traces the history of mass communication research in the United States. Second, it reviews similar studies about the trends of mass communication research. Third, it explores problems and promises of mass communication research as indicated by media scholars and professionals. Finally, it discusses the need for studies of the kind suggested by mass communication educators and media practitioners.

History of Mass Communication

Mass communication research started as early as the late nineteenth century (Dennis, 1988). However, it was not considered an independent field or discipline, but was part of sociology, psychology or political science. In other words, early communication research remained on the periphery of other social sciences.

> By the 1920s sociologists had discovered this field and enriched it with institutional analyses. By the 1930s audience researchers, coming largely from the new field of broadcasting, added their imprint to the intelligence about mass communication (Dennis, 1988, p3).

Later, in the 1970s, the development of the mass media industry, the advent of high technology, the establishment of mass communication graduate programs in colleges and universities, and a growing literature in mass communication brought swift and dramatic changes to mass media research. Media studies grew quickly in scope and number, and became influential throughout the world (Dennis, 1988; Katzen, 1975).

> More academic research into the social aspects of the mass media and mass communication has been undertaken in the United States than in any other country, ... it is still undoubtedly true that the mainstream of mass communication research stems from traditions established in the United States (Katzen, 1975, p43).

Since mass communication is a new field of study, the term "mass communication" has come to have a rather specific connotation in the United States. In an article

in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Morris Janowitz defined mass communication as:

> Mass communication comprises the institutions and techniques by which specialized social groups employ technological devices (press, radio, films, etc.) to disseminate symbolic content to large heterogeneous and widely dispersed audiences. In other words, mass communications perform essential functions for a society that uses complex technology to control the environment (Janowitz, 1968, p.41).

The study of mass communication is also a newly developed research field. In Introduction to Mass Communications, the authors state:

> It [mass communication research] is usually considered as behavioral research-- the study of human beings (rather than inanimate objects)...
>
> It is also interdisciplinary research... It borrows the tools and knowledge of various other fields... It does not confine itself to any particular point of view of theory or subject matter...
>
> It is scientific research, since it uses scientific methodology... Its methods must be objective and systematic...
>
> And, of course, the subject matter of communication research is communication...
> (Emery et al. 1965, p.353-354).

While the passage quoted above is not the only definition which might be legitimately applied, it highlights the strong empirical tradition in media research. This tradition, on one hand, is almost entirely devoted to historical, legal and ethical aspects of the press. On the other hand, mass communication research also includes the study of the communicators, their media, and the content of their messages (Emery et al, 1965).

There are several schools of thought in the United States that have contributed to the philosophical development of mass media studies, and influenced and guided research.

> The "Columbia School" has involved mass communication studies aimed mainly at determining the impact and effect of media messages on individuals, which in turn, has led to the development of various theories about society and culture (Dennis, 1988, p.9-10).
>
> The "Chicago School" focused on problems related to the sociology of work and knowledge as well as organizational theory... the emphasis of research has tended to be on the internal dynamics -- the economics and structure of the media, the "product" of communication, and the people involved in the process (Dennis, 1988, p.10).
>
> The "Communication School" was lively foci for projects involving contract work for industry, but it also engaged in theory construction and methodological testing... it strongly quided by Lazarsfeld tradition and tied to public opinion research... several of the principals of the new centers assisted with war [World War II] research and other policy-oriented efforts (Dennis, 1988, p.10).
>
> The "War Research" was government research on propaganda conducted during World War II... This was administrative research conducted either by government agencies or by universities under contract to solve particular policy problems (Dennis, 1988, p.10-11).
>
> "Industry research" was another element in the history of communication research... which is often concerned with audiences and advertising. Much of this is medium-specific (Dennis, 1988, p.11).

As a result, mass communication research is centered around studies of media persuasion, uses and gratifications, the knowledge gap between social classes, the process and effect of media socialization, agenda-setting, and ideology (Barnouw, 1989).

According to Everette Dennis, mass media study in 1986 was focused at topics such as the impact of television on children, the role of violence in mass media, the attitudes of the public toward the news media, print and broadcasting treatment of minorities and women, coverage of business, education, politics, the military and other specialized concerns (Dennis, 1986).

In addition to the content and structure developed, be it basic or applied, academic or industry based, one of the most striking features in the development of mass communications research is that it has developed a highly sophisticated methodology (Katzen, 1975).

Beginning in the 1960s, journalism education emphasized social science and mathematical methods; journalism students were expected to be able to apply statistical methods and quantitative research to everyday problems (Lovell, 1987).

Review of Recent Studies

There has not been much study about the trends in mass communication research recently, although many scholars and researchers have been zealously discussing the problems and concerns with mass communication research as a whole. Few master's theses or doctoral dissertations have addressed content and change in mass communication research.

"Research Article Productivity of U.S. Journalism

Faculties," published in the summer 1973 edition of Journalism Quarterly," was the only study found similar to this thesis. It covered research articles from six journals (Journalism Quarterly was one of them) for the period 1962-1971. The purpose of the research was to identify individual researchers from schools and departments which produced the greatest number of mass media research studies (Cole and Bowers, 1973). The coding categories were author, school, type of article (either full article or research brief,) author's academic rank, author's highest degree, and index of article productivity per faculty member. The findings were summarized as follow:

> Of the 171 schools studied, Wisconsin had the greatest overall article productivity in the six journals from 1962-1971. Of the 520 full articles included, 75% were written by individual authors and 20% by two authors; only approximately 5% had more than two authors (Cole and Bowers, 1973, p.247-254)

At the end of Cole and Bowers' study, the authors suggested that subject matter of research should be considered for future study (Cole and Bowers, 1973).

Wilbur Schramm, one of the founding fathers of mass communication research, examined the research trends in Journalism Quarterly for the period 1931-1961 and reported:

> There is the trend of growth... a great increase in the number of students and the proportion of faculty engaged in research...
>
> The leading articles in the 1961 volume, unlike the articles of 1931, tend to be quantitative...
>
> It is the tone of the 1961 volume that contrasts so

> sharply with that of 1931. For whereas this earlier volume is thoughtful, graceful of phrase, and often wise, the tone of the later volume is investigative, skeptical, and tough (Nafziger, 1963, p.6-8).

However, Schramm also pointed out that a great deal of trivia and a relatively small proportion of truly insightful research was being published because of the speed with which mass communication research was growing (Schramm, 1983).

In 1984, a Ph.D. dissertation from the University of Texas at Austin, "A Study of Mass Communication Research and Scholarship," discussed the main characteristics, challenges, current practices and future directions of mass communication research. The author, Marjorie Jane Fish, stated in her dissertation:

> Mass communication, a distinctly American social science which developed during the era of stability, had by the 1970s also experienced the repercussions of challenge and disaffection with a positivist, behavioral research orientation...
>
> Developed as a service oriented field, mass communication research appears to continue following the original directions for research activity.
>
> However, researchers also seem to be aware and concerned about the limitations of the research agenda and supportive of developing theories, procedures and structures for more actively pursuing alternate approaches to research activity (Fish, 1984).

Fish examined mass communication research from a sociological perspective to determine the influence of theory, method, funding, and sponsorship arrangements in a university setting (Fish, 1984).

Media professor John C. Schweitzer did a survey in 1988 on "Research Article Productivity By Mass Communication Scholars." In the study he concluded that schools with Ph.D. programs published more articles than those which did not have such programs, but that article writing and publishing was more a function of the individual than of the school itself (Schweitzer, 1988).

"Factors Affecting Scholarly Research Among Mass Communications Faculty" was a similar study by Schweitzer in 1989. In this second study, 97% of the respondents regarded "personal motivation to do research" as an important or very important factor in research productivity (Schweitzer, 1989).

Schweitzer's two studies of research productivity were, however, only one measure of mass communication research activity.

Guido H. Stempel III, the newly retired editor of Journalism Quarterly, did a study on the research trends depicted in Journalism Quarterly for a 17-year period, 1972 to 1989, and concluded that:

> It [the content of Journalism Quarterly] is a reflection of the total research activity of our field. The Quarterly becomes a chronicle of the advancement of knowledge in our field...
>
> Three major factors bear consideration. One is the increase in the volume of material. The second is changing patterns of authorship. The third is the impact of computers (Stempel, 1990, 1-2).

According to Stempel's findings, there was a 25%

increase in the number of research articles published in Journalism Quarterly over the 17 years studied. With regard to authorship, women authors became more prevalent toward the end of the period, and co-authorship was on the rise because more faculty worked together. Computers were not commonplace in 1973, but that had changed by 1989 (Stempel, 1990). This change makes a difference in what is included in Journalism Quarterly articles: more frequent use of numbers and statistics, more frequent use of multivariate statistics and more extensive footnotes due to computerized indexes (Stempel, 1990). As to the research topics studied for the 10-year period, Stempel concluded:

> If you look at such areas as history, international communication, advertising, public relations or communication theory, there has not been a great deal of change in the number of articles. Clearly one reason for this is that people's research interests are related to their teaching assignments. There have not been massive curricular changes in our field in the past 17 years (Stempel, 1990, p. 6).

In sum, mass communication research is an enterprise on the move, entering a period of ferment that has already begun at the technological level (Rice, 1984). Mass communication research has become more sophisticated and specialized than ever before. Moreover, both the academic and the professional researchers in this field have to put more efforts to it.

Promises and Problems

Although mass communication training, teaching and research have become fully accepted as valid fields for university study, they are faced by challenges and uncertainty. Because of the rapid growth of the mass media industry, it is difficult for researchers to keep up with the pace of technological development. Still, it is very important that they recognize the inadequacies, insignificance and irrelevence of some mass communication research as pointed out by communication scholars, professionals and other researchers in this field (Weaver, 1988; Yu, 1988; Sharp, 1988). It is essential that researchers adapt their work to the changing field of mass media.

> The history of communication research shows that its intellectual concerns were highly related to each of the new communication technologies that came, in turn, on the American scene....In the 1950s, it was television, with Wilbur Schramm pioneering in studies of TV's effects on children. Today, an increasing number of contemporary communication scientists conduct research on the social impact of such interactive technologies as computers (Rogers, 1986, p.110).

Therefore, to have more communication among mass communication researchers, a group of leading American communications experts gathered in the fall of 1985 at Syracuse University for a conference called "Communications Research: What, Why, and How?." This conference was to examine and reassess the role of communications research, and to seek answers as to where mass communication is now,

and where it should go from here in the future (Sharp, 1988). These scholars and experts also gave criticisms and had disagreements on some controversial issues of mass communication research.

Nancy Weatherly Sharp from Syracuse University collected all the transcripts and all the manuscipts presented at the conference, and published them all in Mass Communications Research: the Challenge of the Information Age in 1988. This book is the most recent and relevant intellectual discussion about mass communication research as a whole.

