A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ADVERTISING EDUCATORS TOWARD THE TEACHING OF ADVERTISING ETHICS IN SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF JOURNALISM

By

JOHN RAPHAEL ELLERBACH

Bachelor of Arts
University of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa
1975

Master of Arts
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa
1982

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1988

A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ADVERTISING EDUCATORS TOWARD THE TEACHING OF ADVERTISING ETHICS IN SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF JOURNALISM

Thesis Approved:

Charles A. Fleming EdD
Thesis Adviser

Philip E. Paulin

William J. Rugg

John D. Gardner

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the educational preparation of advertising majors in higher education with respect to advertising ethics. It is presumed that the attitudes of advertising educators will affect the way they approach the subject in the classroom, and, consequently, will affect the way future practitioners think about and practice ethics in advertising. Of particular note is the amount of time educators dedicate to teaching advertising ethics, the specific topics they cover in class, and where they rank a separate advertising ethics course in terms of curricular priority with other advertising courses. Also of interest are the teaching philosophies and methods of these educators and their attitudes toward ethics in the advertising business itself. Of secondary concern are the educational and professional backgrounds of the educators.

The author wishes to express appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. Charles Fleming, for his challenging guidance, quick wit, and prompt assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to other committee members, Dr. John J. Gardiner, Dr. William J. Rugg, and Dr. Philip E. Paulin. In addition, special thanks go to Dr. Marlan Nelson, who helped the author begin what will continue to be a gratifying career in higher education.

Special gratitude is also expressed to my wife, Andrea, for her unflagging faith in me, and to my daughters, Aurora and Natalie, for their innocence and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Advertising Today

British author Norman Douglas observed, "You can tell the ideals of a nation by its advertisements." (1) Similarly, you can tell the ideals of a student body by their majors. During the past 22 years the number of advertising graduates increased almost seven-fold. In 1985 American colleges and universities graduated 5,779 advertising majors. In 1980 they graduated 3,755. In only five years, the number of annual advertising graduates rose by more than 2,000. (2)

"In addition," notes a Spring 1987 article in Journalism Educator, "advertising education has grown at a faster rate than its two host academic areas--communications and business--and the field is in the midst of another period of rapid growth." (3)

What lures so many students? For one thing, money. Advertising is a 90-billion dollar a year industry. (4) For another, jobs. Richard R. Cole, dean of the School of Journalism at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, noted that the number of traditional news-editorial jobs "has held fairly constant, while the number of jobs in P.R. and advertising has grown greatly." (5) Add the promise

of employment and the potential of a good salary to the obvious attraction of a career that exudes creativity and seems to defy occupational boredom, and you've got the makings of an attractive profession. In 1985, 193,000 Americans made their living in the advertising business. In 1980 the number stood at 153,000; in 1975, 122,000 Americans were employed in advertising. (6)

Advertising has been defined as "any form of nonpersonal presentation of goods, services or ideas for action, openly paid for, by an identified sponsor. (7) Sandage et. al. defined advertising as "a form of communication that attempts to interpret the qualities of products, services and ideas in terms of consumer needs and wants." (8) Advertising agency mogul David Ogilvy wrote, "I do not regard advertising as entertainment or an art form, but as a medium of information. When I write an advertisement, I don't want you to tell me that you find it 'creative.' I want you to find it so interesting that you <u>buy the product</u>. (9) Thus, the nearly 200,000 advertising practitioners intent on convincing the consumer to buy products expose that consumer to an estimated 2,000 ads per day. (10)

The Advertising Curriculum

One popular method of introducing the aspiring practitioner to this means of convincing the consumer to buy is the advertising curriculum in higher education. The curriculum reflects three broad areas of professional

competence: creative, media and account work. (11)

> CREATIVE: Writers, artists, and production people are employed in this area to create and produce advertising messages. Writing skills and an ability to see the commonplace in a unique way are essential for success as a creative.
>
> MEDIA: This function involves determining in which medium to buy advertising space or advertising time for a client, or it involves selling time and space for broadcast or print media. An analytical mind, a competency in math and, in the case of sales, persistence are necessary.
>
> ACCOUNT WORK: Both client and agency have people who act as liaisons. For the agency, the account executive is more than a salesperson; he is often the "go-between" for the client and the creative and media people in his agency. For the client, the person in charge of the advertising may be, for example, a public relations practitioner. His job is to communicate the wishes of management to the account executive. (12)

To impart the skills necessary to perform creative, media and account work, most journalism schools with advertising sequences will offer a "core" of course requirements that generally include two or more of the following: advertising principles, advertising copywriting, media planning, advertising research, advertising management, advertising law and ethics, advertising psychology, and advertising campaigns. (13) In A Perspective on Advertising Accreditation Standards, Bowers noted that the accrediting council for journalism schools has determined six minimal guidelines for advertising sequences:

1. A qualified faculty with appropriate professional advertising experience.
2. A core of courses that includes principles, creative aspects, media selection and advertising research.
3. Course work that covers the economic, social and ethical issues of advertising.
4. Required courses in marketing.

5. Adequate library resources for references and research.
6. Opportunity for students to gain advertising experience while in school. (14)

Advertising Ethics

Of course, a call for intelligent consideration of ethical problems in advertising was not suddenly revealed to America through guidelines from a relatively-recently established accrediting council. Questions about the ethical implications of advertising and a concern for guidelines for educating the public and practitioners are as old as the nation itself. In Media Ethics, Christians et. al. wrote that the United States is,in part, "a nation founded because of advertising," but that advertising even then was fraught with ethical problems. (15) Media Ethics quotes critic and scholar Daniel Boorstin:

> Never was there a more outrageous or more unscrupulous or more ill-informed advertising campaign than that by which the promoters of the American colonies brought settlers here. Brochures published in England in the seventeenth century, some even earlier, were full of hopeful overstatements, half-truths, and downright lies along with some facts which nowadays surely would be the basis of a restraining order from the FTC...It would be interesting to speculate how long it might have taken to settle this continent if there had not been such promotion by enterprising advertisers. How has American civilization been shaped by the fact that there was a kind of natural selection here of those people who were willing to believe advertising? (16)

Also scrutinizing the past in regard to advertising ethics, George C.S. Benson in Business Ethics in America, operationally defined advertising ethics through America's business ethical heritage. Benson said that this heritage

contains only a few fundamental principles about advertising. One general rule is that sellers should tell buyers the truth about defects in products. According to Benson, "In the nineteenth century, the contrary doctrine of caveat emptor was followed, with disturbing effects on the ethics of advertising, as well as on sales in general." (17)

Another basic principle of Western ethics that has some application to advertising, according to Benson, is the rule of using property so that it does not damage others. "Advertisements that damage competitors or customers can be the subjects of court action. There are also laws that forbid the use of advertisements to achieve criminal ends." (18) Benson claimed that in the United States, "a country that largely ignores basic ethical instruction, enforcement of rules and laws becomes the main means of introducing ethical standards.":

> Such enforcement over advertising as exists seems to be a mixture of self-control by advertising agencies; controls by newspapers and other media; and control by government agencies... (19)

In 1952, the president of Weiss and Geller, an advertising agency, called for controls to uphold ethical standards:

> I need hardly add that I am not opposed to advertising; and I would be the last to deny the vitally important function it renders in our system of production and distribution. Yet it would be a foolish and short-sighted policy to disregard the mounting criticism as of negligible import. I believe that the interest of advertising will best be served by a candid recognition on the part of business and the profession itself of their obligation to lead the fight in upholding standards of decency, honesty, and responsibility. (20)

In addition to Geller, Benson also noted the "powerful reasons for advertising, at least for advertising that gives information about products and opens up markets for new products." (21) He believed that if advertising meets the requirements of economic usefulness, it becomes more ethical in our society. But, according to Benson, "there is still the possibility, indeed the probability, of unethical advertising. But the mere fact of the existence of advertising is not unethical, as some writers seem to imply." (22)

To define areas of ethical concern, Media Ethics posed four questions: Who are the proper audiences for advertising messages? What are the proper subjects of these ads? What techniques should be used? How is advertising affected by (and how does it affect) the media that carry it? (23)

In "Advertising, Its Ethics and Its Critics," Otis Pease said that the status of professionalism (which the advertising industry has yet to achieve) requires good ethics. In short, good ethics is good business: (24)

> Anyone who has examined in detail the history of the the internal search for ethical standards would find it hard not to conclude that it arose not really from a desire to benefit the public or to safeguard the consumer (although these were often byproducts) but rather from a desire to preserve the effectiveness of advertising. Bruce Barton stated it succinctly in 1935. No advertiser, he declared, should be permitted to act in such a way as to "poison the pond in which we all must fish." (It was perfectly clear that what Barton had in mind was a concern not for the fish but for the fishermen.) Put more positively, (as it usually was), the function of advertising codes and ethical systems was to preserve maximum credibility for advertising as a whole, consistent with its function as a weapon in marketing. (25)

Preserving the maximum credibility of advertising as a whole means, as Michael Stankey pointed out in An Interprofessional Perspective on Advertising Education, establishing an academic foothold in the university--the seat of probity and probing of such matters as ethics. (26)

Ethics and Advertising Education

As Geller cited mounting criticism of the advertising industry--criticism that some scholars say has yet to abate (27) --and Benson noted that America largely ignores ethical instruction, advertising educator Charles Sandage claimed that advertisers who hire graduates place little emphasis on their new employees' understanding of social and economic values from which "ethical convictions grow:" (28)

> Too much emphasis has been placed on hiring and training craftsmen and not enough on educating for understanding. It is probable that too many employers have sought only bright young men and women, probably college graduates, but with no attention given to their understanding of advertising and its social and economic values. (29)

Such a vocational emphasis may stem from the priorities set by the advertising industry itself. Approximately 50 times as much money is spent on the actual advertising than is spent on research--the "why" behind those ads. (30) A parallel can be drawn between the great emphasis advertising educators place on teaching advertising skills versus the relatively little emphasis they place on the "why" of advertising, which includes ethics instruction. (31)

The concern is that the current predominantly vocational

orientation in the advertising curriculum tends to down-play and thereby compromise the teaching of ethics.

The editors of Ethics Teaching in Higher Education recommend that "the teaching of ethics be given a far more central role in the curriculum than it has had in recent decades." They claim that "formal opportunities to pursue moral questions are often scant and episodic." (32) This seems to be true of the advertising curriculum.

As of the early 1980's, 87 colleges and universities offered journalism-or-business-based programs in advertising consisting of three or more titled advertising courses. (33) Of those colleges and universities, only four devoted an entire course to the study of advertising ethics. (34)

Of course, there are other ways to study advertising ethics apart from taking a course entirely devoted to the topic. Professors can make advertising ethics a part of their course offerings in creative work, media, and account management. Also, interdisciplinary courses with, for example, the philosophy and journalism departments cooperating, are another way to cover advertising ethics. To date, however, there is little evidence that advertising educators devote much of their course loads to ethics or that more than a few interdisciplinary courses are being taught.

Statement of the Problem

Ethics Teaching in Higher Education stated that the following four purposes should mark all courses in ethics:

stimulating the moral imagination, developing skills in the recognition and analysis of moral issues, eliciting a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibility, and learning to tolerate and to resist moral disagreement and ambiguity. These four purposes, according to the authors, should be supplemented by the examination of those specific topics appropriate to particular areas of personal, social and professional concern. (35) The overall problem: How well are we meeting these ideals in the advertising curriculum? The specific problem to be addressed is the apparent lack of emphasis on standards of quality and performance in the teaching of advertising ethics within a vocationally-oriented curriculum, particularly as those standards are reflected by the attitudes of advertising educators toward teaching ethics in the advertising curriculum. In sum, if advertising educators, for whatever reasons, do not believe in the four purposes listed above, they are hardly likely to devote much quality teaching time or effort to ethical topics of personal, social and professional concern as applied to the advertising business.

Purpose of the Study

The literature gives some indication as to which courses and to what extent advertising ethics are being taught in advertising sequences. Nonetheless, updated information is needed. More information is also needed on advertising professors' attitudes toward and practices concerning the

extent of teaching advertising ethics. In other words, it is known that there are opportunities, though mostly informal and unplanned, afforded the teaching of ethics in the advertising curriculum, but are these opportunities still "scant and episodic"? Furthermore, is there a difference between accredited and nonaccredited schools of journalism/communication in terms of commitment of curricular resources to the teaching of advertising ethics and in terms of their respective respondents' attitudes toward advertising ethics education?

Other major questions to be investigated include the following:

--Is there a difference in attitudes toward the teaching of advertising ethics between professors with doctorates and professors with master's degrees only? Does one group devote more time to teaching advertising ethics? Similarly, the same questions will be asked of the group of educators that most closely identifies with the advertising profession versus the group that most closely identifies with higher education.

--If respondents report having taken one or more courses in ethics, do these respondents differ from the rest in terms of time devoted to teaching advertising ethics and attitudes toward the subject?

--How do advertising professors perceive the ethics of the advertising business itself?

--In the eyes of the educators, does the advertising

business need people educated in advertising ethics?

Based on the purposes and goals identified by ethics educators in colleges and universities, the primary purpose of this study is to collect data about advertising educators' attitudes towards the teaching methods, educational philosophies and the organized curricular structure that are intended to support advertising ethics education.

Significance of the Study

There is a wealth of literature on the effective teaching of ethics in higher education and a wealth of literature on the educational purposes of the journalism curriculum. There is some information on what educators believe constitutes an effective advertising curriculum. Less has been written on effective teaching in the advertising curriculum, and even less on attitudes of advertising professors toward ethics in the advertising curriculum as those attitudes compare with the professional and academic backgrounds of current advertising professors.

This study will use for a base of questioning those goals established to help ensure effective college and university teaching in ethics. In addition, questions will be formulated from goals established by journalism schools for their advertising sequences and current teaching practices and attitudes of advertising educators as they pertain to those goals.

In other words, this inquiry will be based on what

educators have determined to be the essential curricular approaches to teaching ethics in higher education, in journalism and in advertising. Advertising educators will react to a series of statements, many of which center on the concern that advertising education is too vocationally-oriented--too concerned about the "marketplace" for job acquisition and career advancement at the expense of developing ethical convictions at a time when the advertising industry continues to be subject to mounting criticism.

The results of this study should prove useful to advertising educators as they prepare lessons and courses devoted to ethics education.

This study should also be of interest to department heads and deans who may have the power to institute courses on advertising ethics. As Ethics Teaching in Higher Education notes, "Special efforts should be made to explain to the university or professional school what courses in ethics hope to achieve, and what means are to be used in the endeavor." (36)

Professionals and professional organizations in advertising may also find this study useful as they examine advertising educators' goals and means to achieve those goals as they pertain to teaching advertising ethics.

Limitations

This study is limited to 90 colleges and universities with journalism/communication schools that include

advertising sequences as identified in Where Shall I Go to Study Advertising? (37) Many more institutions of higher education may offer one or more courses in advertising. They are not included in this study. The study also does not include schools of business that provide an advertising sequence, since those schools operate under different accreditation standards than do journalism schools.

This study is limited to those schools that carry out the teaching of advertising ethics in various advertising courses. It asks for advertising professors' attitudes toward curricular proposals and teaching strategies. It is limited to insights from one respondent from each advertising sequence, the respondent deemed the most appropriate by the head of the sequence or contact person listed in Where Shall I Go to College to Study Advertising? This study does not attempt to gather input from two other important parties in the advertising education process, the students and practitioners who will likely hire the students.

It should be noted that the profession has no licensing or entrance requirements. No courses in ethics or any other facet of advertising are required for entry into the profession. Those who are not advertising majors and those who have never taken a college course are eligible for advertising employment. This study will examine only the formal education given to advertising students in advertising courses.

Assumptions

It is assumed that responses to the survey will be complete, objective and honest, and that educators will not perceive their responses as being critical of themselves or their programs.

It is assumed that any administrators who receive the survey will forward it to the appropriate advertising educators.

It is assumed that advertising educators have some knowledge of advertising ethics.

It is assumed that responses to questions that ask for information and attitudes about the particular sequence will be responses representative of the entire sequence and its educators and not just the views of the individual respondent.

Organization of the Study

The literature review will examine recommended goals and strategies for the teaching of ethics in courses in higher education. The literature review will also examine the current advertising curriculum in journalism/communication schools in terms of its professors' goals and recommended teaching strategies. Where necessary, highlights will be provided on the advertising business in general, accreditation of journalism schools, the study of ethics in general, advertising professionals' views of the advertising curriculum, advertising professionals' views of ethical

decision making, and effective teaching strategies.

Chapter III, "Methodology"

The chapter on methodolgy will describe the population to be surveyed and the survey instrument. It will contain a discussion why certain survey questions are to be included.

The schedule for administering the survey and for administering follow-up mailings will be outlined.

The chapter will also outline the data to be presented and discussed, explain how the data will be analyzed, and determine the comparisons to be made.

Chapter IV, "Analysis"

The fourth chapter will present, analyze and describe the data collected by the survey.

Chapter V, "Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations"

The final chapter will discuss the findings and analysis, reach conclusions about how advertising ethics is taught in the advertising curriculum, and will identify topics for further study.

Also, the last chapter will attempt to place the teaching of advertising ethics in a social perspective. Of particular note will be an assessment of vocationalism as it pertains to the teaching of advertising ethics. As Kleppner et. al. noted, "The fact is that advertising is a technique; techniques have no morality of their own but reflect the

mores of the times and the standards of their users." (38)

ENDNOTES

1 John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations, ed. Emily Morison Beck, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968), 14th Edition.