David H. Weaver, director of media research at Indiana University, presented at the conference a list of "promises and problems" concerning mass communication research. He identified the problems of mass communication research as:

> A lack of application to important social and scholarly issues...
> A lack of programs of research where studies build upon each other...
> An unwillingness among many researchers to speculate upon the implications of their work for mass communication policy or practice...
> A confusion of statistical significance with practical significance...
> A lack of a forum for researchers, mass communicators, and policy makers to reach and influence each other... (Weaver, 1988, p.23-27).

He criticized mass communication research as trivial, characterized by "A lack of application to important social and scholarly issues", and said it had little relationship to broad general theories of society and social trends and

values. However, another media scholar, George Gerbner, rebutted Weaver by saying:

> What may be trivial from one point of view may be extremely important from another...
> Any research that attempts to extend or challenge an existing theory in the field, no matter how modest (and modesty is usually a question of budget), is non-trivial (Sharp, 1988, p.67)

On the other hand, Weaver encouraged researchers by identifying what he saw as "promises" of mass communication research:

> More and better research on journalists and media organizations...
> More concern with the implications of research for communications policy and practice...
> More programs of research where studies build upon each other over time...
> More studies employing multiple methods and covering longer periods of time...
> More debate over approaches and methods...
> (Weaver, 1988, p.23-33).

Frederick T. C. Yu, the acting dean at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, said that much communication research lacks direction. He said much of it is neither intellectually exciting nor socially useful, and little either commands very high respect in academia or enjoys wide support from the journalism profession (Yu, 1988).

Yu explained the reasons behind his comments were that many scholars and writers who tried to solve communication problems were not associated with mass communication departments or journalism schools (Yu, 1988). At the same time, methodological problems received more attention than

substantive problems (Yu, 1988). He emphasized the importance of bridging different fields of knowledge because mass media researchers were usually required to work with scholars from different academic disciplines and professions and it was difficult for them to communicate and collaborate with each other (Yu, 1988). Yu also said that mass communication researchers do not always agree on the most important problems in the field; this lack of agreement makes their jobs even more difficult (Yu, 1988).

Some scholars claimed that industry research findings are inaccessible because they are kept in-house for proprietary, commercial purposes, or because they appear in publications that most journalists don't monitor (Robinson, 1988; Ismach, 1988). In addition, many of these industry-based studies have problems of discontinuity in time series analysis and lack representativenesss in design (Sharp, 1988). This type of research is only for the short range, and only for resolutions of immediate problems, the conference attendees concluded.

At the same time, the mass media practitioners at the conference found fault with the academics, charging that their work was often obscure and crammed with incomprehensible statistical material. Research findings are often reported opaquely, they said, making them too difficult to decipher, interpret and apply (Ismach, 1988). As a result, practitioners proclaimed that academic research rarely

captured their attention and hardly provoked any changes in the communication world (Sharp, 1988).

However, Daniel B. Wackman, professor at the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota, argued that people in the media industry have different mind-sets from those in the academic world (Sharp, 1988), and, as Guido H. Stempel III pointed out, researchers for the media industry usually have a background in marketing or business administration rather than journalism or mass communication (Stempel, 1988).

Some media practitioners also agreed that academic research does not have to be fully accepted or applied in the business field (Dennis, 1986; Sharp, 1988). Moreover, university-based research often cuts across several media, and uses a variety of approaches and methodologies so that it is less susceptible to myopic introspection (Dennis, 1986). Academic research may serve a purpose in general society, but might not be suitable for producing immediate results to solve any particular problems (Winston, 1988).

A British media sociologist, Jeremy Tunstall, had a more critical view of U.S. mass communication research. He commented:

> Something is badly wrong with U.S. communication research... the symptoms include too much low-quality work... the central mistake was to have a discipline [that is] a combination of practical journalism and social psychology (Yu, 1988).

However, another British scholar, May Katzen, had a

totally opposite point of view of mass communication research in the United States. She concluded in her book Mass Communication: teaching and studies at universities:

> In the United States, education and research about the mass media and mass communication is a strong and growing field which has given a distintive stamp to contemporary study of the mass media all over the world (Katzen, 1975, p.56).

Needs and Suggestions

After identifying all the problems and controversies, the communication scholars and specialists suggested some remedies.

David H. Weaver suggested that:

(1) Mass communication researchers should take extra time and effort to spell out the implications of their research for those working in the media and to publish these studies in places where they might be seen by practitioners and policy makers;

(2) They should be interested in developing programs of studies that lead to more general knowledge;

(3) There should be more opportunities for researchers, communicators, and policy makers to communicate with each other so that the debate over approaches and methods in communication research can become more informed and useful;

(4) Mass communication scholars should avoid defining communication so broadly that it loses any special meaning, and trivializing communication so that an obsession with measurement and the precise specification of contingent conditions leads to "evermore narrow studies that proclaim more and more about less and less;" and,

(5) Those who control and practice mass communication must show an interest in and a willingness to support important academic research (Weaver, 1988, p.21-34).

Frederick T.C. Yu, on the other hand, suggested a broader view and said researchers seeking topics need to look at the entire field of mass communication research and seek answers to questions such as:

> (1) What kinds of knowledge are necessary if societies are to make rational decisions regarding the organization and operation of the mass media?
>
> (2) What social and individual needs can the mass media help to satisfy?
>
> (3) What types of media and content are best suited to what kinds of tasks?
>
> (4) How can standards of mass media performance be defined?
>
> (5) What is the preferred relationship,for each society, between mass communication and interpersonal channels (Yu, 1988, p.45)?

Competent media researchers and journalists should focus on communication theory, according to Arnold H. Ismach:

> Theories of communication would spell out all the relevant factors that influence human or institutional behavior, tell how all the factors are interrelated, and explain why those relationships hold... Theories would tell journalists what to expect in the future; it would identify which messages are most likely to be received, and explain why... (Ismach, 1988, p.170)

Ismach pointed out that there is a lack of integration of theory with practice in the newsroom, and it is also likely that theory is absent in the classroom. Therefore, he suggested that theory and research should be integrated throughout the curricula of schools of journalism and communication (Ismach, 1988).

Guido H. Stempel III pointed out that research courses are usually reserved for graduate programs, which means that undergraduate students do not learn anything about research (Stempel, 1988). And, these undergraduate students compose the majority of the working journalists. Therefore, research in the mass media industry has been abandoned in favor of market researchers, he said. Market research, however, can only go so far, and market researchers rarely understand journalism and mass communication, he said (Stempel, 1988). Stempel also suggested:

> One [solution] would be for journalism accrediting [organizations] to put some emphasis on the place of research in the curriculum.
>
> It will help if the media will look more to journalism schools for help with research projects. This would be mutually beneficial. Journalism faculty members can help the media improve their offerings. The media can help faculty members make research a more viable part of the undergraduate curriculum (Stempel, 1988, p.166)

To bridge the gap between education and the industry, some conference attendees suggested publishing a newsletter that summarized the best academic research and relate it to the professional world (Sharp, 1988). Others said academics should stop doing research in isolation, and it would be helpful if a computer database on communication research could be developed. In the computer database there would be information on current research, such as research topics, research methods, and recommendations for future study

(Sharp, 1988). The database could also include industry-based research, with only research topics listed if it is absolutely proprietary (Sharp, 1988).

To hold more conferences for more interaction and exchange of ideas about media research, such as the conference at Syracuse, would be very helpful, too, the attendees concluded.

The scholars at the conference suggested cumulation for research topics, and pluralism for research methods (Sharp, 1988). Researchers should think about broad issues and try multiple research methods (Sharp, 1988). They should be encouraged to build on the work of each other, extending the work of their predecessors, but not to streamline or oversimplify communication research (Sharp, 1988).

Missing from these studies and the conference report was a current, thorough, quantitative survey of mass communication research as a whole. This study was undertaken to inform researchers what mass communication research is being done, in terms of subject matter, research methodology, and productivity, with an examination of trends, and of researchers from as many research institutions as possible. The findings generated would provide a base of information for researchers to evaluate what has been done, and what needs to be done in the field of mass communication research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

General

This study employs content analysis to examine characteristics and trends of mass communication research in the United States in the 1980s. Bernard Berelson defined content analysis as:

> a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication (Berelson, 1971, p. 18).

He stated that content analysis can provide objective data on performance to compare with the agreed-upon norms stated in the form of communication standards. Guido H. Stempel III further explained:

> Objectivity in content analysis depends upon precisely defined categories of analysis; systematic means that a set procedure can be applied to all the content, and that the data are relevant to the research questions or hypothesis; to be quantitative requires numerical values or frequencies; manifest content means that content must be coded according to the apparent content (Stempel III, 1981, p. 120-121).

Thus, content analysis is appropriate to serve the purposes of this study.

Scope of the Study

As the population for this study, the author chose to examine research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts from January 1980 through December 1989. The 10-year-period was chosen in order to examine trends. Both Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts are devoted to mass communication research and are considered leading publications in that field of study (Katz, 1989).

Journalism Quarterly

Journalism Quarterly was founded by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in co-operation with the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication in 1942. Journalism Quarterly is published four times yearly, exudes a scholarly devotion to research in journalism and mass communication, and is an excellent source of ideas for class term papers (Katz, 1989; Anderson, 1974).

Magazine for Librarians describes Journalism Quarterly as follows:

> This respected journal is "devoted to research in journalism and mass communication." Each of the contributions is well documented and the focus seems to be on scholarship and long-range studies. It covers all aspects of national and international media. Required for any library concerned with mass communications research (Katz, p.585, 1989).

Dissertation Abstracts

Dissertation Abstracts includes most of the dissertations from major research colleges and universities in the United States, and it contains both bibliographic citations and 350-word abstracts for titles published in Dissertation Abstracts International since July 1980 (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1989). Computer technology was used to transform those doctoral dissertations and masters theses in Dissertation Abstracts International from print to database format, "Dissertation Abstracts Ondisc. Dissertation Abstracts International is published monthly by University Microfilms International and includes abstracts of doctoral dissertations produced at nearly 500 participating institutions in North America and throughout the world. Each abstract describes in detail the original research projects on which the dissertation is based (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1989).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The primary research question the author answered was "What has been the trend of mass communication research in the United States of America during the 1980s, as depicted in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts?" This primary question was supported by several subordinate questions and hypotheses.

Research question 1.

What have been the trends in mass communication research in the United States over the period 1980-1989, with respect to research topics, research methodologies and media studied?

Research question 2.

What topics, methodologies, and types of media have been involved in mass communication research by major research colleges and universities in the United States from January 1980 to December 1989?

Research question 3.

Are there differences with respect to research topics, research methodologies, and media types among the research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts from 1980 through 1989?

Null hypothesis:

There is no difference with respect to research topics, research methodologies and media types among the research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts from 1980 through 1989.

Research question 4.