2 Ron Taylor, "Advertising studies increase in South," Journalism Educator, 42 (Spring 1987), p. 27.

3 Ibid., p. 25.

4 Daniel K. Stewart, "Upgrading needed for ad education," Journalism Educator, 40 (Winter 1986), p. 20.

5 Michael W. Hirschorn, "Programs in Advertising and Public Relations Fuel Growth of Journalism-School Enrollment," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 34 (October 14, 1987), p. A36.

6 U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, (Washington, D.C. 1986) 107th Edition, p. 398.

7 Journal of Marketing, 12 (October 1948), p. 202.

8 C.H. Sandage, Vernon Fryburger, and Kim Rotzoll, Advertising Theory and Practice, (Homewood IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1979), p. 3.

9 David Ogilvy, Ogilvy on Advertising, (New York: Vintage Books, 1985), p. 7.

10 "Advertising Image Heads A.A.A.A.'s Agenda," AAAA Newsletter, (January 1984), p. 2

11 Thomas Russell and Glenn Verrill, Otto Kleppner's Advertising Procedure, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986), p. 624.

12 Ibid.

13 F.T. Marquez, "Agency presidents rank courses, job opportunities," Journalism Educator, 35 (July 1980), p. 46.

14 Thomas A. Bowers, A Perspective on Advertising Accreditation Standards, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (65th, Athens, OH, July 25--28, 1982) ERIC: ED 218 614; CS 206 944, p. 11.

15 Clifford G. Christians, Kim B. Rotzoll and Mark Fackler, Media Ethics, (New York: Longman, Inc., 1987), p. 125.

16 Ibid.

17 George C.S. Benson, Business Ethics in America, (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1982), p. 205.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., p. 218.

20 Max A. Geller, Advertising at the Crossroads, (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985) p. vi. Originally published: New York: Ronald Press, 1952.

21 Benson, p. 212.

22 Ibid., p. 213.

23 Christians, p. 131.

24 Otis Pease, "Advertising, Its Ethics and Its Critics," Frontiers of Advertising Theory and Research, ed. Hugh Sargent, (Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books, 1972) p. 22.

25 Ibid. pp. 22--23.

26 Michael J. Stankey, An Interprofessional Perspective on Advertising Education, unpublished dissertation, (Urbana, IL: 1982) pp. 104--111.

27 See Sandage for a discussion of a "climate of sensitivity and wariness," p. 677.

28 The idea of social and economic values from which "ethical convictions grow" is taken from Charles F. Frazer, "Advertising Ethics: The Role of the Educator," Journal of Advertising, 8 (Winter 1979) pp. 43--46.

29 Ibid., p.44.

30 For a discussion of the cost of research versus its payoff, see Paul E. Green and Donald S. Tull, Research for Marketing Decisions, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978) pp. 34--64.

31 See Kim Rotzoll, "Future advertising education: ideas on a tentative discipline," Journalism Educator (Autumn 1985) pp. 37--41.

32 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, eds. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, (New York: Plenum Press, 1980), p. 299.

33 Stankey, p. 78.

34 Birthney Ardoin, "The Teaching of Ethics in Advertising Curricula: An Analysis of ACEJMC Accredited and Non-Accredited Programs and Programs in Business Administration," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (66th, Corvallis, OR August 6-9) ERIC: ED 232 162; CS 207 641, p. 3.

35 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, p. 300.

36 Ibid., p. 302.

37 Where Shall I Go to College to Study Advertising? ed. Billy I. Ross, (Lubbock: TX, Advertising Education Publications, 1987)

38 Russell, p. 579.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

General

This chapter will focus on the role of and the need for ethics in the practice of advertising. It will also focus on the content and goals for ethics instruction in education for advertising. A basic understanding of advertising ethics as a discipline to be studied and effectively taught is important to understanding how higher education can help foster personal and institutional ethical standards for practitioners and their advertising employers respectively. An historical perspective of advertising practices as they pertain to ethics is also necessary.

Recent History of Advertising Pertaining to Ethics

Advertising as a means of supporting media and a means of persuasive selling within the media is, for the most part, an exclusively American custom. The Media Environment by Stanley and Steinberg noted that "one of the spectacular differences between media in almost any country abroad and in the United States is the phenomenon of commercial advertising." (1)

However, in "The Making of a Consumer," George N. Gordon observed that advertising's roots in business did not immediately take a respectable hold with the American public:

> Advertising of some sort has almost always been intimately related to trade and commerce, neither of which, from the beginnings of mercantilism, ranked high in the strata of respectable occupations in the West, until the heroes of invention and production, like Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford, began to capture the fancy of the public at the beginning of the twentieth century. (2)

Today, even after the heroes of invention and production captured the public fancy and employed advertising, the advertising profession does not rank high in the strata of respectable professions. In fact, in 1985, advertising scholar Kim Rotzoll offered this assessment of the public attitude toward the advertising industry and toward the occupation of advertising practitioner:

> Simply, advertising is generally unloved. It may be tolerated, but it is rarely championed. It is the giver of jokes and the target of them. It displays more about our more selfish, grasping natures than we find comforting to address as often as it relentlessly forces us to. The public's judgment of its ethical standards places it at or near the bottom in virtually any occupational array. (3)

In "Popular Perceptions of Advertising Practitioners," Frazer and Biglow reported that several Gallup polls are "crushing in their consistency" in regard to public perceptions of the advertising profession. In those polls, advertising practitioners ranked last in terms of public perceptions of honesty and ethical standards. (4) In their own survey taken in the Denver area, Frazer and Biglow's findings "closely parallel(ed) those of Gallup." (5) In

terms of the reported amount of respect for 11 professions/occupations, advertising practitioners tied for last place with labor union leaders. (6)

Yet, the institution with its purported beginnings on cave walls and the walls in Herculaneum and Pompeii with announcements of the spectaculars of the day--gladiator shows; the institution that flourished with the advent of the printing press, has nowhere found a more receptive climate than in the United States, according to Mass Culture, The Popular Arts in America. (7)

Such receptivity was evident during the Civil War, when one of the nation's first advertising campaigns was launched and raised $2 billion for war bonds. (8) After that, drug and patent medicine advertising flourished and an enterprising J. Walter Thompson persuaded magazines to accept advertising; he bought up the space and resold it, ushering in the era of the "space broker." (9) Sandage et. al. reported that in the era from roughly 1840 to 1915 "advertising evolved from an isolated phenomenon to encompass virtually all of the essential forms, functions and forces of the contemporary institution. (10) The authors listed seven critical developments during this era:

1. National (producer) advertising emerged.
2. The advertising agency evolved from a space wholesaler to a full-service partner of business, replete with creative and research functions.
3. The commission system as a form of agency compensation was solidified.
4. The media came to rely upon advertising as a major subsidy.
5. Major criticism and organized self-regulation appeared.

6. Advertising organizations developed.
7. Serious discussions of advertising theory and tactics became apparent. (11)

A concentration on the "hard sell"--contests, premiums, and "reason why" appeals was a reaction to the Great Depression when advertising volume dropped from a 1929 high of $3.4 billion to a low of $1.3 billion in 1933. (12) Kaufman noted that "gimmicks were needed to coax money from empty pockets." (13)

The man who once tried to sell Edsels and a founder of one of the nation's current top ten ad agencies in terms of income, (14) Fairfax M. Cone, entered the business before the Great Depression:

> When I came into the business, the objections were almost all against specific advertisements where the truth was violated almost as a matter of course; where, for instance, cures were promised for incurable diseases and fortunes assured from the purest of blue-sky investments. (15)

In 1969, Cone wrote that this had changed. But he still warned that advertising's critics, including government officials, naively saw advertising as an agent that conditioned people not to think for themselves, hypnotic in its effect, mesmerizing consumers into helpless brand slavery. (16)

> Altogether, it is the view from the ivory tower that the manufacturers and distributors of consumer goods, and the advertising people who represent them, exercise their wills and their wiles over a public that is entirely unaware of what is being done to it. To which I can only reply that this shows an amazing contempt for the intelligence, the purpose and the wisdom of the great mass of men and women around us. (17)

Cone wrote during the lingering wake of two best-selling

books on advertising that had been written over a decade earlier, The Hidden Persuaders and Madison Avenue U.S.A. Both advanced many ideas for ethical rumination.

In The Hidden Persuaders, Vance Packard conjured up images of advertisers as "depth manipulators" who were "in their operations beneath the surface of American life, starting to acquire a power of persuasion that is becoming a matter of justifiable public scrutiny and concern." (18) Packard saw "anti-humanistic implications" in the advertising practitioners who typically saw Americans as "bundles of day-dreams, misty hidden yearnings, guilt complexes, irrational emotional blockages." (19) In his chapter, "The Question of Morality," Packard posed eight "profoundly disturbing questions about the kind of society they (advertisers) are seeking to build for us." (20)

> --What is the morality of the practice of encouraging housewives to be nonrational and impulsive in buying the family food?
>
> --What is the morality of playing upon hidden weaknesses and frailties--such as our anxieties, aggressive feelings, dread of nonconformity, and infantile hang-overs--to sell products? Specifically, what are the ethics of businesses that shape campaigns designed to thrive on these weaknesses they have diagnosed?
>
> --What is the morality of manipulating small children even before they reach the age where they are legally responsible for their actions?
>
> --What is the morality of treating voters like customers and child customers seeking father images at that?
>
> --What is the morality of exploiting our deepest sexual sensitivities and yearnings for commercial purposes?
>
> --What is the morality of appealing for our charity by playing upon our secret desires for self-enhancement?

> --What is the morality of developing in the public an attitude of wastefulness toward national resources by encouraging the "psychological obsolescence" of products already in use?
>
> --What is the morality of subordinating truth to cheerfulness in keeping the citizen posted on the state of his nation? (21)

In another best-seller that contained thought-provoking ideas about morality, nearly three decades ago Martin Mayer in Madison Avenue U.S.A. used nature metaphors to advance the notion that advertising reflects society but scarcely controls it:

> The essential materialism of democratic communities does not derive from the rain of advertising appeals, but from the soil itself." ... "If you try to charge it with a primary responsibility for the present state of our society, or for the future happiness of mankind, you move into the magical forest of a child's fairy tale, and you leave the real world of palpable trees." (22)

Mayer concentrated less on the consumer effects of advertising and more on the motives and methods of the advertising agency:

> The most interesting cultural phenomenon created by advertising is the advertising community itself, with its strange blend of assertion and obedience, prosperity and insecurity, flamboyance and timidity. In the agencies, especially, at the heart of advertising, endless confusions of purpose, functions, organization and status create a nervous, overworked and overstimulated internal society. At the root of it all lies professional standing. Organized as a profession, as a number of independent firms which offer their clients nothing more or less than the developed skills of the staff, advertising has not been able consistently to establish the long-term client relations which are the economic foundation of professional practice. In the absence of stable agency-client relations or accepted ethical standards to govern the solicitation of clients, the agencies must compete with each other as businesses, although what they offer is a professional service... When professional services aggressively compete with each other for clients, the weapons they find at hand are flattery, boastfulness, scorn and servility. These

are the vices of advertising. (23)

In terms of the vices of advertising, Advertising Procedure offered the following three transgressions: First, that advertising fosters dissatisfaction among the poor by encouraging an unrealistic level of consumption. Second, that advertising communicates a totally unrealistic view of American life. Third, that advertising sometimes makes offensive presentations to certain groups, to women and minorities, for example. (24)

Such vices of advertising, according to the authors of The Media Environment, have resulted in "some excoriating criticism of the media by a number of eminent critics in various disciplines": (25)

> ...the most articulate of whom have been John Kenneth Galbraith and Arnold Toynbee. Professor Toynbee implied that media distribute large quantities of frivolous material because of advertiser domination. Professor Galbraith is even more direct and acerbic. The money spent on advertising products could be spent better by allocating it to various social and ecological needs in the public sector. (26)

On the other hand, advertising through America's media can be viewed as essential support for a wide variety of programming and opinions that Americans otherwise would not have or would have to pay large amounts of money for, and can be viewed as a significant factor for a healthy economy. (27)

Ethical Concerns in Advertising

Advertising is usually part of a larger marketing effort, is usually persuasive in nature, and usually appeals to self-interest and acquisitiveness. (28) Associated with

each of these attributes are ethical problems involving the practitioner, the marketer (client) and the intended receiver of persuasive advertising messages, the American consumer. This section will consider ethical concerns as advertising practitioners relate to clients and the consumer.

Materialism, Myth, Magic and Manipulation

The seemingly acquisitive or materialistic nature of consumers will first be examined for ethical implications. What came first, advertising or materialism? In other words, one area of ethical investigation centers on whether advertising makes people materialistic or whether they are predisposed to being so. In Advertising Theory and Practice, Sandage et. al. presented the following view:

> Advertising, when it is successful, reacts to existing predispositions, this argument goes. Thus, people were materialistic long before advertising became such a major presence in society, and if the ills of society are to be remedied it is better to start by attempting to change individuals themselves through the educational systems, appropriate legislation, and so on. Here advertising is a mirror of what already exists. In short, it works well when it reflects, not when it attempts to shape in directions that individuals are not already leaning anyway. (29)

Advertising practitioner Draper Daniels said that "blaming advertising for the ills of society is like blaming your mirror for the wart on your nose." (30) Yet, as Sandage et. al. reported, some argue that advertising does our society wrong by "elevating material goods to levels of esteem far beyond their functional capabilities." (31)

Others, like Theodore Levitt, argued that advertising

infuses America with a crucial kind of "mythical" imagery. In an eloquent essay, "Advertising and Its Adversaries," Levitt claimed "the consumer refuses to settle for pure operating functionality. For a woman, dusting powder in a sardine can is not the same product as the identical dusting powder in an exotic Paisley package." (32) To Levitt, advertising rescues the average American from the materialistically mundane. The consumer wants truth, but "he also wants and needs the alleviating imagery and tantalizing promises of the advertiser..." (33) "Thus, the issue is not prevention of distortion," said Levitt, "It is, in the end, to know what kinds of distortions we actually want so that each of our lives is, without apology, duplicity, or rancor, made more bearable." (34)

Such alleviating imagery advertising critic Howard Luck Gossage called "magic" in "The Guilded Bough: Magic and Advertising." (35) Unlike Levitt's notion that the "mythology" of advertising can enrich lives, Gossage's notion of advertising magic was the kind of "enrichment" that profits bring. (36) Gossage said:

> The chief concern of our era is the consumption of goods and services. It is a big job, but to assist we have the biggest propaganda force the world has ever seen, advertising. (37)

Gossage left the impression that advertising preys on materialistic dupes, and "if some advertising is more blatantly guilty of magical thinking than others," he wrote, it is because some audiences are more simple-minded." (38) To Gossage, curiosities like Levitt's exotic Paisley package

entice the consumer "beyond natural and ordinary logic" (39) and into the realm of rhinoceros horns and queen bee honey:

> (An) example of imitative magic--in that it is based on the assumption that effect will resemble cause--is the use of powdered rhinoceros horn, which I understand is highly prized in the Far East as an adjunct to virility; look how powerful the rhino is! I don't know what powdered rhinoceros horn costs, but its users probably find it worth the price. Analogous to this was the recent rage for queen bee jelly. One supposes that it served to satisfy a womanly urge to the extreme, uncompetitive femininity; to be the only queen bee in the hive. Or could it be that women have some deep, unconscious impulse to mate in mid-air? (40)

The ethical implications of materialism then, and whether advertising reflects a healthy pursuit of necessary myth or attempts to magically manipulate the ignorant, constitute one of many problems found in the literature associated with the persuasive marketing strategy known as advertising.

Media and Client Relationships

In addition to the materialistic relationship between advertiser and consumer, another relationship to come under ethical scrutiny is the relationship of advertising to the media it supports. Stanley and Steinberg suggested that it remains the responsibility of the media to "accept only advertising that meets their own (the media's) high standards of excellence and honesty." (41)

The authors of Responsibility in Mass Communication offered what they believe is the most important principle that should govern the relationship of advertiser to media:

The most important is that information and opinion

> should be free of advertiser control--except, of course, advertising information, which should conform to acceptable standards of accuracy and reliability. (42)

Advertiser control is typically exerted by withdrawing or threatening to withdraw advertising support, should the advertiser not agree with the information and opinions expressed in a particular medium's programming. (43) Advertising ethicists say that the advertiser should not put the media under such pressure, but if it happens the media should resist. (44)

As the advertising business has been accused of manipulating the public and dictating media content through either withholding or liberally doling out advertising dollars, it has also been accused of compromising the integrity of the agency/client relationship. (45) One area of ethical concern in the agency/client relationship involves an agency's use of privileged client information.

How does an agency "handle" a request from a prospective client who wants sensitive information about a competitor? One practitioner reported that such a request "borders on industrial espionage":

> In my opinion, businessmen are confronted with considerably more ethical decisions in the course of their careers than they would care to admit. I believe the most prevalent cases involve obtaining confidential information. Knowing what your competitor plans to do before he does it is a tremendous advantage, and obtaining such information any way you can get it without getting caught is becoming an accepted business practice. (46)

Another agency/client ethical problem involves the traditional billing procedure, where it appears in the best

financial interest of the agency to place as much of the client's advertising as they can in the media. When, as is sometimes the case, the principal source of an agency's income is the commission allowed it by the advertising media (not direct payment by the client) the ethics of this method come into question. Critics question if all the advertising recommended by the agency is always necessary. In Advertising: Its Role in Modern Marketing, Dunn and Barban gave an example of possible abuse of the commission system:

> In recent years, many advertisers and even some agency leaders have criticized the commission system, saying that it may tempt an agency to recommend an advertising program using expensive media or, conversely, a program in which few services are provided. It is often true that the time spent on an account is not necessarily in proportion to the dollar expenditures of that account. For example, a $50,000 page in a magazine may not require any more agency time and effort than a $500 one in a trade paper. (47)

About two-thirds of agency income is from media commissions, with the balance from fees and other charges. (48)

The State of Advertising Ethics

John O'Toole, author of The Trouble with Advertising, says that advertising's role in society is of lesser magnitude than its visibility. (49) His observations that follow address some of the aforementioned criticisms of advertising:

> ...high visibility calls attention to abuses, excesses, and ineptitude. Abuses, in the form of false or misleading ads, are increasingly rare as the result of industry self-regulation. Excesses, however, do not seem to be diminishing as the volume of advertising grows. Television clutter irritates the public as more and more commercials are crammed into the same amount of time.

> And ineptitude will be with us until there is enough objective evidence to convince the most recalcitrant that advertising that consumers say "insults their intelligence" is not as effective as advertising that pleases them.
>
> Thus, it is incumbent upon all of us who practice this craft to be constantly aware of its high profile, to recognize that advertising is an "uninvited guest" whose presence is suffered as long as it behaves itself, to understand that advertising's role in society--as crucial as it may appear to us--will be played by something else if we fail to observe advertising's responsibility to society. (50)

A supporting view of the current state of advertising ethics comes from historian Stephen Fox, who concludes that advertisers are not relentless manipulators:

> The people who have created modern advertising are not hidden persuaders pushing our buttons in the service of some malevolent purpose. They are just producing an especially visible manifestation, good and bad, of the American way of life. (51)

Still, when it comes to a question of quality communication in reflecting the American way of life today, writers like Benson believe that truth hangs in the balance:

> ...there are still many deceptive ads; do they help make deceptive people? There is agreement among most critics that it could usefully undertake to inform prospective buyers more about products, including the danger of misuse. (52)

To Benson, efforts are currently being made to raise the quality of advertising, but these efforts meet "with only partial success." (53)

While the literature indicates that compared to earlier days of patent medicines, the "hard sell" and other occasions for ethical concern, advertising has seemed to become more conscious of ethical implications if not more ethical, (54)

there remain two "camps" in terms of determining responsibility for ensuring that advertisers don't slip back into their old ways.

In The Permissible Lie, Samm Sinclair Baker called for those in the advertising business to make a concern for the welfare of others a cornerstone of advertising:

> To all admen and all businessmen I urge that they consider "ethics" not just a word, but in the full meaning expressed by Albert Schweitzer: "Ethics means concern not only with our own welfare but also with that of others, and with that of human society as a whole... improvement of the condition of this world." (55)

On the other hand, some businessmen consider any attempt at social responsibility to be phony and counterproductive to the ultimate mission of good business. One businessman put it this way:

> It is the responsibility of business to make a profit. It is the responsibility of government to see that management conducts its business within the law and, if the law does not protect the public adequately, to create new laws. (56)

Regulation as a Means of Ethical Susasion

Part of the American way of life is the freedom and power to exercise influence on ethical decision making in advertising. (57) Advertising's responsibility to a society of consumers, clients and media is manifested in five distinct ways: through government regulation, through media regulation, through consumer groups, through self (institutional)-regulation by means of codes, and through individual values that may ultimately govern how an advertising practitioner acts in a given situation with

ethical ramifications. (58)

Many safeguards against potential abuses of advertising are legal in nature. In Business Ethics in America George C.S. Benson wrote that the United States largely ignores ethical instruction and, consequently, enforcement of rules and laws becomes a main means of introducing ethical standards. (59)

There are several perspectives on whether the government is protecting the public adequately and whether advertisers are doing a good job of policing themselves. Levitt may have claimed that the consumer yearns for escape from the commonplace, but he did not claim the consumer must accept without question or challenge all the commercial propaganda to which he or she is exposed each day:

> ...or that we must accept out of hand the equation that effluence is the price of affluence, or the simple notion that business cannot and government should not try to alter and improve the position of the consumer vis-a-vis the producer. It takes a special kind of perversity to continue any longer our shameful failure to mount vigorous, meaningful programs to protect the consumer, to standardize product grades, labels, and packages, to improve the consumer's information-getting process, and to mitigate the vulgarity and oppressiveness that is in so much of our advertising. (60)

Of interest to the study of modern advertising is the extent that government, often called upon to be a regulator of advertising, is itself a big spender on advertising. In 1984, the federal government spent $287.8 million on advertising--making it the twenty-sixth largest advertiser in the nation. Indicative of the modern phenomenon of service sector advertising, government expenditures on advertising

are expected to increase. (61) Scholars now wonder about the ethical implications of the regulator practicing the persuasive business of the regulated. (62)

Advertising's Functions: Four Premises for Ethical Consideration

To understand the ethical implications of advertising, it is important to comprehend the cultural and economic context in which advertising functions. Therefore, Christians et. al. in Media Ethics have identified four premises that serve as essential background for an understanding of advertising ethics. These are: 1.) Advertising must be considered in light of cultural expectations; 2.) The advertising process has varied intents and effects; 3.) Advertising's actual effects are usually not clearly known; 4.) Advertising is an ambiguous subject capable of many different interpretations. (63)

"To understand advertising, then, we must be clear about what a given culture expects of it," according to Media Ethics: (64)

> ...the "rules" allow for enterprising businesspeople to pursue their self-interests through various merchandising activities, including advertising. ...It is considered appropriate to attempt to persuade. This tells us something concerning our general assumptions about human nature. For why would we permit wanton persuasion to plague a helpless public? Simply because we believe the public is not helpless, but armed with reason, guile, and a certain savvy about how to make one's way in the market. (65)

The second of the basic premises supports the theory that communication is a complex undertaking. Advertising does

not operate under the "bullet" theory of communication; people are not "shot" with an ad, thereby becoming benumbed dupes. (66) This is an oversimplification of advertising's power. Similarly, advertising and its intents and effects cannot be oversimplified in one sweeping generalization ("Advertising is..." for example, "irritating.") because as Christians et. al. noted, "advertisers are attempting to reach and influence individuals for an enormous variety of reasons" (67) --individuals who exhibit a wide variety of responses to ads:

> ...it has been observed that there are usually four general levels of potential advertising response: unconscious, immediate perceptual, retention or learning, and behavioral. Then, within the immediate perceptual level, seven more common responses can be observed: entertainment, irritation, familiarity, empathy, confusion, informativeness, and brand reinforcement. The latter response in particular reminds us of the impressive evidence that suggests that the predominant effect of much advertising is not the seduction of the innocent, but the reinforcement of the behavior and judgment of those who already act as some advertisers wish. (68)

The third premise belies the "slick" appearance of elaborate media plans, the scientific allure of psychographic studies, and the seemingly sophisticated tenor of message strategies. According to Stephen Fox, author of The Mirror Makers, ad creators do not entirely know what they are doing. (69) Similarly, Truth in Advertising... and other heresies, observed, "Our greatest privilege as human beings, I think, is to have the capacity of knowing that someone soon or late will shatter that which we know with so much certainty--to erect rationale he will probably

worship with equally tenuous certainty." (70) In The Mirror Makers, Stephen Fox emphasized the sense of uncertainty associated with advertising:

> Outsiders see only the smooth, expertly contrived finished product, often better crafted than the programming and editorial material it interrupts. Insiders know the messy process of creating an ad, the false starts, rejected ideas, midnight despair, the failures and account losses and creative angst behind any ad that finally appears. (71)

The fourth premise involves the concept of selective perception. Basically, when it comes to awarding advertisings' laurels or lamenting its shortfalls, people see what they want to see. Personal values "color" our perception of advertising and its apparent objectives. (Of course, when defending or deprecating the institution, it is important to be talking about the same kind of advertising. As Christians et. al. emphasize, "business-to-business advertising, for example, is quite different in purpose, content and media form than most consumer advertising directed to individuals." (72)

For an example of how values influence perceptions of advertisements, consider the arena of television ads targeted toward the young. Some may believe ads currently run by the American military to be a manifestation of patriotism and an effective means to offer valuable information regarding careers. On the other hand, other Americans may perceive the ads as a waste of taxpayer money or as playing on the malleable emotions of susceptible teenagers.

In sum, from the days of colonial newspaper ads for the

return of runaway slaves to the times of "Be all that you can be!" television ads for the modern-day army, certain premises with ethical implications have survived and are under heavy scrutiny today.

Self-Regulation

By 1970, advertisers were greatly concerned about the scrutiny afforded their ads and about the interventionist power of government. When one speaks of government regulation--or lack of it-- one speaks of three monumental forces in American life: the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. (73) The FCC enforces rules regarding the types of products that may be advertised on broadcast media, the number and frequency of commercials allowed within a certain period of time, and what broadcast programs and commercials may or may not state or show. (74) The FTC Lancaster saw as "one of the most powerful quasi-independent federal regulatory agencies," and referred to the FTC's "apparently awesome powers over advertising." (75) The FTC controls unfair business practices of advertisers and agencies and takes action on false and deceptive advertising.

Therefore, if one adheres to Gordon's notion that because of its necessarily persuasive nature "advertising must, at present, involve deception to some degree" (76) and if one concurs with the view of business cited earlier that it is the responsibility of government to see that management

conducts its business within the law, then perhaps one can accept the intervention of the FTC and the FCC in advertising matters. That is, of course, if one does not believe that all advertising should be given the same rights as afforded print media under the First Amendment. But "it would be incorrect, based on current precedents, to say that advertising has the full protection that noncommercial speech has." (77) Nonetheless, free speech or not, in 1970 advertising practitioners felt it incumbent upon themselves to "get their own house in order" and create the National Advertising Review Board. (78)

The National Advertising Review Board (NARB) was set up to investigate complaints and monitor deceptive and unfair practices. (79)

Assessment of the effectiveness of self-policing depends on one's perspective. In Business Ethics in America, Benson said that the "advertising-industry enforcement machinery is to be commended." (80) But Rivers et. al. claimed the NARB is not "genuinely diligent" in its efforts, and, consequently, "the public can be excused for its discontent and even occasional hostility against advertising..." (81)

Rivers et. al. believed the media that "really hope to serve the public good will do well to hold advertisers to the Advertising Code of American Business. (82) Reprinted below is the text of "Advertising Principles of American Business," adopted in 1984 by the membership of the

American Advertising Federation.

Truth. Advertising shall tell the truth, and shall reveal significant facts, the omission of which would mislead the public.

Substantiation. Advertising claims shall be substantiated by evidence in possession of the advertiser and advertising agency, prior to making such claims.

Comparisons. Advertising shall refrain from making false, misleading, or unsubstantiated statements or claims about a competitor or his products or services.

Bait advertising. Advertising shall not offer products or services for sale unless such offer constitutes a bona fide effort to sell the advertised products or services and is not a device to switch consumers to other goods or services, usually higher priced.

Guarantees and Warranties. Advertising of guarantees and warranties shall be explicit, with sufficient information to apprise consumers of their principal terms and limitations or, when space or time restrictions preclude such disclosures, the advertisement should clearly reveal where the full text of the guarantee or warranty can be examined before purchase.

Price Claims. Advertising shall avoid price claims which are false or misleading, or savings claims which do not offer provable savings.

Testimonials. Advertising containing testimonials shall be limited to those of competent witnesses who are reflecting a real and honest opinion or experience.

Taste and Decency. Advertising shall be free of statements, illustrations or implications which are offensive to good taste or public decency. (83)

The Individual

Otto Kleppner's Advertising Procedure stated that the most meaningful form of advertising self-regulation is that of the advertiser. (84) Taking this reasoning a step further, entertain the idea that the ethical choices of an advertiser are often instigated by individuals; perhaps the

individual makes but "small choices"--say deciding to change copy from "The Greatest Sale in Oklahoma History!" to "The Greatest Sale in Our Furniture Store's History!" but he and his cohorts make choices nonetheless, the sum total of which can result in deception and the exercise of poor taste or in truthfulness and the exercise of good taste. Therefore, an examination of personal ethics is important to an understanding of the ethical underpinnings of the advertising business. After all, students of advertising may best relate to ethical dilemmas on a personal basis: "What would I do if I were in that practitioner's shoes?" (85)

Media Ethics stressed that "only the individual is truly personal and therefore an authentic moral agent:"

> It is true that a firm or institution, when infused and animated by a single spirit and organized into a single institution, is more than the mere sum of discrete entities and has a personality of its own. It is also true that such institutions can in a sense be held accountable for their deeds and become the object of moral approval or disapproval. But only in a limited sense. Such institutions are real enough, but they lack concreteness. Those we seek to call into account while reasoning morally are not organizations or generalities, but precisely individuals. These alone are existing and responsible agents and alone can be praised or blamed. (86)

Geller asked the question: "Is there something wrong with the advertising code? The answer, obviously, is that there is something amiss in its observance rather than the code itself." (87) Codes, by their very nature, tend to be ambiguous and deal in generalities, and often they deal with what should not be done rather than what should. (88) As Rivers et. al. observed:

> For the New Morality as for the older ones, for the philosopher as for the mass media employees, public good and personal responsibility must be defined jointly out of the public philosophy and law, as one understands those, and out of one's personal concept of values and ethics." (89)

The above emphasizes "one"--the individual. In 1979 Krugman and Ferrell published a study of the ethical beliefs of a key individual in the advertising process, the advertising manager. The study focused on how these advertising practitioners--from agencies and from corporations--perceived behavioral situations related to ethics within their organizations. The researchers listed 16 behaviors that may be perceived as ethical problems and asked the managers to rate them in terms of their own attitudes about ethics, the ethics of their peers, the ethics of their top management, and their opportunities to engage in such potentially unethical situations. The results were that agency practitioners did not consider such items as falsifying time and quality/ quantity reports, padding an expense account more than 10 percent, and manipulating a situation to make a superior look bad to be as unethical as did corporate practitioners. (90) Krugman and Ferrell's recommendation was to go beyond specific agency codes and get to know the individual:

> Given the direction of the findings, it appears that advertising agency management would benefit from not only laying out normative standards of behavior but from investigating the beliefs of the personnel with their firms. This may lead to a more concrete understanding of how the individual makeup of any firm may ultimately affect the actions of the firm. (91)

In another study of practitioners, "Advertising Agency

Practitioners' Perceptions of Ethical Decisions," Rotzoll and Christians asked 123 individuals from three large and one small advertising agency the following questions:

1) Do you feel that you encounter ethical decisions in the practice of your job?

2) If not, please explain why you feel these types of decisions do not arise in your work.

3) If you do...

(a) Please indicate how frequently these decisions arise.

(b) Please describe, in a paragraph or two, the types of situations in which you typically encounter the most important of these decisions. (92)

Most of the respondents said they did encounter ethical decision-making in their work. The advertising message and the agency/client relationship were the two "dimensions" of concern involving ethical decision-making. (93)

Under the advertising message category, three areas of concern emerged: what should be advertised?; how should the message be crafted?; where does the ethical decision making reside? (94)

Under agency/client relationship three main areas also emerged: the conflict between serving the client's best interests and serving the agency's best interests (whether to spend additional dollars, for example); billing practices (do you cover up and even bill expensive agency mistakes?); and handling requests for client confidential information (market research, for example) from the client's competitor. (95)

> These data suggest that agency personnel typically follow the standard of immediate consequences when

> deciding how to act. When faced with problematical situations, the advertising practitioners who returned our questionnaires tended to ask about the direct effect of their behavior on the client and on the usual mores that prevail in the advertising agency. Occasionally, other appeals emerged also: How can I best serve my own individual interests (ethical egoism), what is that right thing regardless of particular circumstances (Kant's universalizability principle), is it illegal? But more than two-thirds of the respondents justified their decision on the grounds that it yielded the greatest benefit to the client or agency. (96)

As demonstrated in the next section, the rationale or "thinking through" process used by advertising practitioners in reaching and justifying ethical decisions is a matter of utmost importance to teaching advertising ethics.

Teaching Ethics in Higher Education

Benson cited a study by Baumhart in which 58 of 100 businessmen interviewed chose "What my feelings tell me is right" as first or second out of nine proposed bases for ethics. (97) This prompts a natural question: Where did those "feelings" originate? Are they well-grounded in ethics education? Benson said, "Institutions of higher education have to date seemed quite ineffective in teaching business ethics, but are now displaying a little interest." (98) But he also conceded that the teaching of ethics is a "very difficult task. In our somewhat cynical society, lectures on ethics are likely to be ignored." (99)

Lectures on advertising ethics are likely to include some general ethics background from a variety of ethical perspectives. The five most prevalent ethical guidelines in the Western tradition are Aristotle's Golden Mean, Kant's

Categorical Imperative, Mill's Principle of Utility, Rawls's Veil of Ignorance, and Judeo-Christian perspective. (100) These perspectives represent ethics theory, as opposed to applied ethics. Applied ethics has been defined as "an attempt to make use of ethical theory and moral rules to arrive at concrete moral judgments in specific circumstances." (101)

One area of concern in teaching ethics in advertising education and, for that matter, in almost any facet of higher education, involves "how much" and "when" regarding the mixture of instruction in theory and applied ethics.

Theoretical and Applied Ethics

Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum (102), unless otherwise noted, provides the basis for the following discussion of ethics theory, applied ethics, and their place in the university curriculum.