With respect to research topics, research methodologies and media types, do the research articles published in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts from 1980

through 1989 fit the needs of the mass communication industry and of society as identified by mass communication scholars and mass media practitioners?

Sampling

There were 1132 research articles in Journalism Quarterly during the 1980s, and 1414 in Dissertation Abstracts in the same time frame. A total of 719 research articles, 322 (28.4% of 1132) from Journalism Quarterly and 397 (28.1% of 1414) from Dissertation Abstracts, was collected from January 1980 to December 1989 as the sample for this study. Stratified random sampling was used, with strata being the (1) publications and (2) publication years for Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly.

For Journalism Quarterly, with the aid of a table of random numbers, about eight research articles were randomly selected from the articles published in each issue. As a result, 322 (28.4%) research articles were chosen out of a total of 1132. Among these 322 articles, however, there were only 226 used as the sample population for the proportion tables with "School" as one of the variables. The other 96 were excluded: eight research articles by foreign authors, 84 done by more than one author, and four from non-academic research firms.

For Dissertation Abstracts, only doctoral dissertations completed at colleges and universities in the

United States were selected as the sample. The stratified random sampling resulted in a total number of 397 dissertations (28.1% of 1414) in Dissertation Abstracts, apportioned by years.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis was the individual research articles or abstracts. Articles and abstracts were examined for research topics (Topic), types of media studied (Media), research methodologies used (Method), the year of research or publication (Year), source of the articles (Publication), i.e., where the research articles were published, either in Journalism Quarterly or in Dissertation Abstracts, and universities the researchers represented (School).

An article containing several elements of analysis which included different topics or methods was counted in all appropriate categories. For instance, a research article about the effect of TV violence on children, by an author from Oklahoma State University, and published in Journalism Quarterly in 1986, would be coded as "Broadcasting" (Media) for TV, "Special Interest Group" and "Theory" (Topic) for children and effect, "80" (School) for Oklahoma State University, "JQ" (Publication) for Journalism Quarterly, and "1986" (Year) for the time of publication.

Categories of Analysis

Among the six units of analysis, (publication, year, school, media, topic and method), media, topic and method were further divided into the following categories, which were adopted and revised from the Ostman and Jeffers special edition, "Articles on Mass Communication in U.S. and Foreign Journals" in Journalism Quarterly.

Operational Definitions of Research Variables

Media: 1) Broadcasting. Any research which is related to radio, television and other electronic media, for instance, telecommunication.

2) Print. Studies concerning all forms of media besides broadcasting media, for example, newspapers and magazines.

3) General. Research about mass media as a whole, i.e., that which applies to both broadcasting and print media, for example, a study of the mass media system in the United States.

4) Other. Topics concerning something besides broadcasting and print media, for example, a study about cultural diffusion.

Topic: 1) Advertising. Studies which are concerned with the business of preparing and distributing advertisements, for instance, television

commercials, newspaper advertisements, and advertisers' ethics. Economic issues are also included in this category.

2) Public Relations. All research about activities concerned with developing and maintaining favorable relationships between an organization and the public.

3) Communication Theory. Studies concerning the relationships between mass media audiences' and communicators' analysis, for instance, process and effects of mass media.

4) Mass Communication Law. Research about the relationship between the government and the mass media, for example, Federal Communication Commission's regulations on television station ownership.

5) Mass Media Education. Studies of teaching, learning, administering, and designing curriculum and instructon of subjects related to mass communication.

6) Media Ethics. Studies of written and unwritten rules and standards governing the conduct of members of the mass media professions, for instance, codes of ethics for journalists, and discussions about ethical topics.

7) History and Biography. Research articles about

media coverage of past events and people, or about media practitioners and their relationship with the mass media, for example, Time magazine's coverage of the 1984 Summer Olympics, and Edward Murrow's career with CBS.

8) International. All research articles which were connected with foreign countries in terms of research topics, research samples and population, for instance, advertising in China, the media system in India.

9) Special Interest Groups. This category is added to examine studies which are concerned with women, children, minorities and other clearly defined groups.

10) Miscellaneous. Any articles which do not fit the above categories, for example, photographic layout.

Method: 1) Case Study. Systematic investigation of an individual, group, organization or event using multiple sources of data.

2) Content Analysis. Content is broken down into units of meanings that can be treated statistically; a text or a genre has to be treated as a complex whole in which many meanings are encoded, decoded and categorized.

3) Experimental Design. Highly structured research in a controlled, artificial environment, or in controlled settings, for instance, research in a controlled laboratory.
4) Q-Methodology. A method of sorting statements or other items on a 7- or 9-point scale where the sorting of items is fixed to approximate a normal distribution.
5) Field Experiment. Experiment is conducted in natural settings in other words, the experimenter goes to the subjects' turf, for example, in classrooms, club meetings, etc.
6) Field Observation. Research data gained from naturalistic observation, including both participant and non-participant observation. Researchers must enter the situation so deeply that they can recreate in imagination and experience the thoughts and sentiments of the observed.
7) Mail Questionnaires (Survey). Self-administered question-and-answer process, always mailed to the respondents.
8) In-person Interview Survey. Researchers obtain data from face-to-face interaction with the respondents.
9) Telephone Interview Survey. Researchers reach

respondents through telephone calls and conduct interviews over the telephone.

10) Historical Research. This method involves a procedure supplementary to observation, a process by which the researcher seeks to test the truthfulness of the reports of observations made by others. Its major purpose is to tell what was, for example, New York Times' coverage of the Cultural Revolution in China, 1966.

11) Other. Any research methodologies which are not mentioned above.

The institutional sources of the research (School) were coded separately with an Arabic numeral system. The numeral order of the 123 schools included in this study was alphabetically arranged. For instance, research articles by faculty and students in Oklahoma State University were coded as "80."

Coding

The author was the only coder. To test the reliability of the coding, a mass communication doctoral student randomly selected 40 research articles from the sample population, and coded them separately, according to the coding procedures developed and used by the author. The extent of agreement between the two coders was checked by a

reliability coefficient formula. This procedure served as a tool to see if the independent coder agreed with the author, and to verify that coding instructions, definitions and procedures were understandable and the primary coder was unbiased.

Statistical Analysis

As the data collected were nominal, complex chi square tests were used to test the statistical significance of differences and relationships among the variables.

Statistical analysis was performed using SYSTAT 4.0, the System for Statistics.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

General

The purpose of this research was to study trends of mass communication research in the United States in the 1980s, and to describe published research. The target population was mass communication research articles from colleges and universities in the United States published in Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly from January 1980 to December 1989.

A total of 719 research articles was randomly drawn from these two publications over the 10-year period. Of these, 397 were from Dissertation Abstracts, and 322 from Journalism Quarterly. All articles selected were examined and coded as to content by research topic, by research methodology, by type of media researched, by school the author represented, and by when and where the article was published (year and publication). Thus, each article could have more than one research topic and research method, but only one medium, one year, one school and one publication category. There were 84 (11.7% of the total target population) articles in Journalism Quarterly written

by more than one author, eight by authors from foreign institutions, four from non-academic research firms. These 96 articles were all excluded from the tables with "School" as one of the variables. Research articles from foreign sources or professional research firms were beyond the scope of the study; and for collaborative work it was impossible to determine the extent of contribution by each of the authors to the articles, as well as to give credit to the universities they represented.

The author was the primary coder, and one mass communication doctoral student was used to check the coding reliability on all categories. The following reliability coefficient formula was used.

$$R = \frac{2M}{N1 + N2}, \quad = \frac{2\ (40)\ \ 80}{40 + 40 = 80} = 1.0$$

R = reliability coefficient (0.0 to 1.0)
M = number of coding decisions on which two coders agree
N1= number of coding decisions by coder #1
N2= number of coding decisions by coder #2

A total of 40 research articles were randomly selected for the coding reliability test. The independent coder agreed with the author on all the 40 articles. As a result, the coding reliability coefficient was 1.0.

Presentation of Findings

The following legend applies to Table I-III, and Table

XVII.

Legend

Symbol	Publication
DA	Dissertation Abstracts
JQ	Journalism Quarterly

The following legend applies to Table I, IV, VII, VIII, and Table XIII.

Legend

Symbol	Research Topic
Ad	Advertising and Economic Issues
Pr	Public Relations
Th	Communication Theory
La	Media Law and Political Events
Ed	Media Education
Et	Media Ethics
Hi	History, Biography
In	International Communication
Sp	Special Interest Groups
Mi	Miscellaneous

Table I shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by topic, published by the two sources (Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly), for the 10-year period.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY TOPIC
IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND
DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS
1980-1989

Topics	Publication DA N=746	JQ N=595	Total N=1341
Ad	6.3%	7.2%	6.7%
PR	0.5	1.8	1.1%
Th	28.6	21.8	25.6%
La	6.2	14.3	9.8%
Ed	5.8	2.7	4.4%
Et	1.1	3.2	2.1%
Hi	23.5	22.7	23.1%
In	12.5	10.0	11.3%
Sp	3.2	4.2	3.7%
Mi	12.3	12.1	12.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The data in Table I show that there is not much difference in scope and emphasis of research topics between these two publications. The 397 research articles published in Dissertation Abstracts have a topic frequency count of 746, indicating that each article studied almost two research topics (1.9), while in Journalism Quarterly, a frequency count of 595 for 322 articles indicates 1.8 topics for each research article.

The topics of communication theory, history and biography (media coverage of past events and people) have the first and second highest percentages overall, 25.6% and 23.1%, respectively. On the other hand, topics concerned

with public relation are the least studied, with only 1.1% of the total 1341 research topics.

Dissertation Abstracts had more articles on communication theory, media education, and international communication, and Journalism Quarterly has more studies on media law and media ethics.

The following legend applies to Table II, V, IX, X, and Table XIV.

Legend

Symbol	Research Methodology
Cs	Case Study
Ca	Content Analysis
E	Lab Experimental Design
Q	Q-Methodology
Fe	Field Experimental Design
Fo	Field Observation Design
Mq	Mail Questionnaires Survey
I	In-person Interview
T	Telephone Survey
H	Historical Research
O	Other Research Methods

Table II presents data on the proportion of research articles, categorized by research method, published by the two sources, for the 10-year period.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY METHOD IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS 1980-1989

Methods	Publication DA N=481	JQ N=431	Total N=912
Cs	10.0%	7.9%	9.0%
Ca	15.8	23.2	19.3%
E	13.3	5.8	9.8%
Q	0.6	0.2	0.4%
Fe	0.4	1.9	1.1%
Fo	2.1	1.6	1.9%
Mq	17.7	18.1	17.9%
I	6.0	5.3	5.7%
T	4.4	6.3	5.3%
H	27.2	26.2	26.7%
O	2.5	3.5	3.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The data shown in Table II indicate that historical research was the most popular methodology for the research articles in both Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly over the past decade (26.7%). Content analysis and mail questionnaires survey were also very popular among all the methods used by articles in these two publications (19.3% and 17.9%). However, Dissertation Abstract's

authors preferred lab-experimental research design (13.3%) to a greater extent than the authors of articles published in Journalism Quarterly (5.8%).

There are 481 method frequency-counts for Dissertation Abstracts, and 431 for Journalism Quarterly. This indicates one or two research methods were used per article in these two publications (1.2 in Dissertation Abstracts, 1.3 in Journalism Quarterly).

Table III shows the percentage of research articles, categorized by media type, from both of the two publications, for the 10-year period.

The following legend applies to Table III, VI, XI, XII, and Table XVI.

Legend

Symbol	Types of Media
Broadcasting	TV, radio, and any other electronic media
Print	Newspaper, magazine, and all kinds of media besides broadcasting media
General	Combination of broadcasting and print media
Other	Any study besides broadcasting and print media

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY MEDIA TYPE IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS 1980-1989

Media Types	Publication DA N=397	JQ N=322	Total N=719
Broadcasting	55.8%	21.4%	40.4%
Print	8.8	45.7	25.3%
General	23.5	24.5	24.0%
Other	11.9	8.4	10.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table III indicates that broadcasting media had the largest percentage of research articles overall (40.4%), and accounted for more than half of those in Dissertation Abstracts (55.8%). On the contrary, Journalism Quarterly had more research articles about print media than broadcasting media (45.7% to 21.4%).

In order to test the difference statistically, a complex chi square was used. At df=1, a chi square of 147 shows that the two publications did differ significantly in the number of research articles each devoted to broadcasting and print media.

There was no difference in the "General" category between the two publications, which meant that research articles in Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly

contained almost the same percentage of articles (23.5% and 24.5%), studying both broadcasting and print media.

Table IV presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by topic and year, published by the two sources, for the overall 10-year period.

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY TOPIC(T) AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

	Year									
T	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=134	133	129	125	75	171	162	146	171	100
Ad	4.5%	6.8%	5.4%	10.4%	5.3%	5.3%	6.8%	8.2%	8.2%	5.0%
PR	0.0	1.5	0.8	1.6	2.7	1.7	0.6	0.7	1.2	1.0
Th	26.1	32.3	23.3	22.4	30.7	24.5	21.0	29.4	25.1	22.0
La	4.5	9.0	11.6	10.4	16.0	11.1	13.6	6.9	7.6	9.0
Ed	6.7	3.0	7.7	3.2	0.0	4.7	4.3	2.1	5.2	5.0
Et	1.5	4.5	0.8	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.2	3.4	2.9	2.0
Hi	26.9	16.6	24.0	21.6	25.3	22.2	24.7	19.9	23.4	28.0
In	9.0	11.3	13.2	12.8	6.7	17.0	11.7	13.0	8.8	10.0
Sp	3.7	1.5	1.6	3.2	1.3	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.7	8.0
Mi	17.1	13.5	11.6	12.8	10.7	8.2	12.4	12.3	12.9	10.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

At Table IV, the data show that the topics of media theory and history had consistently larger percentages over the 10-year period (20.0% to 36.4%).

In 1981, 1984 and 1987, the proportion of communication theory studies was greater than that of history and biography, however, there were more studies on history and biography than on theory in 1989.

Media law was studied more in 1984 than in any other year, and international communication's biggest year was in 1985.

Studies of advertising was more popular in 1983, and media education had the largest proportion of research articles in 1982.

Topics of special interest groups (women, children, and minorities) was emphasized the most in 1989. There were more miscellaneous studies in 1980 than in any other years.

Again, public relations and media ethics had small percentage over the years (0.0% to 4.5%) for the sample selected.

Table V presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by method and year, published by both sources, for the 10-year period.

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY METHOD(M) AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

	Year									
M	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=94	98	88	90	53	98	110	99	111	72
Cs	6.4%	6.1%	9.1%	8.9%	3.8%	8.2%	10.9%	9.1%	11.7%	12.5%
Ca	16.0	26.5	27.3	17.8	20.8	18.4	18.2	23.2	10.8	20.8
E	11.7	4.1	12.5	12.2	3.8	10.2	9.1	14.1	9.9	1.4
Q	0.0	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
FE	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.8
FO	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.7	7.1	1.0	4.2
MQ	19.2	12.3	12.5	20.0	17.0	19.4	15.5	18.2	29.7	20.8
I	4.3	7.2	11.4	6.7	9.4	7.1	1.8	4.1	1.8	6.9
T	9.6	7.2	3.4	4.4	11.3	5.1	4.6	1.0	4.5	5.6
H	25.5	28.6	19.3	26.7	30.2	25.5	33.6	18.2	26.1	23.6
O	5.3	6.1	3.4	3.3	1.9	3.1	1.8	2.0	2.7	1.4
	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%
		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%

The data in Table V indicate that content analysis, mail questionnaires survey and historical method are the most used research methodologies by research articles in Dissertation Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly over the 10-year period. Historical research design had its largest percentages in 1980, 1981, and 1983 through 1986, and in 1989. Content analysis was dominant in 1982 and in 1987

compared to other year. Mail questionnaires survey was the first choice in 1988. Overall, Q-methodology was the least adopted research design throughout the 10 years.

Table VI shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by media and year, and published by the two sources.

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY MEDIA AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Media				
Year	Number	Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
1980	74	41.9%	21.6%	23.0%	13.5%	100.0%
1981	76	43.4	23.7	25.0	7.9	100.0%
1982	73	35.6	28.7	24.7	11.0	100.0%
1983	69	37.7	39.1	18.8	4.4	100.0%
1984	41	31.7	34.1	29.3	4.9	100.0%
1985	81	35.8	30.9	24.7	8.6	100.0%
1986	83	47.0	19.3	21.7	12.0	100.0%
1987	83	38.6	21.7	27.7	12.0	100.0%
1988	89	46.0	13.5	27.0	13.5	100.0%
1989	49	40.8	30.6	16.3	12.3	100.0%

In Table VI, broadcast media appeared to be the most often studied media for many years, except in 1983 and 1984. However, a complex chi square value of 10.3 indicates that the difference is not significant at df = 7 (10.3< .05),

and the different percentages between broadcasting and print media for each year could be due to chance.

Research concerned with both print and broadcast media (the "general" category) remained a sizable percentage thoughout the 10-year period.

Table VII presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by topic and year, and published by Dissertation Abstracts only.

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY TOPIC(T) AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS 1980-1989

	Year									
T	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=79	80	66	66	20	103	94	95	108	35
Ad	6.3%	5.0%	4.6%	10.6%	10.0%	4.9%	6.4%	5.3%	8.3%	2.9%
PR	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.1	0.0	1.0	0.0
Th	26.6	33.8	36.4	25.8	35.0	24.3	23.4	32.6	29.6	20.0
La	3.8	7.5	9.1	4.6	0.0	3.9	10.6	5.3	3.7	14.3
Ed	8.9	3.8	15.2	3.0	0.0	6.8	5.3	3.1	5.6	0.0
Et	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	3.7	0.0
Hi	29.1	20.0	18.2	25.8	20.0	25.2	19.2	23.2	24.1	31.4
In	8.9	15.0	7.6	12.1	15.0	18.5	14.9	13.7	7.4	11.4
Sp	1.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	3.2	4.2	4.6	5.7
Mi	15.2	10.0	9.1	18.2	20.0	7.8	13.8	11.6	12.0	14.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

For research articles in Dissertation Abstracts, topics about communication theory, history and biography had larger percentages overall. Studies of communication theory outnumbered the others for seven years, except in 1980, 1985 and in 1989 when history and biography had higher percentages. There was little research done on public relations and media ethics for the 10-year period of the selected sample.

Table VIII shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by topic and year, in Journalism Quarterly.

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY TOPIC(T) AND YEAR, IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

	Year									
T	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=79	80	66	66	20	103	94	95	108	35
Ad	1.8%	9.4%	6.4%	10.2%	3.6%	5.9%	7.4%	13.7%	7.9%	6.7%
Pr	0.0	1.9	1.6	3.4	3.6	2.9	0.0	2.0	1.6	1.7
Th	25.5	30.2	9.5	18.6	29.2	25.0	17.7	23.5	17.5	25.0
La	5.5	11.3	14.3	17.0	21.8	22.1	17.7	9.8	14.3	6.7
Ed	3.6	1.9	0.0	3.4	0.0	1.5	2.9	0.0	4.8	8.3
Et	3.6	9.4	1.6	3.4	1.8	1.5	0.0	7.9	1.6	3.3
Hi	23.6	11.3	30.2	17.0	27.3	17.7	32.4	13.7	22.2	28.3
In	9.1	5.7	19.1	13.6	3.6	14.7	7.4	11.8	11.1	1.7
Sp	7.3	0.0	3.2	6.8	1.8	0.0	4.4	3.9	4.8	10.0
Mi	20.0	18.9	14.3	6.8	7.3	8.8	10.3	13.7	14.3	8.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Research articles in Journalism Quarterly, like those in Dissertation Abstracts, emphasized communication theory,

media history and biography. However, theory topics accounted for only 9.5% of the total topics in 1982. Usually, percentage of theory topics was followed by history and biography percentages, but the latter two had greater percentages compared to the former in 1982, 1986, and 1988-89.

There were high percentages of miscellaneous topics in 1980 and 1981 (20.0% and 18.9%). Media law appeared to be more important from 1983 to 1986 (17.0% to 22.1%) than in other years.

Compared with the data for Dissertation Abstracts in Table VII, Table VIII shows that Journalism Quarterly had a higher percentage of articles on media law, media ethics, special interests and miscellaneous topics overall. However, there were higher percentages of studies on media education and international communication in Dissertation Abstracts.

Table IX shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by method and year, in Dissertation Abstracts.

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY METHOD(M) AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS 1980-1989

	Year									
M	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=62	58	48	50	15	53	56	60	59	20
Cs	4.8%	8.7%	6.3%	12.0%	0.0%	13.2%	12.5%	13.3%	13.6%	5.0%
Cr	14.5	29.3	16.7	12.0	20.0	18.8	16.1	13.3	6.8	10.0
E	14.5	5.2	20.8	20.0	6.7	15.1	10.7	18.3	8.5	5.0
Q	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
Fe	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.7	0.0
Fo	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.6	8.4	0.0	0.0
Mq	19.4	10.3	16.7	10.0	20.0	13.2	12.5	18.3	33.9	30.0
I	4.8	10.3	16.7	8.0	13.3	5.7	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
T	9.7	1.7	4.2	6.0	20.0	3.8	5.4	1.7	0.0	0.0
H	29.0	27.6	16.7	30.0	20.0	22.6	35.7	18.3	30.5	50.0
O	3.3	3.5	2.1	2.0	0.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	5.1	0.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

According to Table IX, case study, content analysis, lab experimental design, mail questionnaires survey and historical research were popular in Dissertation Abstracts. Among these many popular methods, historical research ranked the first in 1980, 1983-1987 and 1989, mail questionnaires survey in 1987-1988, lab experimental design in 1982 and in 1987, and content analysis in 1981 and 1984. Field experi-

mental and field observation design had small percentages throughout the 10 years.