Aristotle claimed that the study of ethics should not begin until after the age of thirty; until that time, students do not have sufficient maturity and experience. A few educators claim that any kind of ethics education, practical, theoretical or a combination of both should not be "wasted" on undergraduates. For most, however, the question of ethics in the curriculum boils down to how much ethics education is enough and when during the student's career is the best time to teach ethics. Also, some educators maintain that without first a foundation in ethical theory, a student

cannot begin to analyze the "cases" that often make up the study of ethics applied to a particular profession. Yet, can students maintain interest in ethical theory for very long without getting down to cases? Of course, that depends on the student. Rosen and Caplan do find some practical application infused in basically theoretical approaches and, similarly, find some theory involved in basically practical approaches. The two "schools" can and do meet:

> Most contemporary anthologies and textbooks on ethics provide selections or chapters on what might be broadly termed "applied" subjects. In textbooks and anthologies in such avowedly applied fields as bioethics, we note a trend to include chapter and selections on ethical theory. The issue between the two schools now seems to be how much theory and how much application to include rather than whether pure theory or pure application is the correct approach. (103)

Media Ethics made a case for communications students to be "well-grounded" in ethical theory as a boon to examining their moral reasoning. The authors contended that too often "students and practitioners argue about individual sensational incidents, make case-by-case decisions, and do not stop to examine their method of moral reasoning." (104)

To get beyond the simplistic evocative-expressive level of examination of ethical issues, the authors recommended that "a pattern of moral deliberation should be explicitly outlined where the relevant considerations are isolated and given appropriate weight." (105) Therefore, students and others can "learn to analyze stages of decision-making, focus on the real levels of conflict, and make defensible ethical decisions. This test can illustrate how competent moral

justification takes place." (106)

One such test recommended by Media Ethics is the Potter Box, which "introduces four dimensions of moral analysis and aids us in locating those places where most misunderstandings occur." (107) The use of such a model for students to "sort out" definitions, values, loyalties, and principles could be a sign of creative teaching in lessons on advertising ethics.

Other Perceptions

Apart from theoretical versus applied ethics several other dichotomous perceptions of ethics courses prevail. Among them: moralizing versus philosophizing and ethics versus values.

Should an ethics course be the place where prescriptive views about morality are ingrained in students? Callahan and Bok are dead set against it:

> Indoctrination, whether political, theological, ideological, or philosophical, is wholly out of place in the teaching of ethics. Although students should be assisted in developing moral ideals and fashioning a coherent way of approaching ethical theory and moral dilemmas, the task of the teacher is not to promote a special set of values, but only to promote those sensitivities and analytical skills necessary to help students reach their own moral judgments. (108)

Although sometimes in conversation the terms "ethics" and "values" are used interchangably, Rosen and Caplan point out that there are at least four different perceptions of the word "values" that scholars adhere to. For example, some use the word "values" not only to encompass morality, but to

indicate there are dimensions of valuation in addition to that of morality. "Such persons believe that political, economic, social and ideological values are as important, if not more important, to the understanding of moral issues than the pronouncements of moral philosophers." (109)

Rosen and Caplan also noted that those involved in the teaching of ethics to undergraduates have "drastically different conceptions" of what should be taught. (110)

Not only is the content of ethics courses up for debate, so is the place in the curriculum. Sloan reported that throughout most of the nineteenth century, the most important course in the college curriculum was moral philosophy. It was usually taught by the college president and was required of all college seniors as the capstone of the curriculum. Its aim was to help students integrate their entire college experience and gain an ethical sensitivity that would not only benefit the student in his job but also the society as a whole. (111) The advent of operational utility changed that.

The Pervasive Method

"Higher education for operational utility is the education to equip a student to operate in society at large or to perform the specific tasks demanded by his job," according to Michael R. Harris in Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education. (112) As the nineteenth century American literary college was supplanted by colleges with an egalitarian orientation and a bent for the practical,

sometimes ethics was taught as a "catch-as-catch-can" proposition in various courses as an ethical topic "came up." (113) As we shall see, some advertising educators today believe in this approach. Callahan and Bok eschew such an approach:

> Although moral problems ought to be faced when they arise in the context of other courses...reliance should not be placed upon such sporadic encounters as a substitute for the availability of well-organized, full courses. No other serious subject is taught in the curriculum by what has been called the "pervasive method," and ethics ought not to be the outcast. (114)

Goals and Ideas for Teaching Ethics

Five educational goals have been proposed in The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education:

Stimulating the Moral Imagination. Attempt to engage the emotions and feelings of students, to help them to see that we live our lives in a "web of moral relationships." Help students to recognize that moral positions and rules can be actual suffering or happiness, and to accept the fact that moral conflicts are often inevitable and difficult.

Recognizing Ethical Issues. After emotional involvement, make a conscious, rational attempt to "identify those elements that represent appraisal and judgment."

Developing Analytical Skills. Do this by "careful dissection of arguments, by an attempt to understand both the logical and social implications of our moral stands, by attempts to understand the importance of coherence and consistency."

Eliciting a Sense of Moral Obligation and Personal Responsibility. Why should I be moral? "It makes no sense to talk of ethics unless one presupposes that individuals have some freedom to make moral choices and that they are responsible for the choices they make."

Tolerating--and Resisting--Disagreement and Ambiguity. "We can and do differ with our closest friends on matters of ethics, and many ethical issues admit no final, clear resolution. Nonetheless, while there must be toleration of disagreement and ambiguity, there must no less be an attempt to locate and clarify the sources of disagreement, to resolve ambiguity as far as possible, and to see if ways can be found to overcome differences of moral viewpoint and theory." (115)

Other ideas, less theoretical and more practical, have been advanced in terms of the effective teaching of ethics. One obstacle to overcome is the perception of teacher as "trickster"--that the teacher can make any view seem good or bad because he is trained to do so:

> To help overcome the students' sense of being tricked, the teacher can present a problem or an issue concerning which the teacher does not have a solution. The teacher can present the issue, along with proposed solutions or theories, and then try to show why each is unsatisfactory. This does not commit one to the view that there is no solution, indeed, one can always express confidence that a solution will be reached. It does give the students a sense, though, that the teacher is not omniscient. (116)

Other approaches to pedagogical problems in the teaching of ethics to undergraduates include moral negotiation, a method of discussion that has both "sides" of an issue

clarifying their positions and working cooperatively; and "dispensability" where the teacher is always on guard not to choose for the student the "correct" theory or even the method of choosing a correct theory, but instead "works himself out of a job" by allowing students that freedom of choice. (117)

The above discussion sets forth certain goals that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of an ethics course or a lesson in ethics. One major question remains: Who is qualified to teach ethics? Obviously, not all advertising educators have a background in ethics. Similarly, not all philosophers have a background in business communications. In such a case, team teaching has been recommended by some. "The initial goal of team teaching," according to Rosen and Caplan, "should be the mutual education of the instructors." A second goal should be that the theoretical material be "tightly integrated" with the applied material. (118)

Callahan and Bok said that the university offers a unique context for the examination of ethics and defined exactly the role of the professional school in this examination:

> We ask only that such an examination be made formal and explicit, and that sufficient imagination, energy, and resources be invested in the teaching of ethics that its importance will become manifest, both within and outside of the university.
>
> ...The teaching of ethics in professional schools ought to prepare future professionals to understand the types of moral issues they are likely to confront in their chosen vocations, introduce them to the moral ideals of their profession, and assist them in understanding the relationship between their professional work and that of the broader values and needs of the society. (119)

Teaching Ethics in the Journalism and Advertising Curriculum

Two Approaches to the Curriculum

Advertising education mirrors its host discipline, journalism/communications, in that it is faced with what Rotzoll calls an "ongoing educational dichotomy: the inductive/practice-specific approach and the deductive/principles-first approach." (120) In other words, how much emphasis should be placed on skills courses that reflect current advertising practice and how much emphasis should be placed on the "why" courses, the theory and applied theory courses, which would include advertising ethics?

Stankey wrote:

> ...the attitude of many practitioners has been that "you can't teach advertising in the classroom" and "advertising courses are a waste of time." They have recommended instead a broad background devoid of advertising training coupled with on-the-job training in advertising techniques. Educators have generally touted the value of university-based training for careers in advertising, but have failed to agree on the proper content or orientation. (121)

The 1900's saw a major push for professionalization for advertisers, and the advertising establishment of that era favored university instruction in advertising. Emulating the classical professions, such as law and medicine, advertising leaders hoped to standardize advertising techniques and to formalize advertising education. (122) Therefore, students could get a background in advertising and consequently waste less of the agency's precious and expensive time in basic

training. (123) However, such a convenience for the profession and a boon to enrollment for the journalism schools was not and is still not without its detractors, particularly as that convenience pertains to vocationalism. And although progress has been made with the objectives of standardizing advertising techniques and formalizing advertising education, they remain controversial issues to this day. (124)

Journalism as a "Moral Enterprise"

In assessing journalism education in terms of a liberal arts or a vocational "skills" approach in "Agenda for Journalism Education," Mencher said there is no way journalism schools can keep up with the latest, sometimes expensive technology in the field. But, he claims, J-schools can "pass on a way of thinking that marks the professional, some knowledge of the way the press works in a democracy, and the understanding that journalism is, above all, a moral enterprise. The rest the business itself can handle." (125)

The literature's answer to the liberal arts versus skills question as applied to journalism and advertising education seems to be "both." Planning for Change in Journalism Education, published in 1984, stated that many schools of journalism were "little more than trade schools" by the 1970's and 1980's and called for journalism schools to be "responsive to new social conditions and demands" as we continue to move from an industrial to an information society. (126)

In "Journalism courses are essential part of a liberal education," De Mott said it is time journalism and mass communication rid itself of its "inferiority complex" and demonstrate that a course in mass communication and society is an indispensable course in every college student's education. De Mott quoted James Reston: "...the mass communications of this country have more effect upon the American mind than all the schools and universities combined." (127)

Two Premises for the Future of Advertising Education

As to the advertising curriculum's projected role in affecting the American mind and guiding students of the 21st century, Rotzoll offered two premises.

First, he believed that advertising education will continue to reflect existing advertising practice. "This nonvisionary statement would seem to hold true regardless of the inductive or deductive philosophy pursued," he said. "We are, after all, involved in teaching students about a business they seek to enter." (128) Second, Rozoll believed advertising education can "mature" by concentrating on a principles-first approach "built around a corpus of knowledge in advertising's enduring areas of concern":

> Advertising encompasses certain recognizable functional (research, creative, media), synthesis (management, campaigns), and institutional (social and economic dimensions, ethics) areas in which there is a comfortable amount of normative material derived from accumulated advertising practice as well as theory development in such related fields as psychology, sociology, and communications. Emphasis on this material through a

> deductive approach to the educational task can, to some degree at least, free the advertising educator from the tyranny of the immediate, while better serving students, who emerge with principles rather than particulars. (129)

Rotzoll called the University of Missouri's journalism curriculum "relentlessly practice-oriented" and "still admired by many." (130) An associate professor at this school wrote that in preparing the advertising curriculum for the 1990's, Missouri has taken the following into account:

--The need to build every course on a strong theoretical base.

--Increased concentration on ethical and social issues.

--The need to provide practical experience, but not at the expense of learning how to think, reflect, and evaluate. (131)

Consequently, today even a practice-oriented school recognizes the need for addressing the "why" courses in the advertising curriculum, of which ethics can be an integral part.

Curricular Recommendations

A problem, of course, in any endeavor is the difference between merely recognizing a need and actually doing something about that need. To assist in the recognition and fulfillment of curricular needs, the Accrediting Council on Education for Journalism and Mass Communication has issued guidelines for advertising sequences. Among them: coursework that covers the economic, social and ethical issues of advertising. The ACEJMC makes it clear that all students should also have instruction in factual writing, editing,

communication law, ethics, theory, history and responsibilities of journalism and mass communication. Such teaching recommendations are important to understand as one assesses the reasoning that teaching advertising ethics as a separate course or as an intergral part of many advertising courses is prohibitive because the curriculum is already full. Such an attitude on the part of advertising educators will be probed as part of this study.

In addition, interdisciplinary courses through such departments as English, philosophy, psychology, sociology and speech have been recognized as potential contributors to the integration of practice-specific journalistic knowledge and general knowledge. This study will attempt to find out more about advertising educators' attitudes toward interdisciplinarity as well.

Marketing Communications

Another tack to take in ensuring plenty of curricular attention to, in this case, an understanding of the social and economic implications of advertising (of which ethics is an integral part) is to convert the major to a broad-based marketing communications major, particularly since some scholars and practitioners believe that those contemplating entering the advertising field do not benefit from a curriculum steeped in skills courses. John S. Wright leaned toward this approach, advocating the education of "advertising generalists from whose ranks the future leaders

of the advertising business complex will emerge." (132) He was not advising the abolition of the advertising major in favor of a liberal arts major (as some argue) but instead, combining the best curricular offerings of advertising and marketing education because "many employers in the advertising business...are attracted to marketing majors because they sense that the broad-gauged training within the business field is what is desired when adding new employees." (133)

Other Ideas That Influence the Journalism and Advertising Curriculum

It is now apparent that one cannot speak of the advertising ethics curriculum in journalism schools without paying heed to the journalism curriculum. In regard to the inductive/deductive problem in constructing the advertising/journalism curriculum, the following information about vocationalization, scholarship and professionalization may be useful:

--In the early 1960's the Ford and Carnegie Commissions criticized business schools for "overvocationalization." Consequently, many advertising programs were ushered out of the business schools and were taken up by the journalism schools. (134)

--Critics argue that we cannot teach advertising on a scholarly plane until we have more advertising educators who are scholars themselves. Stewart says, "It is the poor quality of current advertising research that effectively

prevents the development of advertising into an organized body of knowledge." (135)

--The development of advertising into an organized body of knowledge is sometimes considered one step toward elevating the status of advertising to a profession. Such status has not been achieved. Some argue that the quest for respectability through professionalization should not be the goal of academe--that academe must lead the institution of advertising and not simply mimic it or pander to it for funds. They say that academe must be a critic of the institution, particularly its ethical decision-making process. Others say that an agreement on mutual objectives by educators and practitioners as to the desired qualities of advertising majors is a step toward professionalization similar to that of the legal or medical professions. Yet others say that advertising was never meant to be a profession in the same sense that the licensed practices of law and medicine are, and that the principal effect of professionalism is to "erode the moral basis of society." Educator James Carey claimed "morality is in a peculiar state of decline today because "a dangerous relativism" has taken over in our society of specialized professions, like the law..." (136)

Overvocationalization of the curriculum, scholarship, and the quest for professional status through the aid of academe are important to understanding advertising education and the teaching of advertising ethics, since all three reflect a

certain "mind-set" or "posture" on the part of the advertising educator. The assumption is that an educator's stance in regard to student training, the educator's own scholarship, and academe's relationship with the advertising industry will affect how the educator influences the curriculum in regard to the teaching of ethics. (137)

Another issue concerning attitudes about the advertising curriculum has to do with the "amoral" posture that some advertising practitioners may assume in their day-to-day activities and that some advertising educators may assume in their refusal to teach ethics. They attempt to persuade us that the obsessive role of the advertising business must be to sell products and services and make a profit for the advertisers. Given this direct dictate from the "field," some advertising educators may respond with something like: "If theory and ethics clouds the issue of effectiveness in selling and takes away time to be spent teaching the art and science of selling, then we should not be teaching theory and ethics." Such a response will be studied through this survey.

A Case Against Teaching Ethics in the Journalism Curriculum

Apart from the "amoral" argument just discussed, there is another stance against the teaching of ethics in the journalism schools. In "Should J-schools teach ethics?" James W. Carty Jr. wrote that few journalism teachers are

qualified as philosophers to teach courses which treat problems in communication ethics. "Journalism is a specialized social science, and philosophy is a separate liberal arts discipline to be considered properly in its own academic area of the humanities," Carty wrote. (138) Carty said that students can take an ethics course or "on their own read texts and original works by philosophers...Then after reflecting on the wisdom of the ancients and their own experiences, future journalists can create their own ethical philosophy, based on historical position or their own created eclectic perspective." (139)

Carty's argument can be questioned on several counts. First, it may sell journalists short. Perhaps not all journalism teachers are scholars and not all should be entrusted with heavy teaching responsibilities in ethics, but, as Momeyer asserts in "Teaching as a Moral Activity," "It is salutary each year to teach something you know relatively little about but passionately desire to know a great deal more about." (140) It would seem that the inquisitive and reflective nature of journalists would help them in a quest to incorporate ethics into the curriculum.

Secondly, Carty does not give interdisciplinarity its due. Team teaching has been cited as a good way to share and learn--for students and teachers. As Gardiner sees it, in an effective information-processing society, those who flourish will be the collaborators. (141)

Third, Carty presumes that journalism courses will be

imbued with theoretical rather than applied ethics. Yet, in all likelihood ethical instruction in a professional curriculum may rely on a combination of both, but with a probable emphasis on applied ethics. (142)

Fourth, Carty implies that students will be motivated to read classical writings in ethics on their own. Granted, given the many demands placed on the college student, he may still have time to read for "fun." But will he pick up a treatise on ethics? And if he does so, will he learn effectively without guidance? Carty presumes that students will be able to pursue their own course of reflection, arriving at the embracing of their own ethical beliefs. The literature indicates, however, that the process of understanding the ethical implications of certain behaviors and fully analyzing choices is a process that needs guidance from dedicated educators. One cannot automatically assume that students will automatically be able to "make the connection" by integrating knowledge from a general ethics course to their communications careers. (143) They will need the help of journalism educators who can demonstrate a theory in action, much as Rotzoll and Christians did in explaining "Advertising Agency Practitioners' Perceptions of Ethical Decisions." (144)

As Dressel points out in College and University Curriculum, "A sound education rarely results from excellent teachers who operate in complete isolation from one another." (145) Good teachers find ways to provide sequence,

continuity and integration in the curriculum, through communicating curricular intent with each other and through serious attempts to link their course objectives with the objectives of courses previously taken by students. They don't take it for granted the undergraduates will "pick up" essential, formative knowledge on their own. (146)

Carty's arguments will be studied through this survey.