Table X presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by method and year, published in Journalism Quarterly.

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY METHOD(M) AND YEAR, IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

	Year									
M	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	N=39	41	40	31	38	45	54	39	52	52
Cs	10.3%	2.4%	12.5%	6.5%	5.3%	2.2%	9.3%	2.6%	9.6%	15.4%
Ca	15.4	22.0	40.0	32.3	21.1	17.8	20.4	38.5	15.4	17.3
E	5.1	2.4	2.5	3.2	2.6	4.4	7.4	7.7	11.5	7.7
Q	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fe	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	1.8	5.1	1.9	3.9
Fo	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	5.1	1.9	5.8
Mq	18.0	17.1	7.5	12.9	15.8	26.7	18.5	18.0	25.0	17.3
I	2.6	2.4	5.0	6.5	7.9	8.9	3.7	2.6	3.9	9.6
T	5.1	14.6	2.5	3.2	7.9	6.7	3.7	0.0	9.6	7.7
H	38.4	29.3	22.5	29.0	34.2	28.9	31.5	18.0	21.2	13.5
O	2.6	9.8	5.0	6.5	2.6	4.4	1.9	2.6	0.0	1.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For research articles in Journalism Quarterly,

historical research was the most popular method used overall, followed by content analysis and mail questionnaires survey. Again, few research articles used Q-methodology, field-experiment and field-observation methods in this publication.

Compared with the articles in Dissertation Abstracts (Table IX), there were fewer articles using lab-experimental research design in Journalism Quarterly because of the smaller percentages.

Table XI shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by media and year, published in Dissertation Abstracts.

TABLE XI

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY MEDIA AND YEAR, IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS 1980-1989

		Media				
Year	Number	Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
1980	41	56.1%	9.8%	14.6%	19.5%	100.0%
1981	44	61.4	2.3	25.0	11.3	100.0%
1982	40	55.0	7.5	22.5	15.0	100.0%
1983	37	59.5	8.1	24.3	8.1	100.0%
1984	10	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	100.0%
1985	49	53.1	16.3	26.5	4.1	100.0%
1986	50	54.0	8.0	26.0	12.0	100.0%
1987	51	49.0	9.8	29.4	11.8	100.0%
1988	57	56.1	8.8	19.3	15.8	100.0%
1989	17	64.6	11.8	11.8	11.8	100.0%

Broadcasting media had always been the most studied media type throughout the entire period by research articles in Dissertation Abstracts, and the percentage was very high, ranging from 49.0% to 64.6%. Except in 1980 studies about both broadcast and print (the General category) had the second largest percentage for the period. Print media, on the other hand, was less discussed in this publication.

Table XII presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by media and by year, published in Journalism Quarterly.

TABLE XII

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY MEDIA AND YEAR, IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Media				
Year	Number	Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
1980	33	24.2%	36.4%	33.3%	6.1%	100.0%
1981	32	18.8	53.1	25.0	3.1	100.0%
1982	33	12.1	54.5	27.3	6.1	100.0%
1983	32	12.5	75.0	12.5	0.0	100.0%
1984	31	22.6	45.2	25.8	6.4	100.0%
1985	32	9.4	53.1	21.9	15.6	100.0%
1986	33	36.4	36.4	15.1	12.1	100.0%
1987	32	21.9	40.6	25.0	12.5	100.0%
1988	32	28.1	21.9	40.6	9.4	100.0%
1989	32	28.1	40.6	18.8	12.5	100.0%

Research articles in Journalism Quarterly had more interest in print media than in broadcasting media. For instance, about 75.0% of the research articles in 1983 were on print topics. The percentage for print media studies ranked first for all the 10 years except for 1988. Unike articles in Dissertation Abstracts, "general" media had the second largest percentage for seven years, and 40.6% of articles studied both media in 1988.

The following legend applies to Table XIII-XVII.

Legend

Symbol	School
1	University of Akron
2	University of Alabama
3	American University
4	University of Arizona
5	Arizona State University
6	University of Arkansas
7	Arkansas State University
8	Auburn University
9	Bemidji State University
10	Boston College
11	Bowling Green State University
12	Brandeis University
13	Brigham Young University
14	University of California, Berkeley
15	University of California, Irvine
16	University of California, L. A.
17	University of California, San Diego
18	California State University
19	Case Western Reserve University
20	University of Central Florida
21	Central Missouri State University
22	City University of New York
23	Cleveland State University
24	University of Colorado at Boulder
25	Colorado State University
26	Columbia University Teachers College
27	Cornell University
28	University of Delaware
29	University of Denver

Symbol	School
30	Drake University
31	Eastern Texas State University
32	Emerson College
33	University of Florida
34	Florida State University
35	George Peabody College For Teachers of Vanderbilt University
36	University of Georgia
37	Governors State University
38	Hamline University
39	Harvard University
40	University of Hawaii
41	Hope College, Michigan
42	Howard University
43	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
44	Indiana University
45	University of Iowa
46	Iowa State University
47	Kansas State University
48	Kent State University
49	University of Kentucky
50	Louisiana State University
51	University of Louisville
52	Loyola University of Chicago
53	University of Maryland, Baltimore County
54	University of Maryland, College Park
55	University of Massachusetts
56	Memphis State University
57	Miami University
58	University of Michigan
59	Michigan State University
60	Middle Tennessee State University
61	University of Minnesota
62	University of Mississippi
63	University of Missouri-Columbia
64	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
65	New Mexico State University
66	University of New Orleans
67	Northwest Missouri State University
68	University of New York
69	New York University
70	Northern Arizona University
71	University of North Carolina at Asheville
72	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
73	North Colorado Univniversity
74	North Illinois University
75	University of North Texas
76	Northwestern University
77	Ohio University

Symbol	School
78	Ohio State University
79	University of Oklahoma
80	Oklahoma State University
81	University of Oregon
82	University of Pennsylvania
83	Pennsylvania State University
84	Pepperdine University
85	University of Pittsburgh
86	Purdue University
87	Resselaer Polytechnic Institute
88	Rochester Institute of Technology
89	Saint Mary's College
90	San Diego State University
91	San Francisco State University
92	San Jose State University
93	University Southern California
94	University of South Carolina
95	University of South Florida
96	Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
97	University of Southern Mississippi
98	University of Southwestern Louisiana
99	Stanford University
100	State University of New York at Albany
101	State University of New York at Buffalo
102	Syracus University
103	Temple University
104	University of Tennessee
105	University of Texas
106	University of Texas at Austin
107	University of Texas at Dallas
108	Texas Technical University
109	Texas Women's University
110	University of Toledo
111	Towson State University, Maryland
112	Union For Experimenting Colleges and Universities
113	University of Utah
114	University of Virginia
115	Virginia Commonwealth University
116	Virginia Polytech Institute
117	University of Washington
118	Washington State University
119	Wayne State University
120	West Virginia University
121	Western Illinois University
122	University of Wisconsin-Madison
123	Youngstown State University

Table XIII presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by topic and by school, published by both sources, for the 10-year period.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY TOPIC AND SCHOOL IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Topic									
Sch	N	Ad	PR	Th	La	Ed	Et	Hi	In	Mi	Sp	To
1	1	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	20	10.0	0.0	30.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	100.0%
3	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
4	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	100.0%
5	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
6	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
7	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%
8	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0%
9	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
10	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%
11	20	0.0	0.0	15.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	35.0	10.0	15.0	0.0	100.0%
12	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
13	5	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
14	8	12.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	100.0%
15	8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	100.0%
16	8	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
17	3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
18	9	22.2	0.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
19	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
20	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
21	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
22	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
23	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
24	10	30.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	100.0%
25	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
26	10	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	0.0	100.0%
27	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
28	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
29	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
30	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
31	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
32	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
33	9	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	22.2	0.0	100.0%
34	23	0.0	0.0	34.8	8.7	13.0	0.0	21.7	13.0	4.4	4.4	100.0%

(Table XIII continued)

		Topic										
Sch	N	Ad	PR	Th	La	Ed	Et	Hi	In	Mi	Sp	To
35	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
36	14	7.1	0.0	28.6	0.0	7.1	7.1	14.3	0.0	35.7	0.0	100.0%
37	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
38	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
39	9	0.0	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	0.0	22.2	0.0	11.1	11.1	100.0%
40	6	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	100.0%
41	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
42	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	100.0%
43	37	24.3	0.0	24.3	5.4	2.7	0.0	18.9	5.4	16.2	2.7	100.0%
44	51	9.8	3.9	21.6	7.8	7.8	2.0	19.6	13.7	7.8	5.9	100.0%
45	25	8.0	0.0	36.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	32.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	100.0%
46	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
47	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
48	4	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
49	7	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	100.0%
50	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
51	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
52	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
53	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
54	13	0.0	0.0	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	15.4	0.0	30.8	7.7	100.0%
55	25	4.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	32.0	36.0	8.0	0.0	100.0%
56	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
57	4	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
58	19	5.3	0.0	26.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	36.8	15.8	5.3	5.3	100.0%
59	61	13.1	0.0	39.3	4.9	1.6	0.0	14.8	8.2	11.5	6.6	100.0%
60	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
61	53	7.6	1.9	22.6	11.3	1.9	5.7	18.9	22.6	5.7	1.9	100.0%
62	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
63	25	0.0	0.0	20.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	28.0	20.0	4.0	100.0%
64	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
65	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
66	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
67	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
68	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
69	33	9.1	3.1	27.3	3.0	6.1	0.0	33.3	0.0	15.2	3.0	100.0%
70	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
71	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100,0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
72	13	15.4	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	7.7	30.8	23.1	7.7	0.0	100.0%
73	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
74	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
75	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
76	27	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.9	18.5	11.1	3.7	100.0%
77	37	0.0	2.7	24.3	13.5	0.0	2.7	40.5	8.1	8.1	0.0	100.0%
78	27	7.4	0.0	29.6	0.0	3.7	0.0	22.2	18.5	14.8	3.7	100.0%
79	10	0.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	100.0%
80	9	11.1	0.0	22.2	11.1	22.2	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	100.0%

(Table XIII continued)