Advertising Education and the Pervasive Method

Advertising educators do not appear to be relying exclusively on the "on your own" approach to ethics education. In the advertising curriculum, the recent literature shows that advertising educators are relying on the "pervasive method" of teaching ethics. In 1983 Ardoin found that only four advertising programs out of 70 responding offered a separate, specialized course on the subject of advertising ethics. Instead, most of the respondents preferred to teach ethics as the subject became appropriate in their respective advertising courses. The study also showed that over 28 percent of the programs taught ethics to some degree in all advertising courses, with the Principles of Advertising course the most cited for teaching ethics, as 44.3 percent of respondents said ethics was treated to some extent in that introductory course. (147)

Ardoin believed that most advertising educators take the teaching of advertising seriously: (148)

> How they (respondents) covered ethics and how much time was devoted to the subject seemed to be where the differences occurred. Most respondents seemed to prefer to teach ethics as the subject became appropriate for the topic being discussed. Many respondents felt that ethics was a way of life that touched every part of advertising and that teaching it separately would make the course redundant. Others felt that control in teaching the subject was of primary importance and that teaching ethics should not be limited to the classroom. (149)

The Paragram

The advertising curriculum, with its limited number of required courses and electives in order to comply with accreditation standards, yet with so much content material to be covered to ready students for the profession, can be examined in the light of what Phelan calls a "paragram." (150)

In "Locating Ethics in Mediaworld" Phelan quoted a network official who said, "without obvious irony," "Gee, I don't think I have ever run across an ethical problem after twenty years in the business." (151) Phelan's point was that the practitioner is not looking very hard. In other words, the official had persuaded himself to follow the "narrow view" of what is ethical and what is not: "So many communications professionals never make decisions;" Phelan noted, "they obey the automatic dictates of the marketplace, because the `real world' has a `bottom line.'" (152) This suggests, then, that an inquiry might be made to determine whether advertising educators think the same way; that is, do the apparent "automatic dictates" of vocational preparation and of accrediting standards preclude the teaching of

advertising ethics--even through the pervasive method? Such an inquiry represents another objective of this study.

Phelan's answer to paragrammatic thinking is a type of education he calls "sensitivity training," which operates on two levels.

> The first level involves honest self-assessment. ... At the first level, there are very few real moral dilemmas for most people. Honest self-assessment is a matter of motivation, not of knowledge. The question is rarely "What am I to do?" It is more often "Do I have the courage to do what I know to be right, just, loyal, truthful or (at a very advanced level) self-sacrificing?"...At this level, then, conscience sensitivity training is aimed at getting people to acknowledge the irritating relevance of an ethical ideal to a pedestrian and even humdrum situation, when they would rather pretend that everything is humdrum and preordained. (153)

In the advertising curriculum, the "irriating relevance of the ideal" could be regarded as devotion of more time to the teaching of ethics. The "preordained" could be regarded as the current vocational and accreditation constraints on the curriculum.

Phelan's second level of paragramming "involves scrupulous awareness of the particular world in which one has chosen to live and operate." In the world of advertising, among others, Phelan encounters language that is "precedent-free," assumption-low, and contextless..." (154)

> A good example of its (paragramming's) extreme form can be found in civil defense manuals, which say things like: "In the event of an atomic attack, you may experience radiation sickness. High fever often accompanies radiation sickness. For fever, take aspirin and plenty of liquids." True; but certainly not the truth.... (To) paragram questions of war and peace, sexuality and loyalty, commitment and community is to evade such questions.
>
> Paragramming ignores moral questions to the point of

> extinction, and the marketing pressures that encourage writers to paragram editorials, political speeches, medical and insurance advertisements, governmental policy reports, and virtually every other public discourse of Mediaworld are creating an amoral world. This is, perhaps, a major reason why so many people believe that they have never run into a moral or ethical problem. There is no place for such problems in their language and, thus, in their consciousness, therefore they are finally without conscience, what C.S. Lewis (1947) called "men without chests." (155)

If one applies Phelan's logic to the advertising curriculum, one may ask whether a curriculum without a specific advertising ethics course and with a "catch as catch can" approach to the teaching of ethics in other advertising courses could be regarded as amoral.

This study will investigate whether we are training "advertisers without chests." It will inquire if some advertising educators are interpreting the "automatic dictates of the marketplace" to preclude or curtail the teaching of ethics. It will probe whether advertising lessons are replete with "how to" but bereft of the ethical implications of "how to." According to Phelan, "Preparing people for a profession surely involves opening their eyes to the reality, and not the romantic stereotype, of the human structure within which they will be called upon to make decisions that have moral consequences." (156)

A 1977 study uncovered nine reasons why 171 of 237 schools of journalism/communication did not offer a special course in media ethics. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents said that "ethical issues are discussed as they arise in other courses. "The next highest response came from

14 percent of the schools (schools could respond with more than one reason): "Small department with limited program." In 1977, only three percent of respondents said there was no room in the curriculum. "None of the 171 schools argues that ethics are not pertinent to the curriculum. This option was offered in the survey but no one marked it." (157)

Given the choices of secular humanism, Judeo-Christian, utilitarianism, positivism and "none in particular," 30 of the 64 schools teaching ethics claimed they do not stress any ethical system in particular:

> The word "stressed" in the question may have made some respondents wary, since it may appear dictatorial. In a pluralistic society promoting the individual conscience, we characteristically do not wish to impose our values on anyone--even in the teacher/student relationship. But if that possible distortion is not a substantial one, this large percentage could indicate these courses are not well developed, or it could point to the more disturbing possibility that if no specific value system is emphasized, one option tends to be viewed as any other. History suggests that in such a situation the lowest common denominator usually evolves, which in America means civil law. (158)

Among conclusions reached by the 1977 survey were that the teaching of media ethics in that era was "in a very rudimentary, unsophisticated form" and that with law making up the major context for 30 percent of the courses, there is a "need for discussion over the boundaries between ethics and law." (159)

Conclusion

Challenges for the Journalism/Advertising Ethics Educator

The challenge for the journalism and advertising ethics educator, then, may be one of eluding Phelan's paragrammatic orientation through promoting individual conscience, yet not to be so "wishy-washy" as to not take a stand on particular ethical issues. A concomitant dedication to fostering and strengthening students' moral stances, yet still articulating--without imposing--one's own, may be an effective approach. John C. Merrill put it this way: "I have always thought we should do both--*teach* ethics and teach *about* ethics, and certainly in the final analysis, we *must* leave with the students final decisions--but these certainly can be influenced by the instructor and the total class experience." (160)

In theory, effective teachers of ethics in journalism and advertising are able to help students confront their own beliefs, help students learn approaches so they can solve ethical problems on their own, and help students understand the context within which professional ethical decisions are made. (161) In practice, effective teachers of ethics can employ creative pedagogical techniques to accomplish those goals. *Teaching Ethics in Journalism Education* reported that "the most typical procedure appears to be a combination of lectures by the instructor, classroom visits by profes-

sionals, discussions, and student research papers." (162) However, it is obvious that merely the use of a particular procedure does not guarantee effective teaching. As Merrill noted, a guest speaker can do a course more harm than good if he hasn't given much serious thought to ethics. (163) Similarly, discussions that are superficial, that disintegrate into a paragrammatic state, will certainly not engender learning. (164) By the same token, lectures can be boring, not relevant to student needs and preachy; term papers can be exercises in endurance rather than enlightenment. (165)

The literature suggests that the effective teacher of advertising ethics or, for that matter, the effective teacher period is able to take his students beyond the superficial, beyond the limited visions inherent in a devotion to materialism or vocationalism, for example. As Carey lamented, "...status and prestige, not knowledge or ethics or rectitude, turn out to be the key to professionalism." (166) Therefore, if one believes Carey, professionalism as a means to ethical enhancement of advertising is at least a secondary concern.

Should specialization, in this case, the vocationalization of advertising, be a reason to underplay the importance of teaching ethics? As Rizzuti observed in "Who Should Teach Ethics?":

> Specialization...cannot be allowed to restrict the teaching of ethics, a subject which by its very nature defies specialization. If we wish to educate our students, we must make them aware of the ethical dim-

ension of life, and since the ethical dimension pervades all of life, each discipline, in its own way, must contribute to the achievement of this goal. (167)

ENDNOTES

1 Robert H. Stanley and Charles S. Steinberg, The Media Environment, (New York: Hastings House, 1977), p. 267.

2 George N. Gordon, "The Making of a Consumer," Ethics and the Press, eds. John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney, (New York: Hastings House, 1975), p. 281.

3 Kim Rotzoll, "Future advertising education: ideas on a tentative discipline," Journalism Educator, (Autumn 1985) p. 37.

4 Charles F. Frazer and F. William Biglow, "Popular Perceptions of Advertising Practitioners: 'I Don't Get No Respect,'" Proceedings of the 1983 Convention of the American Academy of Advertising, (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas) p. 103.

5 Ibid., p. 104.

6 Ibid.

7 Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America, eds. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, (New York: The Free Press, 1957) p. 434.

8 Louis C. Kaufman, Essentials of Advertising, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1987), p. 12.

9 Ibid. pp. 12--17.

10 Charles H. Sandage, Vernon Fryburger, and Kim Rotzoll, Advertising Theory and Practice, (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1979), p. 42.

11 Ibid.

12 Kaufman, p.18.

13 Ibid.

14 Michael L. Rothschild, Advertising, (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1987), p. 22.

15 Fairfax M. Cone, With All Its Faults, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969), p. 3.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., pp. 3--4.

18 Vance Packard, The Hidden Persuaders, (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1957), p. 7.

19 Ibid., p. 4.

20 Ibid., p. 221.

21 Ibid., pp. 221--222.

22 Martin Mayer, Madison Avenue U.S.A., (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1958), p. xvii.

23 Ibid., p. 323--324.

24 Thomas Russell and Glenn Verrill, Otto Kleppner's Advertising Procedure, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986), p. 609.

25 Stanley, p.267.

26 Ibid.

27 See Russell, pp. 602--612.

28 For an overview of the functions of advertising, see Sandage, pp. 3--19.

29 Sandage, p. 626.

30 Ibid., p. 625.

31 Ibid., p. 627.

32 Theodore Levitt, "Advertising and Its Adversaries," Business Ethics, eds. Milton Snoeyenbos, Robert Almeder, and James Humber (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1983), p. 422.

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid., p. 423.

35 Howard Luck Gossage, "The Gilded Bough: Magic and Advertising," Harper's, (July, 1961) pp. 363--370.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid., p. 364.

38 Ibid., p. 370.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid., p. 365.

41 Stanley, p. 272.

42 William L. Rivers, Wilbur Schramm, and Clifford G. Christians, Responsibility in Mass Communication, (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), p. 117.

43 Ibid., pp. 116--127.

44 Ibid.

45 See Kim B. Rotzoll and Clifford G. Christians, "Advertising Agency Practitioners' Perceptions of Ethical Decisions," Journalism Quarterly, 57 (Autumn 1980), pp. 427--428.

46 Ibid. p. 428.

47 S. Watson Dunn and Arnold M. Barban, Advertising: Its Role in Modern Marketing, (Hinsdale, IL: The Dryden Press, 1982) p. 158.

48 Ibid., p. 162.

49 Rothschild, p. 756.

50 Ibid.

51 Clifford G. Christians, Kim B. Rotzoll and Mark Fackler, Media Ethics, (New York: Longman, Inc., 1987), p. 208.

52 George C.S. Benson, Business Ethics in America, (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1982), p. 228.

53 Ibid.

54 For a cogent account of this consciousness, see Benson, pp. 205--231.

55 Samm Sinclair Baker, The Permissible Lie, (Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company, 1968), p. 221.

56 Ibid.

57 Benson argues (p. 228) that such responsibility should not be left up to government alone.

58 See "The Regulation of Advertising" in Sandage, pp. 643--666.

59 Benson, p. 218.

60 Levitt, p. 423.

61 Kaufman, p. 540.

62 A fascinating study might be done on cases where such a conflict arose.

63 Christians, pp. 125--128.

64 Ibid., p. 126.

65 Ibid.

66 See David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960) pp. 27--28.

67 Christians, p. 126

68 Ibid., p. 127.

69 Stephen Fox, The Mirror Makers, (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1984), p. 380.

70 Walter Weir, Truth in Advertising ...and other heresies, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963), p. 14.

71 Fox, p. 380.

72 Christians, p. 128.

73 See "Policing Advertising" in Kaufman, pp. 513--524.

74 Ibid., p. 517.

75 Kent M. Lancaster, "Teaching Economic and Social Aspects of Advertising," Advertising Working Papers, (Urbana: IL, unpublished), No. 13, November, 1982. p. 6.

76 Gordon, p. 282. Deception, however, no greater than those deceptions "employed in other commercial affairs, in most education and in modern government."

77 Russell, p. 585.

78 See Dunn, p. 114, for an informative chart of NAD/ NARB procedures.

79 Ibid.

80 Benson, p. 219.

81 Rivers, pp. 125--126.

82 Ibid., pp. 124--125

83 Christians, pp. 221--222.

84 Russell, p. 593.

85 For an approach to teaching that uses questions "(1) to cause the respondent to become aware of his own ignorance on a topic; (2) to teach virtue; and (3) to seek precise definitions for concepts and principles" see Richard A. Schwarzlose, "Socratic method adds zest to ethics, law classes," Journalism Educator, 33 (April 1978), pp. 9--13+.

86 Christians citing Henry Stob, Ethical Reflections: Essays on Moral Themes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 3--6.

87 Max A. Geller, Advertising at the Crossroads, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952), p. 80.

88 Rivers, p. 143.

89 Ibid., p. 145.

90 Dean M. Krugman and O.C. Ferrell, "Comparing the Ethical Beliefs of Advertising Agency Practitioners to Corporate Practitioners," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (62nd, Houston, TX, August 5--8, 1979).

91 Ibid., p. 8.

92 Rotzoll, p. 425.

93 Ibid., p. 426.

94 Ibid., pp. 426--427.

95 Ibid., pp. 427--428.

96 Ibid., p. 428

97 Benson, p. 5.

98 Ibid., p. 24.

99 Ibid., p. 21

100 As explained in Christians, pp. 11--17.

101 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, eds. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, (New York: Plenum Press, 1980) p. 73.

102 Bernard Rosen and Arthur L. Caplan, Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum, (New York: The Hastings Center, 1980)

103 Rosen, p. 12.

104 Christians, p. 2.

105 Ibid.

106 Ibid.

107 Pages 2--7 in Christians explain how to use the Potter Box.

108 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, p. 302.

109 Rosen, p. 16.

110 Ibid.

111 Douglas Sloan, "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum, 1876--1976," in Callahan, p. 2.

112 Michael R. Harris, Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education, (Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1970) p. 31.

113 Before the advent of operational utility, the college president often taught the "capstone" course in moral philosophy (ethics).

114 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, p. 302

115 Rosen, pp. 18--19.

116 Ibid., p. 41.

117 See "Problems of Pedagogy in Teaching Undergraduate Ethics," in Rosen, pp. 33--56.

118 Ibid., p. 23.

119 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, p. 300.

120 Rotzoll, p. 37.

121 Michael J. Stankey, An Interprofessional Perspective on Advertising Education, unpublished dissertation, Urbana: 1982. p. 1.

122 Stankey devotes a large part of his dissertation to this topic.

123 Ibid., p. 76.

124 Historically, Advertising Age has kept up the ongoing debate with an occasional series of articles on the topic.

125 Melvin Mencher, "Agenda for Journalism Education," Nieman Reports, (Autumn 1982), p. 48.

126 Plannning for Curricular Change in Journalism Education, a report on the Project on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education, School of Journalism, (University of Oregon, Eugene, May, 1984), pp. 5--6.

127 John De Mott, "Journalism courses are essential part of liberal education," Journalism Educator, (Autumn 1984) p. 31.

128 Rotzoll, "Future Advertising Education..." p. 40.

129 Ibid., p. 41.

130 Ibid.

131 Russell C. Doerner, "Advertising program revised to prepare for needs of 1990s," Journalism Educator, (Spring 1984) pp. 18--19.

132 John S. Wright, "Working Adpeople and Educators Must Agree on a Basic Curriculum," Advertising Age, (November 13, 1980) p. 84.

133 Ibid., p. 82.

134 Stankey, pp. 77--78.

135 Daniel K. Stewart, "Upgrading needed for ad education," Journalism Educator, 40 (Winter 1986) p. 53.

136 For more information on Carey's perspective on professionalism, see the source from which these snippets were taken: James W. Carey, "A Plea for the University Tradition," Journalism Quarterly, 55 (Winter 1978). pp. 846--855. In this instance, Carey quotes Charles Frankel, p. 850.