		Topic										
Sch	N	Ad	PR	Th	La	Ed	Et	Hi	In	Mi	Sp	To
81	11	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	100.0%
82	11	0.0	0.0	36.4	9.1	9.1	0.0	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1	100.0%
83	8	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	100.0%
84	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
85	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	100.0%
86	12	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	8.3	0.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	8.3	100.0%
87	5	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
88	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
89	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
90	4	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
91	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
92	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	100.0%
93	19	0.0	0.0	31.6	5.3	5.3	0.0	21.1	10.5	26.3	0.0	100.0%
94	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
95	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
96	28	10.7	0.0	25.0	14.3	0.0	3.6	28.6	10.7	3.6	3.6	100.0%
97	4	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
98	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
99	24	12.5	0.0	41.7	0.0	12.5	4.2	0.0	8.3	20.8	0.0	100.0%
100	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
101	13	0.0	0.0	38.5	0.0	7.7	0.0	30.8	0.0	23.1	0.0	100.0%
102	10	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	100.0%
103	15	0.0	0.0	13.3	13.3	6.7	0.0	40.0	13.3	13.3	0.0	100.0%
104	29	3.5	3.5	27.6	13.8	0.0	0.0	31.0	10.3	6.9	3.5	100.0%
105	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
106	35	11.4	0.0	22.9	14.3	2.9	0.0	25.7	11.4	8.6	2.9	100.0%
107	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
108	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
109	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	100.0%
110	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
111	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
112	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
113	11	9.1	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0	27.3	27.3	9.1	0.0	100.0%
114	4	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
115	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
116	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0%
117	17	5.9	0.0	47.1	5.9	0.0	5.9	17.7	11.8	5.9	0.0	100.0%
118	7	0.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	100.0%
119	12	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	33.3	25.0	8.3	8.3	100.0%
120	6	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
121	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
122	66	6.1	0.0	31.8	9.1	4.6	1.5	16.7	12.1	15.2	3.0	100.0%
123	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%

According to Table XIII, of the 123 schools studied 54 universities had their largest percentage of research articles on communication theory, 45 universities emphasized history and biography, and 21 had their largest percentage on mass communication law. Again, public relations was the least researched topic overall.

The top ten schools, which had the largest total number of research topics studied, were ranked as follow:

1. University of Wisconsin-Madison
2. Michigan State University
3. University of Minnesota
4. Indiana University
5. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,
5. Ohio University
6. University of Texas at Austin
7. New York University
8. University of Tennessee
9. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Communication theory accounted for 31.8% of all research articles by University of Wisconsin-Madison, and 39.3% by Michigan State University. Ohio University had more than 40% of its articles studying history and biography, while New York University had more than 33% on this topic. Public relations and media ethics were ignored by these schools in the sample selected.

Table XIV presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by method and by school, published by the two sources, for the 10-year period.

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY METHOD AND SCHOOL IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Method										
Sch	N	Cs	Ca	E	Q	Fe	Fo	Mq	I	T	H	O	T
1	3	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	%
2	12	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	%
3	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
4	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
5	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	%
6	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
7	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
8	4	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	%
9	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
10	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
11	14	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	0.0	57.4	7.1	%
12	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
13	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
14	4	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
15	4	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	%
16	4	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
17	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	%
18	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	50.0	16.7	%
19	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	%
20	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
21	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
22	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
23	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
24	5	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	%
25	3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	%
26	6	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	%
27	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
28	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
29	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
30	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
31	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
32	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	%
33	6	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	%
34	10	5.0	25.0	15.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	%
35	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
36	10	0.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	%
37	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
38	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
39	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	%
40	6	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	%
41	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%

(Table XIV continued)

		Method										
Sch	N	Cs	Ca	E	Q	Fe	Fo	Mq	I	T	H	O	T
42	6	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	%
43	18	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	50.0	5.6	%
44	31	3.2	22.6	6.5	0.0	3.2	3.2	12.9	6.5	9.7	32.3	0.0	%
45	19	10.5	15.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	47.4	0.0	%
46	3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
47	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	%
48	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	%
49	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	%
50	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	%
51	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
52	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
53	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
54	9	22.2	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	22.2	0.0	%
55	15	6.7	26.7	6.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	26.7	0.0	%
56	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
57	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
58	18	5.6	27.8	5.6	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.1	16.7	5.6	22.2	0.0	%
59	38	5.3	23.7	23.7	0.0	0.0	2.6	15.8	5.3	0.0	15.8	7.9	%
60	5	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
61	29	3.5	24.1	6.9	0.0	0.0	3.5	13.8	3.5	6.9	37.9	0.0	%
62	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	%
63	17	0.0	17.7	0.0	23.5	0.0	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.0	41.2	0.0	%
64	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	%
65	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	%
66	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
67	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
68	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
69	26	11.5	23.1	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	50.0	3.9	%
70	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
71	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
72	11	18.2	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	36.4	0.0	%
73	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
74	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
75	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
76	18	27.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	38.9	0.0	%
77	32	15.6	18.8	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1	15.6	6.3	12.5	18.8	6.3	%
78	19	5.3	15.8	10.5	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.1	5.3	0.0	31.6	5.3	%
79	5	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	%
80	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	%
81	6	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	%
82	8	25.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	%
83	6	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	%
84	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
85	5	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	%
86	9	33.3	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	%
87	5	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	%

(Table XIV continued)

		Method										
Sch	N	Cs	Ca	E	Q	Fe	Fo	Mq	I	T	H	O	T
88	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
89	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	%
90	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	%
91	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
92	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
93	13	38.5	7.7	23.1	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	0.0	%
94	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
95	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
96	17	5.9	23.5	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.7	5.9	0.0	41.2	0.0	%
97	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	%
98	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
99	15	13.3	6.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	6.7	6.7	20.0	0.0	%
100	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	%
101	9	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	%
102	5	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	%
103	11	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	0.0	27.3	0.0	%
104	17	5.9	23.5	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.0	35.3	0.0	%
105	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
106	23	8.7	30.4	17.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	8.7	0.0	21.7	0.0	%
107	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
108	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
109	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
110	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
111	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
112	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
113	5	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	%
114	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
115	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%
116	4	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	%
117	12	0.0	16.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	8.3	8.3	16.7	0.0	%
118	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	%
119	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	%
120	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	%
121	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	%
122	46	10.9	17.4	17.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.2	15.2	8.7	13.0	2.2	%
123	3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	%

* because of space limitations, the overall percentage for each school (100.0%) is represented by "%" only.

In Table XIV, there were 55 schools that used historical research methodologies as their first choice, 36 adopted

content analysis and mail questionnaire survey.

Q-methodology was seldom used for mass communication research over the past decade, except by the University of Missouri-Columbia (23.5%).

The top ten schools, determined by the total number of research methodologies included in the articles examined, are ranked as follow:

1. University of Wisconsin-Madison
2. Michigan State University
3. Ohio University
4. Indiana University
5. University of Minnesota
6. New York University
7. University of Texas at Austin
8. Ohio State University
9. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
9. University of Michigan
9. Northwestern University

Top research methods used by the University of Wisconsin-Madison included content analysis, lab-experimental design, mail questionnaires and in-person interviews (15.2% to 17.4%). Content analysis and lab-experiment had the largest percentages for Michigan State University. Historical research design was used the most in New York University and in University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which accounted for 50.0% of their research articles. Q-methodology and field experimental design were the least used research methods for these eleven schools.

Table XV shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by school and year, from Dissertation

Abstracts and Journalism Quarterly combined.

TABLE XV

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY SCHOOL AND YEAR IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Year										
Sch	N	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	Total
1	3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
2	10	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	100.0%
3	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
4	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	100.0%
5	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
6	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
7	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
8	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	100.0%
9	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
10	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
11	11	27.2	18.2	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0%
12	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
13	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
14	4	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
15	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
16	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
17	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
18	5	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
19	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
20	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
21	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
22	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
23	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
24	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	100.0%
25	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
26	5	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
27	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
28	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
29	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
30	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
31	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
32	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
33	5	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	100.0%
34	13	15.4	15.4	7.7	7.7	0.0	15.4	0.0	23.0	15.4	0.0	100.0%
35	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
36	8	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	100.0%
37	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
38	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%

(Table XV continued)

Sch	N	Year 1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	Total
39	4	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
40	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0%
41	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
42	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	100.0%
43	18	0.0	11.1	11.1	16.7	5.6	11.1	5.6	11.1	16.7	11.1	100.0%
44	24	12.5	12.5	4.2	4.2	8.3	12.5	4.2	12.5	16.7	12.5	100.0%
45	14	14.3	21.4	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	7.1	0.0	7.1	7.1	100.0%
46	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%
47	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
48	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
49	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
50	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
51	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
52	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
53	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
54	7	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	100.0%
55	14	21.4	7.1	14.3	7.1	7.1	14.3	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1	100.0%
56	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
57	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
58	11	27.3	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	9.1	0.0	100.0%
59	32	9.4	3.1	12.5	9.4	6.3	9.4	12.5	18.8	15.6	3.1	100.0%
60	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	100.0%
61	24	4.2	12.5	16.7	16.7	8.3	8.3	4.2	8.3	12.5	8.3	100.0%
62	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
63	13	0.0	23.1	7.7	0.0	0.0	23.1	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	100.0%
64	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
65	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
66	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
67	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
68	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
69	20	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	15.0	25.0	20.0	100.0%
70	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
71	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
72	7	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	42.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
73	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
74	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
75	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
76	17	5.9	11.8	5.9	5.9	5.9	17.6	5.9	11.8	17.6	11.8	100.0%
77	22	13.6	0.0	13.6	9.1	0.0	4.5	13.6	13.6	18.2	13.6	100.0%
78	15	6.7	20.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	20.0	6.7	13.3	13.3	6.7	100.0%
79	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
80	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	100.0%
81	6	16.7	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	100.0%
82	6	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
83	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	100.0%

(Table XV continued)

		Year										
Sch	N	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	Total
84	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
85	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
86	6	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	100.0%
87	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
88	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
89	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
90	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
91	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
92	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
93	11	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	18.2	18.2	18.2	0.0	100.0%
94	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
95	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
96	13	15.4	23.1	7.7	7.7	0.0	15.4	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	100.0%
97	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
98	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
99	13	7.7	15.4	7.7	7.7	7.7	15.4	15.4	7.7	7.7	7.7	100.0%
100	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
101	7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	0.0	100.0%
102	5	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
103	9	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	11.1	100.0%
104	16	6.3	18.8	18.8	6.3	0.0	6.3	12.5	12.5	12.5	6.3	100.0%
105	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
106	17	11.8	5.9	11.8	0.0	17.6	5.9	5.9	23.5	11.8	5.9	100.0%
107	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
108	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
109	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
110	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
111	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
112	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
113	5	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	100.0%
114	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
115	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
116	3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
117	11	9.1	9.1	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	27.3	18.2	0.0	100.0%
118	4	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
119	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	100.0%
120	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
121	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
122	35	5.7	11.4	20.0	17.1	0.0	14.3	11.4	11.4	8.6	0.0	100.0%
123	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%

From the data in Table XV, 31 schools had the highest productivity in 1985, and 30 in 1988. The most productive

top ten schools for the overall 10-year period are as follow:

1. University of Wisconsin-Madison
2. Michigan State University
3. Indiana University
3. University of Minnesota
4. Ohio University
5. New York University
6. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
7. Northwestern University
8. University of Texas at Austin
9. University of Tennessee

Overall, 1988 was the most productive year for the top ten schools, because six of the ten schools had their largest proportion of research articles published in 1988. However, University of Wisconsin-Madison had the highest percentage of research articles in terms of research topics included in 1982.