137 See Stewart for a perspective on what he perceives as a lack of advertising scholarship.

138 James W. Carty Jr., "Should J-schools teach ethics?" Journalism Educator, 33 (April 1978) p. 8.

139 Ibid.

140 Richard W. Momeyer, "Teaching as a Moral Activity," Teaching Philosophy, 3' (Fall 1979) p. 141.

141 See John J. Gardiner, "Building Bridges Between Disciplines: Collaboration in an Information Processing University," paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference for Improving University Teaching, Heidelberg, Germany, July 15--18, 1986.

142 Such an emphasis is likely, of course, since the practical nature of advertising courses lend themselves to case studies and other "real world" examples.

143 See Paul L. Dressel, College and University Curriculum, (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1968), particularly the "Competiencies and Their Attainment" and "Basic Considerations in Curriculum Development" chapters.

144 Rotzoll, pp. 425--431.

145 Dressel, p. 22.

146 See Dressel, p. 24, for example, on independent study.

147 Birthney Ardoin, "The Teaching of Ethics in the Advertising Curricula: An Analysis of ACEJMC Accredited and Non-Accredited Programs and Programs in Business Administration," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (66th, Corvallis, OR, August 6--9, 1983).

148 Ardoin, p.1.

149 Ibid.

150 John M. Phelan, "Locating Ethics in Mediaworld," Teaching Values and Ethics in College, ed. Michael J. Collins (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p. 62.

151 Ibid.

152 Ibid., p. 63.

153 Ibid., pp. 62--63.

154 Ibid., p. 63.

155 Ibid., p. 64.

156 Ibid., p. 61.

157 Christians, "Variety of approaches used..." p. 4.

158 Ibid., p. 5.

159 Christians, "Variety of approaches used..." p. 7.

160 John C. Merrill, "Do we teach ethics--or do we teach about ethics?" Journalism Educator, 33 (July 1978) p. 59.

161 For more information, see Charles F. Frazer, "Advertising Ethics: The Role of the Educator," Journal of Advertising, 8 (Winter 1979) pp. 43--46.

162 Clifford G. Christians and Catherine L. Covert, Teaching Ethics in Journalism Education, (New York: The Hastings Center, 1980), p. 17.

163 Merrill, p. 60.

164 See chapter on "Discussion Methods" in Kenneth Hoover, College Teaching Today, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1980)

165 Ibid., pp. 174--196.

166 Carey, p. 850.

167 Carol J. Rizzuti, "Who Should Teach Ethics?" in Teaching Values and Ethics in College p. 59.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

General

A study was conducted to gather information concerning ethics instruction in advertising education. Such a study is needed to determine current attitudes of advertising educators toward teaching methods, philosophies and curricular organization as they pertain to advertising ethics education. Such a study is also needed to obtain educators' attitudes concerning ethics in the advertising industry itself.

The population is four-year colleges and universities in the United States which have advertising programs, sequences, or emphases as listed in the 1987 edition of Where Shall I Go To College To Study Advertising? edited by Billy I. Ross. (1) The study includes those colleges and universities with a program of instruction intended to qualify students for entry into some facet of the advertising business. Not included are institutions that only offer elective courses in advertising. There are 102 institutions listed in Where Shall I Go...? that offer advertising instruction beyond only elective courses. Ninety-one of these are listed as journalism/communication schools. This entire population of

91 was used for the study (one questionnaire was returned indicating that the contact person and program could not be located). Although many institutions have more than one person who teaches at least one advertising course per year, one representative respondent from each institution was chosen.

A questionnaire and cover letter were mailed to 91 colleges and universities as listed in the 1987 edition of Where Shall I Go To College To Study Advertising? This publication lists 11 advertising programs in business schools in addition to the 91 programs in schools/colleges/ departments of journalism or communication. Since they operate under accreditation standards different from those of journalism schools, the 11 programs in business schools were not contacted for this study. Where Shall I Go...? lists a contact person for each school's advertising program. (Because it lists a specific contact person for advertising, this publication is superior to other directories that list only one contact person for an entire school or department.) Questionnaires were mailed to the contact persons. Each were asked to distribute the questionnaires to the appropriate instructor.

Information was gathered on advertising educators' attitudes toward the teaching of ethics in the advertising curriculum. Of particular note were attitudes and practices as they refer to the pervasive method of teaching advertising ethics and to devoting a separate course to teaching

advertising ethics.

Also, information was gathered concerning the educators' school/college/departmental sequences. Such information included number of majors and whether those majors are required to take or have as an elective certain ethics courses.

In addition, information was gathered on educators themselves, including information on their professional and educational backgrounds and on their attitudes toward some general statements about ethics in the advertising business itself.

Finally, information was gathered about the priority of an advertising ethics course in the curriculum and about the importance of various ethics topics to the advertising curriculum.

The Population

Appendix A lists the 91 schools in four-year institutions of higher education in the U.S., according to Where Shall I Go To College To Study Advertising? that offer sequences, programs or emphases in advertising.

Ninety institutions comprise the survey population for this study, as one respondent/program was unable to be contacted.

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked whether their schools are accredited. In journalism/mass communication, accreditation means:

> ...a program or program specialty has been evaluated by a team of educator, media and industry professionals and that the program or program specialty has passed a thorough examination. It also means that the school has undergone a penetrating self-study which emphasized attention to innovative educational and training techniques. (2)

In journalism/communications schools, advertising programs by themselves do not receive accreditation. Instead, the overall administrative unit, department or school of which the advertising program is a part is accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. The administrative unit, however, would not have received accreditation had the advertising program not met the committee's standards.

Accreditation is often considered an important variable because of the self-study component and because of the evaluation done by advertising professionals and educators from outside the school in question. The assumption often made is that accredited programs are more consistent with and more responsive to the needs of the advertising profession. Consequently, the degree of commitment to advertising ethics education in accredited advertising programs is important information, particularly since the ACEJMC calls for the inclusion of the teaching of ethics in the curriculum.

It is important to note, however, that all that can be said about accredited programs is that they have undergone a prescriptive self-study and have been evaluated by outsiders. One cannot automatically assume that advertising programs not accredited are of lower quality than accredited

programs. Programs have various reasons why they do not apply for accreditation or why they have failed or lost it.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was a mail questionnaire forwarded by cover letter to the contact persons from the 91 programs listed in Where Should I Go To College To Study Advertising? The letter asked that the survey be given to the faculty member best qualified to answer the questions.

Content of Cover Letter

The cover letter contained the following information:

a. The letter forwards a questionnaire that predominately asks for information and attitudes about the teaching of advertising ethics at that institution and about the teaching of advertising ethics in general.

b. The survey is part of a doctoral dissertation concerned with advertising education.

c. The survey should be given to and completed by the faculty person most knowledgeable about content of advertising courses and content of other courses taken by advertising majors.

d. Cooperation is urged. Failure to complete and return the survey in a reasonable period of time will detract from the value of the study for advertising educators.

e. The survey should be returned within 14 days in the addressed, postage-paid envelope included with the cover

letter and survey.

f. Those who request a copy of the summarized findings will be sent one.

g. Institutional and personal anonymity will be assured. All data will be reported in aggregate form. The code number will be used only for keeping track of responses; it will be removed upon receipt of the completed survey.

h. Questions about the survey should be addressed to: John Ellerbach, School of Journalism and Broadcasting, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078-0195; (405)--624--6354.

A copy of the cover letter is contained in Appendix B. A copy of the follow-up cover letter is contained in Appendix C.

Content of the Questionnaire

A copy of the questionniare is contained in Appendix D.

The questionnaire is organized in the following sections:

Section I: General Information

Section II: Information on ethics instruction in the advertising program and the department in general.

Section III: Likert scale items.

Section I: General Information

a. Code number. This was used to keep track of

responses and to indicate when follow-up mailing was necessary. When a completed survey was received, the code number was removed to assure participants' anonymity.

b. Whether the advertising program is accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. This information is necessary to make a comparison between accredited and non-accredited programs. Where Do I Go...? does identify accredited programs, but the information is over a year old. Consequently some programs may have gained accreditation while others may have lost it.

c. Number of years of professional advertising experience and number of years teaching experience.

d. Whether the faculty member is full time or part time.

e. Whether the faculty member has ever taken a course or courses in advertising ethics or any other course in ethics. This information is needed to make comparisons between respondents' attitudes toward various statements about advertising ethics and advertising ethics education and their own educational background in terms of ethics instruction.

f. Highest academic degree earned by respondent.

g. Whether the faculty member usually thinks of him/herself as a college/university professor who happens to teach advertising or as an advertising professional who happens to teach. They chose one. This is important information since comparisons will be made between educators'

attitudes toward the teaching of advertising ethics and their self-perceptions in terms of their jobs.

Section II: Information on Ethics Instruction in the Advertising Program

Responses to these items will aid in determining the opportunities advertising majors have to learn about ethics, and the nature and extent of such learning opportunities.

a. Whether advertising majors are required to take a course specifically devoted to advertising ethics.

b. Whether advertising majors are required to take any non-advertising course in ethics.

c. Whether the respondent's school offers a course in advertising ethics as an elective.

d. Apart from ethics courses required or elective, approximately how much time (if any) does the respondent devote to the teaching of ethics in his/her advertising courses. This is important since it will facilitate comparisons between favoritism of the pervasive method and actual percentage of course load devoted to teaching ethics under this method.

e. A listing of the eight most common advertising courses were provided. Educators were asked to rank them in order from least important to most important. This is important information because a comparison will be made between the relative importance (rank) advertising educators

place on teaching ethics in the curriculum and the amount of class time they report devoting to teaching ethics.

f. What specific topics do the educators believe are essential to cover in a lesson or lessons on advertising ethics? The key word in this statement is "specific." The assumption is made that even if a respondent reports spending relatively little time teaching ethics in core or elective advertising courses, that focused lessons will be quality lessons.

Section III: Likert Scale Statements

This section will help identify attitudes of faculty members toward ethics education in advertising and toward the advertising business in general. This section collected information concerning the extent to which faculty members in the advertising program agree with the following statements that:

a. Instruction in advertising ethics should be included in advertising education.

b. Advertising is predominantly an unethical business.

c. Instruction in ethics is the responsibility of the advertising profession and not higher education.

d. Knowledge of ethics is essential to the contemporary practice of advertising.

e. Advertising ethics education is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical.

f. Education in advertising ethics is essential to

the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession.

g. Advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers.

h. The quality of present instruction in advertising ethics in their school is adequate for advertising majors.

i. Advertising ethics instruction can be accomplished adequately by the lecture method alone.

j. A lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors.

k. Instructors' lack of background in advertising ethics is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors.

l. The extent of ethics instruction for advertising majors in their school should be increased.

m. If advertising majors take an ethics course outside the department, there is no need for additional instruction on ethics within the department.

n. Advertising graduates with coursework in ethics have an advantage in the job marketplace over advertising graduates without that coursework.

o. The best way to teach advertising ethics is as an ethical topic or question arises in class.

p. Ethics education for advertising majors will be stronger if other departments on campus are involved in its teaching.

q. There is more pressure now than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business.

r. The best way to teach advertising ethics is to give students specific rules for behavior.

s. The only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services.

t. Advertising majors can pick up an understanding of ethics on their own, without the help of an educator.

u. The pressures of the marketplace encourage advertising practitioners to ignore moral questions.

v. The dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "principles (theory, the "why" of advertising) first."

w. The dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "skills (vocational, the "how to" of advertising) first."

Procedure

The cover letter and questionnaire were pretested by local faculty members and graduate students to ensure all items were understandable.

The cover letter, questionnaire and postage-paid return envelope were mailed to the 91 institutions in the study population March 8, 1988.

A log was maintained to indicate when questionnaires were mailed, when follow-up mailings were made and when responses were received. A follow-up mailing consisting of a cover

letter and the questionnaire was mailed April 1, about three weeks after the first mailing and ten days after the March 22 deadline stated in the cover letter. Questionnaires not received by May 5 were not included in the study.

Analysis

General

A purpose of this study was to gather information about the nature and extent of ethics instruction provided by advertising educators at those colleges and universities offering accredited and non-accredited advertising programs.

Some analysis is descriptive only; some is inferential. The following comparisons are of particular interest:

a. Extent of ethics instruction as a function of program accreditation. It is hypothesized that accredited advertising programs will have more extensive instruction in ethics than non-accredited programs since the accreditation standards in journalism schools do call for ethics instruction.

b. Extent of ethics instruction as a function of the self-perception of the advertising educator. It is hypothesized that the instructor who most closely identifies with the practice of advertising rather than the teaching of it will see less of a value in teaching ethics and more value in the vocational aspects of teaching advertising and will, consequently, devote less time to teaching ethics.

c. Attitudes toward the pervasive method of teaching

advertising ethics as a function of educators' own educational backgrounds. It is hypothesized that educators with coursework in ethics will be less receptive to the exclusion of ethics education altogether in the advertising curriculum and less receptive to the exclusive use of the pervasive method than those with no coursework in ethics. It is also hypothesized that those with doctoral degrees will not favor the pervasive method of teaching advertising as the exclusive way to teach ethics in the advertising curriculum, while those without doctoral degrees will favor the pervasive method as an exclusive way to teach advertising ethics.

d. Attitudes toward the pervasive method of teaching advertising as a function of the percentage of courseload that the educator devotes to teaching ethics in advertising courses not devoted specifically to ethics instruction. It is hypothesized that an advertising educator who ranks the advertising ethics course as a high priority in the curriculum (whether the department has one or not) will devote more of his/her coursework in other advertising courses to ethics instruction than an advertising educator who does not rank high in curricular priorities a separate ethics course.

e. Attitudes toward the importance of teaching advertising ethics as a function of how strongly advertising educators believe that advertising practitioners encounter ethical dilemmas in their jobs. It is hypothesized that

those educators who believe that advertising professionals often encounter ethical dilemmas will deem the teaching of advertising ethics more important than those educators who do not agree that advertising professionals face many ethical dilemmas.

Tables of Data

The following tables or appendices of survey results are included in the study report. Unless otherwise noted, data will be broken down into accredited and nonaccredited institutions.

a. List of institutions participating in the study. This appendix indicates the scope of the study.

b. Number of required advertising ethics courses, non-advertising ethics courses and advertising ethics elective courses offered by accredited, non-accredited and all programs responding to the questionnaire.

c. Number of faculty respondents who think of themselves as primarily college teachers and number who think of themselves as primarily advertising professionals. Again, this will be broken down into accredited nonaccredited, and all programs.

d. Number of respondents who had taken a course in advertising ethics or any course in ethics.

e. Approximate time devoted to teaching advertising ethics in advertising courses other than advertising ethics. Five time categories will be provided: Less than 5 percent,

between 5 percent and 10 percent, between 10 percent and 20 percent, between 20 percent and 30 percent, and over 30 percent.

f. Average curricular priority rankings for eight typical advertising courses. A "1" represents first priority; a "2" represents second priority, etc.

g. Number of advertising educators who ranked the advertising ethics course in each ranking sector (1--8).

h. Reasons given for the rankings. This will be broken down into eight categories: those who ranked the advertising ethics course first, those who ranked it second, etc.

i. Suggestions for specific topics to be covered in a lesson or lessons on advertising ethics.

The following tables will represent faculty responses to Likert scale items and faculty attitudes toward various ethical issues in advertising as well as issues in the teaching of advertising.

j. Agreement with the statement that advertising ethics should be included in advertising education.

k. Agreement with the statement that advertising is predominantly an unethical business.

l. Agreement with the statement that instruction in ethics is the responsibility of the advertising profession and not higher education.

m. Agreement with the statement that knowledge of ethics is essential to the contemporary practice of advertising.

n. Agreement with the statement that advertising ethics education is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical.

o. Agreement with the statement that education in advertising ethics is essential to the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession.

p. Agreement with the statement that advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers.

q. Agreement with the statement that the quality of present instruction in advertising ethics in their school is adequate for advertising majors.

r. Agreement with the statement that advertising ethics instruction can be accomplished adequately by the lecture method alone.

s. Agreement with the statement that a lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to adequate ethics instruction for advertising majors.

t. Agreement with the statement that instructors' lack of background in advertising ethics is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors.

u. Agreement with the statement that the extent of instruction for advertising majors in their program should be increased.

v. Agreement with the statement that if advertising majors take an ethics course outside the department, there is

no need for additional ethics instruction within the department.

w. Agreement with the statement that advertising graduates with coursework in ethics have an advantage in the job marketplace over advertising graduates without such coursework.

x. Agreement with the statement that the best way to teach advertising is as an ethical topic or question arises in class.

y. Agreement with the statement that ethics education for advertising majors will be stronger if other departments on campus are involved in its teaching.

z. Agreement with the statement that there is more pressure now than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business.

aa. Agreement with the statement that the best way to teach advertising ethics is to give students specific rules for behavior.

bb. Agreement with the statement that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services.

cc. Agreement with the statement that advertising majors can pick up an understanding of ethics on their own, without the help of an educator.

dd. Agreement with the statement that the pressures of the marketplace encourage advertising practitioners to ignore moral questions.

ee. Agreement with the statement that the dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "principles first."

ff. Agreement with the statement that the dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "skills first."

ENDNOTES

1 "Where Shall I Go To College To Study Advertising?" Billy I. Ross, ed., (Lubbock, TX: Advertising Education Publications, 1987)

2 Journalism & Mass Communication Directory, Vol. 4, 1986, Fred L. Williams, ed., (Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1986), p. 3.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

General

Of the 90 institutions in the sample, 72 responded to the initial survey and follow-up mailing, for an overall response rate of 80 percent.

Forty-seven respondents reported that their institutions are accredited; 24 indicated that currently their institutions are not accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Six of the 24 indicated that their accreditation status is pending. One respondent left the accreditation question blank. For computational purposes, this response was treated as non-accredited.

Characteristics of Program Respondents

Of the 72 programs in journalism/communication responding, only three (4 percent) require their advertising majors to take a course specifically devoted to advertising ethics. In comparison, 18 (25 percent) of the 72 programs require their advertising majors to take an ethics course taught outside the advertising sequence. An advertising ethics course is an elective in 15 (21 percent) of the

responding programs.

As shown in Table I, there is little difference between accredited and nonaccredited programs in terms of required ethics courses. There is, however, a significant relationship between accreditation status and the offering of an advertising ethics course as an elective (Chi-square of 6.58 at the 95 percent confidence level; probability =.01). That is, an accredited program is much more likely to offer advertising ethics as an elective than is a non-accredited program. Fourteen accredited programs and only one nonaccredited program offer such a course.

TABLE I

REQUIRED ADVERTISING ETHICS COURSES, NON-ADVERTISING ETHICS COURSES AND ADVERTISING ETHICS ELECTIVE COURSES OFFERED BY ACCREDITED, NON-ACCREDITED AND ALL PROGRAMS (NUMBERS REPRESENT ADVERTISING PROGRAMS)

	Ad ethics required	Any ethics required	Ad ethics as an elective
Accredited	2	10	14
Non-Accredited	1	8	1
All programs	3	18	15

Characteristics of Faculty Respondents

Seventy of the 72 faculty respondents reported they are full-time educators. All advertising faculty members were queried on their self-perceptions in terms of thinking of themselves mainly as professors or mainly as advertising professionals. Although three respondents checked both categories and one responded, "I fail to see the difference," the overwhelming majority (54), as Table II indicates, said they think of themselves mainly as college/university professors who teach advertising, rather than as advertising professionals who teach advertising.

TABLE II

HOW FACULTY RESPONDENTS ANSWERED THE INQUIRY "DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF MAINLY AS:" (NUMBERS REPRESENT PROFESSORS)

	College/university professor who teaches advertising	Advertising professional who teaches advertising
Accredited	35	5
Non-Accredited	19	10
All Programs	54	15

In terms of years of respondents' professional experience, in this sample accredited programs hold a slight edge. The same is true for years of teaching experience.

Table III lists the mean scores for years of teaching and years as advertising professionals of all respondents from accredited and non-accredited programs.

TABLE III

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING AND AS ADVERTISING PROFESSIONALS

	Teaching	Professional
Accredited	15.1	10.2
Non-Acredited	11.7	6.5
All Programs	13.9	8.9

The data show a significant relationship between professional experience and self-perception, supporting the notion that as professional experience increases, the educators may be more likely to see themselves as advertising practitioners first (Chi-square of 33.118 at the 95 percent confidence level; probability=.000). The data do not indicate, however, a significant relationship between teaching experience and self-perception.

Table IV lists frequencies for respondents who have or have not taken courses in advertising ethics or any ethics course. Nine percent of respondents had taken a course in advertising ethics; however, 61 percent had taken some kind of course in ethics.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD TAKEN A COURSE IN ADVERTISING ETHICS OR ANY COURSE IN ETHICS

	Ad Ethics Course	Any Ethics Course
Accredited	6	28
Non-accredited	1	16
All Programs	7	44

Sixty-five percent (47) of advertising educator respondents hold doctorate degrees; the rest (25) hold master's degrees. According to this study, there was no significant difference found regarding academic degree and amount of course load devoted to teaching advertising ethics. In other words, neither group devoted significantly more time than the other to teaching advertising ethics.

In addition, one hypothesis held that faculty self-perception would affect the amount of time the advertising educator devoted to ethics instruction. The data did not support this hypothesis.

It was also hypothesized that accredited advertising

programs would have more extensive instruction in ethics than nonaccredited programs. While this was borne out, as cited earlier, in the offering of an advertising ethics elective, it did not hold true for the amount of time the advertising educator--apart from any courses with advertising ethics as their main focus--devotes to teaching advertising ethics. Table V breaks down the approximate percentage of course time that respondents say they devote to teaching advertising ethics. There were two nonresponses.

Table V indicates that the average advertising educator says he/she spends between five and ten percent of non-advertising ethics course time teaching ethics.

TABLE V

APPROXIMATE TIME DEVOTED TO TEACHING ADVERTISING ETHICS IN ADVERTISING COURSES OTHER THAN ADVERTISING ETHICS (NUMBERS EQUAL RESPONDENTS)

	Less than 5%	5% to 10%	10% to 20%	20% to 30%	Over 30%
Acc.	14	19	9	2	2
Non.	5	13	4	2	0
All	19	32	13	4	2

Note: Acc.=accredited programs; Non.=non-accredited programs; All=all programs.

Also of interest, in terms of non-advertising ethics course percentage devoted to teaching ethics, is a comparison of those programs that have some kind of advertising ethics

elective and/or ethics requirement with those programs that do not. Thirty-one (43 percent) of the responding programs do have some kind of advertising ethics elective and/or ethics requirement, either advertising ethics or a general ethics course. Forty-one (57 percent) have no such elective or requirement. Nonetheless, the data show no significant relationship between the elective/requirement group and time devoted to teaching ethics in non-ethics advertising courses. An hypothesis that this group would devote significantly more time to teaching ethics in other, non-ethics courses is not supported by the data.

The issue of how much of the curriculum to devote to the teaching of advertising ethics was also probed in a question that asked advertising educators to rank eight typical advertising courses from most important to the curriculum to least important. It should be noted that nine respondents either did not answer this forced-ranking question or used one ranking number more than once. One respondent left the blanks empty and responded, "They're all important." The objective of this question was to determine where an advertising ethics course would rank in curricular priority.

Table VI (on the next page) shows that the advertising ethics course ranked last, with a mean ranking of 6.603 (out of eight rankings) for all programs. A Chi-square test showed no significant difference at the 95 percent level of confidence between the rankings of respondents from

accredited programs and the rankings of respondents from non-accredited programs.

TABLE VI

CURRICULAR PRIORITY RANKINGS (MEANS) FOR EIGHT TYPICAL ADVERTISING COURSES ("1"= FIRST PRIORITY; 2= SECOND, ETC.)

	Prin.	C.B.	Man.	Copy	Rsch.	Camp.	Eth.	Plan.
Acc.	1.67	6.08	5.9	2.84	4.82	4.05	6.66	3.79
Non.	2.24	5.44.	5.72	3.04	5	3.8	6.52	4.28
All	1.89	5.83	5.83	2.92	4.89	3.95	6.6	4

Course abbreviations: Prin.=Principles of Advertising; C.B.=Consumer Behavior; Man.=Advertising Management; Copy=Advertising Copywriting; Rsch.=Advertising Research; Camp=Advertising Campaigns; Eth.=Advertising Ethics; Plan.=Media Planning.

As a follow-up to the ranking question, respondents were asked why they ranked the advertising ethics course where they did. Table VII (on the next page) lists the priority rankings and the number of respondents (63 total) who ranked the ethics course in each priority cell. Table VIII (which begins on the next page) lists typical responses to the follow-up question. Numbers in parentheses next to the responses indicate how many respondents said the same thing.

TABLE VII

HOW ADVERTISING EDUCATORS RANKED THE ADVERTISING ETHICS COURSE

Priority in curriculum	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
Number of ad educators	0	2	1	4	8	8	15	25

Sixty-three percent of those advertising educators responding to the ranking question ranked the advertising ethics course either last or next-to-last in terms of curricular priority.

TABLE VIII

REASONS GIVEN FOR THE RANKINGS

Those who ranked the course as the second priority:

--"Not offered. If so, I would say it ranks 2nd most important."

--"Because it is important!"

The respondent who ranked the course as the third priority:

--"In the intro to advertising class for non-majors as well as majors, I find students very cynical about advertising. As consumers as well as practitioners, they need a basis for developing values and judgments."

Those who ranked the course as the fourth priority:

--"Should be part of a curriculum, but you need a foundation to base it on."

TABLE VIII (Continued)

--"Because it can not be an entire course here, but it is very important.

--"Fundamental ethics are taught in all my courses."

Those who ranked the course as the fifth priority:

--"Students need to know what advertising entails to understand ethical dilemmas."

--"...we are extremely limited in the courses we are allowed to teach our students."

--"I hope soon to have a course devoted solely to advertising ethics, which will be the fifth required course in the sequence."

--"Because I teach ethics as part of my content in all courses." (2)

Those who ranked the course as the sixth priority:

--"It is most important to ad students after learning basic skills."

--"Covered in other courses." (4)

--"Others more important." (3)

Those who ranked the course as the seventh priority:

--"Ethics should be included in all courses, not segregated."

--"While ethics is vital, you must understand the advertising business if you are to understand the framework in which ethical behavior is expected."

--"Ethics is not significant enough to warrant an entire course. ...Regulatory mechanisms have done away with most abuses. Teachers highly cynical should not teach the professsion, they should teach ethical problems in such areas as mass communication. PR has problems. Journalism (advocacy journalism) has problems, too. Telecommunication has problems as well."

--"For a professional program, it's the least useful for job preparation."

--Limited curriculum. (2)

--Taught in other courses. (5)

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Those who ranked the course as the eighth priority:

--"Not that it is less important, but how to design a course is another matter."

--"The market demands certain knowledge from our students and we must meet those demands first."

--"Not germane."

--"It is an integral part of other courses. Ethics is 'philosophical.'"

--"A nebulous topic."

--"It is a question of resources. The other courses are simply more directly related to our program goals."

--"Taught in other courses; doubt if it could stand on its own."

--"Because it's not an issue. We're talking truth in advertising. That's simple."

-- "I think it unnecessary to devote a whole course to advertising ethics. We, in fact, combine advertising ethics with the study of advertising regulation, both government and industry self-regulation. I think every student in every university ought to be required to take a course in ethics, and it ought to be taught in the philosophy/humanities area."

--"The least necessary for entry-level career position."

--"Complex issue. Believe ethics should be woven into entire university curriculum. Honesty is main issue and advertising needs no special set of commandments..."

--"Mostly because I'm not aware of such a course actually existing."

--"Because we should teach ethics in every course, not create an academic ghetto for ethics."

--Taught in other advertising courses. (10)

The question following the "Why did you rank..." question asked for specific topics that the respondent believes are essential to cover in a lesson or lessons on advertising ethics. Table IX summarizes the responses. Most responses were general. For example, "truth in advertising" and "confidentiality of information" were common responses. Other general responses included "ethical decision making," "socio-economic consequences of advertising," "conflicts of interest," "case studies," "consumerism," "agency-client relationships," "personal ethics," "business ethics," "historical problems" and "regulation." Since the question asked for specific topics, only those topics with a reasonably narrow focus--topics that could be covered in a lesson or a few lessons--are included in Table IX .

TABLE IX

SUGGESTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TOPICS TO BE COVERED IN A LESSON OR LESSONS ON ADVERTISING ETHICS

--Double billing
--Kickbacks, payoffs, bribes
--Advertising potentially harmful/dangerous products
--Codes of advertising ethics
--Relationship between law and ethics
--Advertising to children
--Stereotypes: advertising to minorities, men, women etc.
--Abuse of emotional appeals
--Abuse of sexual appeals
--Competing for clients
--Taxation of advertising
--Subliminal advertising
--Advertising by the learned professions

TABLE IX (Continued)

--Healthcare ads
--Cigarette warnings
--Alcohol ad bans and warnings
--Smokeless tobacco ads
--Teens and alcohol ads
--Political advertising
--Advertising on public TV
--Religious advertising
--Satanism in advertising
--The $1,000,000 minute
--Unbrand/generic advertising
--Public utility advertising
--Military ads
--Ads for gambling
--Alcoholism in the advertising industry
--Comparison advertising
--Advertising licensing
--Signed ads
--Mail order overkill
--Mail order fraud
--Commercial zipping and zapping
--Ad impact on the poor and elderly

Faculty Attitudes Toward Advertising Ethics and the Teaching of Advertising Ethics

A five-point Likert scale was used to examine faculty attitudes toward advertising ethics and the teaching of advertising ethics. For each of the following tables, the range of values is from 1 to 5, with a "1" meaning "strongly agree" and "5" meaning "strongly disagree."

With 72 usable responses, Table X indicates strong agreement with the statement that instruction in advertising ethics should be included in advertising education. Overall, 94 percent agreed with the statement and only 4 percent disagreed.

TABLE X

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT INSTRUCTION IN ADVERTISING ETHICS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN ADVERTISING EDUCATION

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	26 (55%)	18 (38%)	0 (0%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	1.57
Non.	25	15 (60%)	9 (36%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.44
All	72	41 (57%)	27 (38%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	1.53

Note: Nr.=Number of respondents; SA=strongly agree; A=agree; N=neutral; D=disagree; SD=strongly disagree.

The extent of agreement for both accredited and non-accredited groups was close, with accredited at 93 percent

and non-accredited at 96 percent.

For both categories of programs, the proportion of disagreement was not the same; three accredited and no non-accredited program representatives disagreed with the question. There was not, however, a significant difference between the means of the two groups.

Table XI indicates strong general disagreement among the 71 usable responses to the statement that advertising is predominantly an unethical business. Ninety-three percent overall disagreed with the statement. Only three percent took the opposite view.

For accredited programs, disagreement at 91 percent was about the same as the proportion of disagreement for non-accredited programs (92 percent). The proportion of agreement among non-accredited programs (8 percent) was slightly greater than the proportion of agreement among accredited programs (0 percent).

There was no significant difference between the means for accredited and non-accredited programs.

TABLE XI

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING IS PREDOMINANTLY AN UNETHICAL BUSINESS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	22 (47%)	21 (45%)	4.39
Non.	24	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (6%)	17 (70%)	6 (25%)	4.04
All	71	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	39 (55%)	27 (38%)	4.27

Overall, as shown in Table XII, there was disagreement that instruction in ethics is the responsibility of the advertising profession and not higher education. Only six percent of 71 faculty respondents agreed with the statement, while 82 percent disagreed.

The proportions of disagreement of accredited and non-accredited program respondents were about the same, 83 and 80 percent respectively. The proportions for agreement varied little as well, with 4 percent for accredited and 8 percent for non-accredited.

The means of both groups were nearly identical. Consequently, there was no significant difference between the means of the two groups on this question.

TABLE XII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT INSTRUCTION IN ETHICS IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ADVERTISING PROFESSION AND NOT HIGHER EDUCATION

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	6 (13%)	22 (48%)	16 (35%)	4.12
Non.	25	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	10 (40%)	10 (40%)	4.1
All	71	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	9 (13%)	32 (45%)	26 (37%)	4.11

There was strong agreement that knowledge of ethics is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical. Eighty-six percent of the respondents agreed with

this statement, while only 8 percent did not.

As Table XIII shows, a slightly greater proportion of respondents from non-accredited programs (92 percent) tended to agree with the statement when compared to the proportion of those agreeing (83 percent) from accredited programs. The proportions for disagreement stood at 11 percent for accredited and 4 percent for non-accredited. There was not a significant difference, however, between the means of the two groups of programs.

TABLE XIII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT KNOWLEDGE OF ETHICS IS ESSENTIAL TO THE CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE OF ADVERTISING

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	17 (37%)	21 (46%)	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	1.94
Non.	25	9 (36%)	14 (56%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1.76
All	71	26 (37%)	35 (49%)	4 (6%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)	1.87

With 70 usable responses, there was general agreement (71 percent of all respondents) that advertising ethics education is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical. As seen in Table XIV (next page), 14 percent of respondents disagreed with this statement.

The proportion of agreement among respondents from non-accredited programs was larger than that of respondents from accredited programs, 84 percent to 65 percent

respectively. Similarly, 20 percent of respondents from accredited programs disagreed with the statement, while only 4 percent from non-accredited programs did. Nonetheless, the difference between the two group means proved not to be significant.

TABLE XIV

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING ETHICS EDUCATION IS ESSENTIAL IF WE ARE TO MAKE THE ADVERTISING BUSINESS MORE ETHICAL

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	45	16 (36%)	13 (29%)	7 (16%)	7 (16%)	2 (4%)	2.24
Non.	25	10 (40%)	11 (44%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1.84
All	70	26 (37%)	24 (34%)	10 (14%)	7 (10%)	3 (4%)	2.1

There was only slight general agreement that education in advertising ethics is essential to the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession. Table XV

TABLE XV

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT EDUCATION IN ADVERTISING ETHICS IS ESSENTIAL TO THE MOVEMENT OF ADVERTISING TOWARD RECOGNITION AS A PROFESSION

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	43	9 (21%)	14 (33%)	9 (21%)	6 (14%)	5 (12%)	2.63
Non.	24	7 (29%)	14 (58%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1.92
All	67	16 (24%)	28 (42%)	10 (12%)	8 (12%)	5 (7%)	2.37

shows that overall 66 percent of respondents agreed with that statement. Overall, 19 percent disagreed and 14 percent of respondents were undecided.

A major difference in proportions emerged from the accredited and non-accredited groups. Fifty-four percent of respondents from accredited programs compared to 87 percent of the respondents from non-accredited programs agreed with the statement, while proportions for disagreement were 26 percent for accredited and only 8 percent for non-accredited. A t-test (t=2.428; probability= .018) showed that the mean difference between the two groups was significant, that respondents from non-accredited programs may tend to place a little more emphasis on advertising education as a way to help advertising be recognized as a profession than do respondents from accredited programs.