Table XVI shows the proportion of research articles, categorized by school and by media, published by the two sources.

TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY SCHOOL AND MEDIA IN DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS AND JOURNALISM QUARTERLY 1980-1989

		Media				
Sch	N	Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
1	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	10	40.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	100.0%
3	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
4	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
5	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
6	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
7	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
8	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%

(Table XVI continued)

Sch	N	Media				
		Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
9	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
10	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
11	11	63.6	18.2	18.2	0.0	100.0%
12	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
13	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
14	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%
15	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
16	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
17	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0%
18	5	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	100.0%
19	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
20	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
21	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
22	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
23	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
24	5	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
25	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
26	5	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	100.0%
27	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
28	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
29	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
30	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
31	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
32	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
33	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	100.0%
34	3	30.8	15.4	30.8	23.1	100.0%
35	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
36	8	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	100.0%
37	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
38	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
39	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0%
40	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
41	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
42	5	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	100.0%
43	18	27.8	22.2	22.2	27.8	100.0%
44	24	29.2	25.0	20.8	25.0	100.0%
45	14	35.7	28.6	35.7	0.0	100.0%
46	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
47	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0%
48	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
49	3	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	100.0%
50	3	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	100.0%
51	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
52	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
53	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
54	7	14.3	14.3	42.8	28.6	100.0%

(Table XVI continued)

		Media				
Sch	N	Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
55	14	57.1	7.2	14.3	21.4	100.0%
56	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
57	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
58	11	63.6	9.1	27.3	0.0	100.0%
59	32	46.9	18.7	34.4	0.0	100.0%
60	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
61	24	20.8	41.7	37.5	0.0	100.0%
62	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
63	13	38.5	23.0	38.5	0.0	100.0%
64	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
65	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
66	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
67	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
68	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
69	20	80.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	100.0%
70	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
71	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
72	7	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	100.0%
73	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0%
74	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	100.0%
75	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
76	17	88.2	5.9	5.9	0.0	100.0%
77	22	45.5	13.6	27.3	13.6	100.0%
78	15	66.7	0.0	13.3	20.0	100.0%
79	4	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	100.0%
80	5	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	100.0%
81	6	50.0	16.7	16.7	16.6	100.0%
82	6	50.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	100.0%
83	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	100.0%
84	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
85	3	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	100.0%
86	6	0.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	100.0%
87	4	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0%
88	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
89	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
90	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%
91	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
92	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
93	11	63.6	0.0	9.1	27.3	100.0%
94	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
95	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
96	13	0.0	46.1	38.5	15.4	100.0%
97	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
98	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
99	13	30.8	0.0	61.5	7.7	100.0%
100	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0%

(Table XVI continued)

Sch	N	Media: Broadcast	Print	General	Other	Total
101	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0%
102	5	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	100.0%
103	9	55.6	11.1	33.3	0.0	100.0%
104	16	50.0	18.8	18.7	12.5	100.0%
105	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
106	17	35.3	41.2	17.6	5.9	100.0%
107	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%
108	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
109	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%.
110	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%.
111	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
112	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0%
113	5	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	100.0%
114	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0%
115	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0%
116	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0%
117	11	27.2	36.4	27.3	9.1	100.0%
118	4	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	100.0%
119	5	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	100.0%
120	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	100.0%
121	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0%
122	35	45.7	20.0	25.7	8.6	100.0%
123	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%

Overall, broadcast media were the most often studied media for 70 colleges and universities during 1980 to 1989, while only 34 and 31 schools emphasized print and general media, respectively, in the same time frame.

The top ten productive schools overall were the following:

1. University of Wisconsin-Madison
2. Michigan State University
3. Indiana University
3. University of Minnesota
4. Ohio University
5. New York University
6. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
7. Northwestern University

8. University of Texas at Austin
9. University of Tennessee

Eight of the top ten universities had higher percentages of research articles on broadcast media than on print media. University of Minnesota and University of Texas at Austin are the only two schools among the top ten which had a greater proportion of studies on print media than on broadcast media.

Table XVII presents the proportion of research articles, categorized by school and by publication, for the 10-year period.

TABLE XVII

PERCENTAGE OF RESEARCH ARTICLES, BY SCHOOL AND PUBLICATION FOR THE 10-YEAR PERIOD 1980-1989

	Publications	
	DA	JQ
Sch	N=397	N=226
1	0.0%	0.4%
2	0.5	3.5
3	0.3	0.0
4	0.8	0.0
5	0.0	0.9
6	0.3	0.0
7	0.0	0.4
8	0.0	1.8
9	0.0	0.4
10	0.3	0.0
11	2.3	0.9
12	0.3	0.0
13	0.3	0.4
14	1.0	0.0
15	0.8	0.4
16	1.0	0.0
17	0.5	0.0
18	0.0	2.2
19	0.3	0.0

(Table XVII continued)

Sch	Publications DA N=397	Publications JQ N=226
20	0.0	0.4
21	0.3	0.0
22	0.3	0.0
23	0.0	0.4
24	0.5	1.3
25	0.0	0.4
26	1.3	0.0
27	0.0	0.4
28	0.0	0.4
29	0.3	0.0
30	0.3	0.0
31	0.0	0.4
32	0.0	0.4
33	0.8	0.9
34	2.5	1.3
35	0.3	0.0
36	1.0	1.8
37	0.0	0.4
38	0.0	0.4
39	1.0	0.0
40	0.0	1.8
41	0.0	0.4
42	1.0	0.4
43	4.3	0.4
44	2.5	6.2
45	3.0	0.9
46	0.0	0.9
47	0.0	0.9
48	0.5	0.0
49	0.3	0.9
50	0.0	1.3
51	0.0	0.4
52	0.3	0.0
53	0.3	0.0
54	0.8	1.8
55	2.8	1.3
56	0.0	0.4
57	0.0	0.9
58	2.5	0.4
59	5.8	4.0
60	0.0	1.3
61	3.3	4.9
62	0.5	0.0
63	1.8	2.7
64	0.3	0.0

(Table XVII continued)

Sch	Publications DA N=397	JQ N=226
65	0.0	0.9
66	0.0	0.4
67	0.0	0.4
68	0.0	0.4
69	5.0	0.0
70	0.0	0.4
71	0.0	0.4
72	0.8	1.8
73	0.0	0.9
74	0.3	0.9
75	0.5	0.0
76	4.0	0.4
77	3.5	3.5
78	3.5	0.4
79	0.5	0.9
80	0.3	1.8
81	1.3	0.4
82	1.3	0.4
83	1.0	0.4
84	0.3	0.0
85	0.8	0.0
86	0.3	2.2
87	1.0	0.0
88	0.0	0.9
89	0.0	0.4
90	0.0	0.9
91	0.0	0.4
92	0.0	0.9
93	2.8	0.0
94	0.3	0.0
95	0.0	0.4
96	1.0	4.0
97	0.3	0.4
98	0.0	0.4
99	3.0	0.4
100	0.3	0.4
101	1.5	0.4
102	1.0	0.4
103	1.8	0.9
104	2.8	2.2
105	0.0	0.4
106	2.5	3.1
107	0.0	0.4
108	0.0	0.4
109	0.3	0.0

(Table XVII continued)

Sch	Publications DA N=397	JQ N=226
110	0.0	0.4
111	0.0	0.4
112	0.3	0.0
113	1.0	0.4
114	0.5	0.0
115	0.0	0.4
116	0.0	1.3
117	2.3	0.9
118	0.5	0.9
119	1.3	0.0
120	0.0	1.3
121	0.0	0.9
122	6.3	4.4
123	0.0	0.4
Total:	100.0%	100.0%

According to Table XVII there were 67 schools that had a higher percentage of research articles published in Journalism Quarterly. There were 53 schools that had a higher percentage of articles in Dissertation Abstracts. In other words, Journalism Quarterly included and published more research articles from these 123 American research uniersities than Dissertation Abstracts.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

This thesis is an overview of mass communication research during the 1980s in the United States as represented in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts. The purpose of this study is to provide mass communication researchers an understanding of research in their fields as a whole over the most recent 10 years. The ultimate objective of this research is to make mass communication more effective, credible and successful in the future.

This study was stimulated by the academic dialogues at the "Communications Research: What, Why, and How?" conference held at Syracuse University in the fall of 1985. At the conference several mass communication scholars from major American research universities met and came up with many thoughtful ideas, valuable suggestions and recommendations based on their experiences with and study of mass communication research. In addition to the scholarly discussions at the Syracuse conference, which served as the main source for the literature review of this study,

some similar studies were reviewed. The findings derived from these previous similar studies reinforce the content and scope of this study, and also make it more historically relevant and academically meaningful.

Summary of the Study

The sample population for this thesis was limited to university-based mass communication research articles published in two major journals over the 10-year period in this country. The sampling units were individual academic research articles completed by researchers from American colleges and universities, and which were published by Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts, for the period January 1980 to December 1989. A total of 719 mass communication research articles was randomly drawn from the sample population. Quantitative as well as qualitative content analyses were the research methodologies employed for this study.

The primary research question was "What has been the trend of mass communication research in the United States of America from January 1980 to December 1989, as depicted in Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts?" Four research questions and one research hypothesis were established to meet the purpose and objectives of this study.

Six variables of analysis (publication, year, school, media type, topic and method) were developed. For each

variable, several sub-categories were established, and each research article was coded accordingly. The findings were presented in 17 percentage tables, and were analyzed by complex chi-square statistical tests.

Discussions of Findings

With respect to mass communication research topics represented in the articles, communication theories, history and biography had consistently larger percentages of research articles published by Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts each year throughout the 10-year period. On the contrary, public relations and media ethics had the smallest proportions overall.

Dissertation Abstracts had more articles on international communication and media education than Journalism Quarterly, while Journalism Quarterly emphasized media ethics and media law. It was assumed that there were more international authors in Dissertation Abstracts and they tended to study topics related to their own countries. Also, doctoral students are trained to be educators and that's why they generated more research about media education. Again, not all doctoral dissertations get published in Journalism Quarterly so there were not many international communication research articles in it. Authors in Journalism Quarterly, more likely than not, are faculty members at colleges and universities, and they might

focus their research on the needs and trends of the field, for example, media ethics and media law.

Content analyses, mail surveys (questionnaires), and historical research designs were the most frequently used research methodologies for academic-based mass communication research published by Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts from January 1980 to December 1989. Q-methodology was the least used research method overall, however.

Broadcast media appeared to have a larger percentage of research articles devoted to them than articles on print media for most of the 10-year period except in 1983 and in 1984. However, the differences in 1983 and 1984 were not genuine, and could have been due to chance. Mass communication research concerned with both print and broadcast media had a consistently larger proportion of articles in the 1980s compared to other media areas.

Among the top 10 productive American research universities examined in terms of research topics, five of them favored communication theory, and the other five studied history and biography the most. In addition to theory, the University of Minnesota had another preference for international communication, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign had a high percentage of research articles on advertising.

Among the top 11 schools chosen for high research

methodologies, seven of them preferred historical design, and five of them preferred content analysis. The University of Wisconsin-Madison and Michigan State University had as large a percentage of mass communication research articles using laboratory experimental design as that of content analysis.

Among the top 10 universities in terms of media types, eight of them emphasized on broadcast media, and the other two had more research articles studying print media than broadcast media.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison and Michigan State University ranked first and second as the most productive schools with the largest number of mass communication research articles published in both Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts during the 1980s. In addition, mass communication research completed by researchers from these two universities was broader in content (largest research topic frequency-count), and tended to use more multiple research methodologies (largest research methodology frequency-count) than other institutions represented.

When comparing mass communication research articles in Journalism Quarterly with those in Dissertation Abstracts, it was found that more institutions were represented in the former than the latter. However, Dissertation Abstracts contained a greater number of mass communication research

articles overall than did Journalism Quarterly.

There was not much difference with respect to the scope and emphasis on reseach topics between these two publications, with almost two research topics represented in each research article for both journals. For each journal, the most popular research topic was communication theory, while the least popular topic was research on public relations. It is assumed that a possible reason for the apparent lack of emphasis on public relations is that much public relations research is published in Public Relations Review or other specialized journals.

For mass communication studies from both of the two publications for the 10-year period, historical research was the most popular research methodology, and Q-methodology was the least. There was no difference between the two publications in terms of pluralism of methodology used (about 1.3 methods per article), but Dissertation Abstracts' authors preferred laboratory experimental design over those of Journalism Quarterly.

As for the media studied, Journalism Quarterly had more research articles on print media than on broadcast media; Dissertation Abstracts, on the other hand, included more on broadcast media than print. This difference in emphasis on print and broadcast media between the two journals was significant and not due to chance. The research null hypothesis was not supported, and there was

difference in research on media types between these two journals.

From the research data collected, communication theory was the most often studied subject overall. This finding satisfied some media scholars' emphasis on the importance of communication theory to mass communication as a whole. The study of communication theory reflects the philosophy of the "Columbia School," which involved mass communication studies mainly on the impact and effect of media messages on individuals as well as various theories (Dennis, 1988).

Each research article included in this study had almost two topics involved, which meant that researchers had been thinking about broader issues. This finding fits the suggestion of Frederick T. C. Yu that researchers should have a broader view and should seek multiple topics (Yu, 1988).

Most of the 719 research articles utilized 2-3 research methodologies, which indicated pluralism had been undertaken by academic mass communication researchers for the 1980s. Also, there were sizable percentages of research articles published in these two journals studying both print and broadcast media. It is obvious that Everette Dennis' 1986 study that university-based research often cut across several media, and used a variety of approaches and methodologies still applies for mass communication research in colleges and universities in the 1980s. The finding

indicates that mass communication researchers had tried multiple research methods in the 1980s as suggested by the Syracuse conference attendees.

Research articles which built upon each other, as suggested by many media experts, could be seen in Journalism Quarterly. Usually, researchers tended to do studies that were based on their previous research, for example, several articles included in this study were based on the authors' dissertations.

The study of different research topics, various research methodologies, and types of media by Journalism Quarterly and Dissertation Abstracts during 1980-1989 remained fairly consistent. There was no indication of a significant increase or decrease of frequency of topics, research methodologies, media types and even productivity for each research university included in the study.

Conclusions

Publication is at least one of the indicators of research, and research is the most important function of all disciplines of learnings (Cole and Bowers, 1973). Journalism Quarterly, an American journal devoted entirely to journalism and mass communication research, and Dissertation Abstracts, a database publishing theses and dissertations from major research colleges and universities in the United States, by no means contain a substantial

proportion of the research studies done on some aspect of mass communication, or which address major concerns in the field. And as a result, these two journals did reflect some research activity in the field of journalism and mass communication for the 10-year period.

The findings of this study generally indicate that academic communication research has been static, and not dynamic. Mass communication research has not changed much in terms of research topics, research methodology, and research productivity in colleges and universities in the United States during the 1980s. This could be explained by Guido Stempel III's recent study that people's research interests are related to their teaching assignments, and that's why there have not been massive curricular changes in mass communication research over the past decade (Stempel III, 1990).

Over the decade, most mass communication researchers studied communication theory, history and biography, they tended to use the historical method and content analysis, and they paid more attention to the broadcasting media than print.

The top ten research universities remained almost identical for the 10-year period, and more surprisingly, they were also very similar to the top ranking schools chosen by Schweitzer's previous study of 1988.

Doctoral dissertations produced by the 123 schools

were theory-oriented, emphasized broadcast media, and used more laboratory-experimental research design. As was to be expected, Journalism Quarterly emphasized print media and contained mass communication research by faculty members, with more collaborative and cumulative work.

Recommendations

Since all knowledge is diffused, any evaluation based on publishing alone would be incomplete (Cole and Bowers, 1973). The thesis was limited to published, and university-based mass communication research. Books or chapters in books, presentations at conferences, unpublished educational handouts, and manuscripts for seminars should be considered and included for future study.

The quantitative content analysis used for this study was confined to empirical observations only. More in-depth investigation, such as mail survey and telephone interviews, would help to clarify the findings. For example, it would be interesting to learn what factors influenced the research priorities of academics, for both doctoral students and faculty; why the top 10 research universities remained at the top over the 10 years; and the gap between the needs of the mass communication profession and the academic would be appropriate and practical for future study.

Universities and colleges with journalism or mass communication programs should cooperate and conduct more

joint projects. For master's and doctoral students collaborative work should be allowed and encouraged.

In all, more frequent interaction among students and faculty in journalism and mass communication, and more communication between the academic and the industry of mass media will enhance the overall quality of mass communication research.

In conclusion, research is an intellectual activity which could never be overemphasized. Especially with the rapidly changing communication environment we encounter in the technological world, mass communication as a field of study needs more effective and dynamic research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Peter J. (1974). Research Guide In Journalism. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Corporation.

Barnouw, Erik. (1989). International Encyclopedia of Communication. New York: the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

Berelson, Bernard. (1971). Content Analysis in Communication Research. Facsimile of 1952 edition. New York: Hafner Publishing Co.

Cole, Richard R., Bowers, Thomas A. (1973). Research Article Productivity of U. S. Journalism Faculties. Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1973, 246-254.

Davison, W. Phillips, Yu, Frederick T. C. (1974). Mass Communication Research: Major Issues and Future Directions. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.

Dennis, Everette. (1986). Media Research As Sense-maker. Content, November/December 1986, 9-12.

Dennis, Everette. (1988). Whence We Came: Discovering the History of Mass Communication Research. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 3-20). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Dissertation Abstracts International: the Humanities and Social Sciences, vol. 50. (1989) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms Inc.

Dunwoody, Sharon. (1988). The Practitioners Are Interested...: But They Are Not Journalists. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 172-174). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Emery, Edwin, Ault, Phillip H., & Agee, Warren K. (1965). Introduction To Mass Communications. 2nd ed. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc.

Fish, Marjorie Jane. (1984). A Study of Mass Communication Research And Scholarship. Unpublished dissertation.

Ismach, Arnold H. (1988). Communication Research and the Practice of Journalism. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 167-171). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Janowitz, Moriss. (1968). The Study of Mass Communication. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 3, 41-45.

Katz, Bill, Katz, Linda Sternberg. (1989). Magazines For Libraries, sixth ed, 585.

Katzen, May. (1975). Mass Communication: teaching and studies at universities. Paris: The Unesco Press.

Lovell, Ron. (1987). Triumph of the Chi-squares. The Quill, 75, 22-24.

Nafziger, Ralph O., White, David M. (1963). Introduction of Mass Communications Research. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Rice, Ronald E., and Associate (1984). The New Media: Communication, Research, and Technology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Robinson, John P. (1988). Nudging Communications Research into the Age of Information. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 129-131). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Rogers, Everett M. (1986). Communication Technology: the New Media in Society. New York: the Free Press.

Schweitzer, John C. (1988). Research Article Productivity By Mass Communication Scholars. Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1988, 479-484.

Schweitzer, John C. (1989). Factors Affecting Scholarly Research Among Mass Communications Faculty. Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1989, 410-417.

Sharp, Nancy Weatherly. (1988). Challenges to Communications Research in the Age of Information. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 61-106). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Sharp, Nancy Weatherly. (1988). Communications Research: the Challenge of the Information Age. New York: Sycracuse University Press.

Stempel III, Guido H. (1988). A Lesson We Teach about Research. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 165-166). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Stempel III, Guido H. (1990). Trends in Journalism Quarterly: Reflections of the Retired Editor. Unpublished.

Stempel III, Guido H., Westley, Bruce H., eds. (1981). Research Methods in Mass Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Tan, Alexis S. (1988) Why Research Manuscripts Are Rejected. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 139-141). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Weaver, David H. (1988) Mass Communication Research Problems and Promises. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 21-38). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Winston, Brian. (1988). The Fault Is in Ourselves. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 158-160). New York: Syracuse University Press.

Yu, Frederick T. C. (1988). Where Is Mass Communication Research Going?. In Nancy W. Sharp (Ed.), Communications Research (pp. 39-58). New York: Syracuse University Press.

VITA

Chiung-pi Su

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A STUDY OF MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH PUBLISHED IN JOURNALISM QUARTERLY AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1989

Major Field: Mass Communications

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Taipei, Taiwan, the Republic of China, January 1, 1964, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ying-yuan Su.

Education: Obtained the High School Diploma at Taipei Municipal the First Girls' High School, June 1982; received Bachelor of Law degree in Legal Science from Fu-Jen Catholic University in Taipei, Taiwan in June, 1986; received Master of Education in Instructional Media from Central State University at Edmond, Oklahoma in May, 1988; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1990.

Personal Experience: Resident Assistant, West Hall, Oklahoma Central State University, 1987-1988; Chinese Instructor, Stillwater Chinese Baptist Church, 1989-1990, Student Intern, KOCO-TV, Oklahoma City, 1989-1990.

Professional Organizations: Member of Women In Communication, OSU Chapter; Member of Asian American Journalists Association.