TABLE XVI

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING PRACTITIONERS SELDOM, IF EVER, HAVE ETHICAL PROBLEMS IN THEIR ADVERTISING CAREERS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	17 (37%)	26 (57%)	4.48
Non.	25	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	10 (40%)	12 (48%)	4.28
All	71	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)	27 (38%)	38 (54%)	4.41

Table XVI (above) shows that ninety-two percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement that advertising

practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers. The table shows that only two of the 71 useable responses were in agreement with that statement. There was a slightly greater proportion of accredited respondents (94 percent) disagreeing with the statement than non-accredited (88 percent), but there was no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

Table XVII indicates that exactly half the respondents agreed with the statement that the quality of present instruction in their respective schools is adequate for advertising majors. The other half is comprised of 33 percent who disagreed that the quality of instruction in their schools is adequate for advertising majors, and of 17 percent who are undecided.

TABLE XVII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE QUALITY OF PRESENT INSTRUCTION IN ADVERTISING ETHICS IN THE RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL IS ADEQUATE FOR ADVERTISING MAJORS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	45	4 (9%)	23 (51%)	4 (9%)	13 (29%)	1 (2%)	2.64
Non.	25	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	8 (32%)	5 (20%)	4 (16%)	3.12
All	70	6 (9%)	29 (41%)	12 (17%)	18 (26%)	5 (7%)	2.81

A greater proportion of respondents from accredited programs (60 percent) agreed with this statement than those

from non-accredited programs (32 percent). Concerning this statement, 32 percent of respondents from non-accredited programs were unsure. Despite the disparity in proportions between the accredited and non-accredited programs, no significant difference was found between the means.

According to Table XVIII, overall, 75 percent of respondents disagreed with the statement that advertising ethics instruction can be accomplished adequately by the lecture method alone. Eight percent agreed with that statement; 17 percent were unsure.

The proportion of agreement among representatives from accredited programs was about the same as the proportion of agreement among representatives from non-accredited programs. The proportion of disagreement among non-accredited was slightly higher (80 percent) than the proportion of disagreement among accredited (72 percent). There was not, however, a significant difference between the means of the two programs.

TABLE XVIII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING ETHICS INSTRUCTION CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED ADEQUATELY BY THE LECTURE METHOD ALONE

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	9 (20%)	30 (65%)	3 (7%)	3.67
Non.	25	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	16 (64%)	4 (16%)	3.88
All	71	1 (1%)	5 (7%)	12 (17%)	46 (65%)	7 (10%)	3.75

Overall, (see Table XIX) respondents tended to agree (75 percent) that a lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for their respective advertising majors. Twenty-percent disagreed with that statement.

The proportion of non-accredited respondents who agreed with the statement (88 percent) was greater than the proportion of respondents from accredited programs who agreed (67 percent). Disagreement proved to be proportionately less for non-accredited (12 percent) compared to accredited (24 per-cent). A t-test (t=2.051; probability= .044) showed a significant difference between the means of the two groups, indicating that representatives from accredited programs did not feel quite as strongly as did representatives from non-accredited programs that a lack of room in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for their particular advertising majors.

TABLE XIX

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT A LACK OF ROOM FOR ADDITIONAL, REQUIRED COURSES IN THE CURRICULUM IS AN OBSTACLE TO INCREASED ETHICS INSTRUCTION FOR THE RESPONDENT'S ADVERTISING MAJORS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	8 (17%)	23 (50%)	4 (9%)	6 (13%)	5 (11%)	2.5
Non.	25	8 (32%)	14 (56%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	1.92
All	71	16 (23%)	37 (52%)	4 (6%)	9 (13%)	5 (7%)	2.3

The majority of respondents (67 percent) disagreed that instructors' lack of background in advertising ethics is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors. The proportion of disagreement from respondents from accredited programs was larger than the proportion of disagreement from respondents from non-accredited programs, 74 percent and 56 percent respectively. Yet, no statistical significance was found between the mean scores of the two groups. (See Table XX) Agreement with the statement accounted for 23 percent of the responses, with accredited at 20 percent and non-accredited slightly higher at 28 percent.

TABLE XX

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT INSTRUCTORS' LACK OF BACKGROUND IN ADVERTISING ETHICS IS AN OBSTACLE TO INCREASED ETHICS INSTRUCTION FOR RESPONDENT'S ADVERTISING MAJORS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	45	1 (2%)	8 (18%)	3 (7%)	25 (56%)	8 (18%)	3.69
Non.	25	1 (4%)	6 (24%)	4 (16%)	12 (48%)	2 (8%)	3.32
All	70	2 (3%)	14 (20%)	7 (10%)	37 (53%)	10 (14%)	3.56

There was slight overall agreement (53 percent) with the statement that the extent of ethics instruction for advertising majors at the respondent's school should

be increased. Table XXI shows that twenty-seven percent disagreed with the statement; 20 percent were undecided.

In terms of proportions, 68 percent of respondents from non-accredited programs agreed, while accredited agreed at only 46 percent. Disagreement was divided as well, with 32 percent of accredited disagreeing and only 16 percent of non-accredited. At the 95 percent confidence level, the difference between the means was not significant.

TABLE XXI

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE EXTENT OF ETHICS INSTRUCTION FOR ADVERTISING MAJORS IN THE RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL SHOULD BE INCREASED

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	3 (7%)	18 (39%)	10 (22%)	13 (28%)	2 (4%)	2.85
Non.	25	3 (12%)	14 (56%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)	2.36
All	71	6 (8%)	32 (45%)	14 (20%)	17 (24%)	2 (3%)	2.68

All 72 respondents reacted to the statement that if advertising majors take an ethics course outside the department, there is no need for additional ethics instruction within the department. Table XXII (on the next page) shows overall disagreement with this statement (73 percent). Only 14 percent of all respondents agreed with the statement. The proportions regarding agreement between the accredited/non-accredited groups were close, with 13 percent

and 16 percent respectively. The proportions regarding disagreement differed by 7 percentage points, 75 percent for accredited and 68 percent for non-accredited. However, there was no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

TABLE XXII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT IF ADVERTISING MAJORS TAKE AN ETHICS COURSE OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT, THERE IS NO NEED FOR ADDITIONAL ETHICS INSTRUCTION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	6 (13%)	30 (64%)	5 (11%)	3.72
Non.	25	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	15 (60%)	2 (8%)	3.56
All	72	1 (1%)	9 (13%)	10 (14%)	45 (63%)	7 (10%)	3.67

Table XXIII indicates general disagreement with the

TABLE XXIII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING GRADUATES WITH COURSEWORK IN ETHICS HAVE AN ADVANTAGE IN THE JOB MARKETPLACE OVER ADVERTISING GRADUATES WITHOUT THAT COURSEWORK

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	45	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	11 (24%)	20 (44%)	11 (24%)	3.87
Non.	25	1 (4%)	4 (16%)	10 (40%)	7 (28%)	3 (12%)	3.28
All	70	1 (1%)	7 (10%)	21 (30%)	27 (39%)	14 (20%)	3.66

statement that advertising graduates with coursework in ethics have an advantage in the job marketplace over advertising graduates without that coursework. Fifty-nine percent of respondents disagreed with that statement, 11 percent agreed, and 30 percent were undecided.

In terms of proportions, as many respondents from non-accredited programs were undecided as disagreed with the statement (40 percent in each case). Twenty-percent of non-accredited agreed with the statement, compared to just 7 percent of accredited. Sixty-eight percent of accredited disagreed.

Although one must consider that there were 21 undecided responses, the means for the accredited/non-accredited groups did yield a significant difference at the 95 percent confidence level. This may mean that respondents from accredited programs disagree a bit more strongly with the ethics coursework/job advantage statement.

Concerning the attitude toward the advertising teaching philosophy of "principles first," Table XXIV (next page) depicts overall agreement (73 percent) and nearly identical proportions of agreement (73 percent for accredited and 72 percent for non-accredited) for the two groups. Likewise, proportions for disagreement are very similar, with 14 percent for accredited and 16 percent for non-accredited. Similarly, the means are nearly identical, for no significant difference between them.

TABLE XXIV

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE DOMINANT PHILOSOPHY IN TEACHING ADVERTISING SHOULD BE "PRINCIPLES (THEORY, THE "WHY" OF ADVERTISING) FIRST."

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	44	8 (18%)	24 (55%)	6 (14%)	6 (14%)	0 (0%)	2.23
Non.	25	5 (20%)	13 (52%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	2.28
All	69	13 (19%)	37 (54%)	9 (13%)	9 (13%)	1 (1%)	2.25

Table XXV shows only slight disagreement with the statement that the best way to teach advertising ethics is as an ethical topic or question arises in class. Fewer than half the respondents disagreed with the statement (45 percent) while about one-third of the programs agreed (34 percent). Greater proportions of respondents from accredited

TABLE XXV

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE BEST WAY TO TEACH ADVERTISING ETHICS IS AS AN ETHICAL TOPIC OR QUESTION ARISES IN CLASS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	3 (7%)	14 (30%)	6 (13%)	21 (46%)	2 (4%)	3.11
Non.	25	0 (0%)	7 (28%)	9 (36%)	9 (36%)	0 (0%)	3.08
All	71	3 (4%)	21 (30%)	15 (21%)	30 (42%)	2 (3%)	3.1

programs tended to take both sides of the issue (37 percent agreed and 50 percent disagreed) while the proportions for non-accredited were smaller (28 percent agreed and 36 percent disagreed). Over one-third of the non-accredited responses (36 percent) fell in the undecided category. There was no significant difference between the nearly identical means.

The statement that ethics education for advertising majors will be stronger if other departments on campus are involved in its teaching produced no overall, clear-cut consensus. Thirty-six percent of respondents agreed with the statement and 35 percent disagreed. Furthermore, over one-fourth (28 percent) of the respondents chose the "undecided" response. However, Table XXVI shows respondents from accredited programs did lean proportionally toward disagreement (41 percent to 30 percent for agree) while respondents from non-accredited programs leaned toward agreement (48 percent to 24 percent disagree). Still, there

TABLE XXVI

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ETHICS EDUCATION FOR ADVERTISING MAJORS WILL BE STRONGER IF OTHER DEPARTMENTS ON CAMPUS ARE INVOLVED IN ITS TEACHING

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	1 (2%)	13 (28%)	13 (28%)	19 (41%)	0 (0%)	3.09
Non.	25	2 (8%)	10 (40%)	7 (28%)	6 (24%)	0 (0%)	2.68
All	71	3 (4%)	23 (32%)	20 (28%)	25 (35%)	0 (0%)	2.94

was no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

Overall, there was slight agreement with the statement that there is more pressure now than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business. Table XVII shows 51 percent of all respondents agreed with the statement. Twenty-five percent disagreed, and 24 percent were undecided.

The proportion of agreement was stronger for respondents from non-accredited programs (60 percent) when compared with respondents from accredited programs (47 percent). Similarly, a smaller proportion of non-accredited disagreed with the statement (16 percent) compared to the accredited proportion of disagreement (30 percent). For both groups, nearly one-fourth of the responses fell in the "undecided" column. There was no significant difference between the means.

TABLE XXVII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THERE IS MORE PRESSURE NOW THAN EVER FOR ETHICAL BEHAVIOR IN THE ADVERTISING BUSINESS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	5 (11%)	17 (36%)	11 (23%)	10 (21%)	4 (9%)	2.81
Non.	25	1 (4%)	14 (56%)	6 (24%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	2.56
All	72	6 (8%)	31 (43%)	17 (24%)	13 (18%)	5 (7%)	2.72

Regarding the statement that the best way to teach advertising ethics is to give specific rules for behavior, there was strong, general disagreement. Seventy-two percent of the respondents disagreed, while only 11 percent agreed. The accredited and non-accredited groups also registered about the same proportions of agreement/disagreement.

TABLE XXVIII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE BEST WAY TO TEACH ADVERTISING ETHICS IS TO GIVE STUDENTS SPECIFIC RULES FOR BEHAVIOR

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	8 (17%)	24 (51%)	9 (19%)	3.77
Non.	25	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	4 (16%)	13 (52%)	6 (24%)	3.92
All	72	0 (0%)	8 (11%)	12 (17%)	37 (51%)	15 (21%)	3.82

There was no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

Faculty representatives from accredited programs were unanimous in their disagreement with the statement that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services. Non-accredited programs were near unanimity at 92 percent disagreement with two undecided. No respondent agreed with this statement.

As shown in Table XXIX, overall, 98 percent disagreed. The group means, by far the highest in disagreement of all 23 Likert item questions in the questionnarie, did not demonstrate a significant difference.

TABLE XXIX

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE ONLY ROLE OF THE ADVERTISING EDUCATOR SHOULD BE TO TEACH STUDENTS TO SELL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	47	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (34%)	31 (66%)	4.66
Non.	25	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	9 (36%)	14 (56%)	4.48
All	72	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	25 (35%)	45 (63%)	4.6

Table XXX shows strong overall disagreement with the statement that advertising majors can pick up on their

TABLE XXX

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT ADVERTISING MAJORS CAN PICK UP AN UNDERSTANDING OF ETHICS ON THEIR OWN, WITHOUT THE HELP OF AN EDUCATOR.

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	0 (0%)	8 (17%)	3 (7%)	24 (52%)	11 (24%)	3.83
Non.	25	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	10 (40%)	8 (32%)	3.92
All	71	0 (0%)	11 (15%)	7 (10%)	34 (48%)	19 (27%)	3.86

own an understanding of ethics without the help of an educator. Overall, three-fourths of the respondents disagreed with this statement, while only 15 percent agreed. The proportions of agreement/disagreement among groups did not vary much. Seventeen percent of accredited programs agreed with the statement; 12 percent of the non-accredited agreed as well. Seventy-six percent of the accredited programs disagreed, compared to 72 percent of the non-accredited. There was no significant difference between the means.

As shown in Table XXXI, the statement that the pressures of the marketplace encourage advertising practitioners to ignore moral questions drew slight agreement from 71 respondents. Fifty-two percent said they agreed with the statement; 39 percent said they disagreed, with 8 percent undecided. A slightly larger proportion of non-accredited

TABLE XXXI

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE PRESSURES OF THE MARKETPLACE ENCOURAGE ADVERTISING PRACTITIONERS TO IGNORE MORAL QUESTIONS

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	46	5 (11%)	18 (39%)	3 (7%)	14 (30%)	6 (13%)	2.96
Non.	25	0 (0%)	14 (56%)	3 (12%)	8 (32%)	0 (0%)	2.76
All	71	5 (7%)	32 (45%)	6 (8%)	22 (31%)	6 (8%)	2.89

(56 percent) agreed with the statement than accredited (50 percent). In the same vein, the proportion of non-accredited disagreement (32 percent) was slightly lower than that of accredited (43 percent). There was no significant difference between the means.

There was general disagreement with the final statement on the questionnaire. As seen in Table XXXII, 68 percent of respondents disagreed that the dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "skills first." Only 22 percent agreed. The proportions for the two groups were similar as well. For accredited: 23 percent agreed and 66 percent disagreed. For non-accredited: 20 percent agreed and 72 percent disagreed. The means were nearly identical; therefore, there was no significant difference between them.

TABLE XXXII

AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THE DOMINANT PHILOSOPHY IN TEACHING ADVERTISING SHOULD BE "SKILLS (VOCATIONAL, THE "HOW TO" OF ADVERTISING) FIRST."

	Nr.	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Acc.	44	0 (0%)	10 (23%)	5 (11%)	18 (41%)	11 (25%)	3.6
Non.	25	0 (0%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	15 (60%)	3 (12%)	3.64
All	69	0 (0%)	15 (22%)	7 (10%)	33 (48%)	14 (20%)	3.62

Other Data

It was hypothesized that accredited programs would have more extensive instruction in ethics than non-accredited programs. Although, as cited earlier, 14 accredited programs did offer an advertising ethics elective while only 2 non-accredited did, overall, taking into account a program's electives and requirements in ethics (see questionnaire, Section II, questions 1, 2, and 3, Appendix D) the hypothesis is not supported. Table XXXIII shows the number of accredited and non-accredited programs that reported at

TABLE XXXIII

NUMBER OF ACCREDITED AND NON-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS REPORTING AT LEAST ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: A REQUIRED ADVERTISING ETHICS COURSE, A REQUIRED NON-ADVERTISING ETHICS COURSE, OR AN ADVERTISING ETHICS ELECTIVE.

	Not Accred.	Accredited	
Ad Ethics as a requirement, and/or ad ethics as an elective, and/or any non-advertising ethics required.	17	24	total 41
None of the above	8	23	total 31
	total 25	total 47	TOTAL 72

least one of the following: a required advertising ethics course, a required non-advertising ethics course, an advertising ethics elective. A Chi-square value of 1.909, however, was not significant.

In addition, the "extensive instruction" idea was also measured by the mean scores in regard to how much time respondents from accredited and non-accredited programs devoted to teaching ethics in courses other than advertising ethics courses. The means for both groups were nearly identical, 2.13 for accredited and 2.11 for non-accredited. (1=less than 5 percent of course time devoted to teaching ethics, 2=between 5 and 10 percent, 3=between 10 and 20 percent, 4=between 20 and 30 percent, 5=over 30 percent)

It was also hypothesized that the instructor who most closely identifies with the practice of advertising rather than the teaching of it will see less value in teaching ethics and more value in the vocational aspects of teaching advertising. Consequently, he/she will devote less time to teaching ethics. The data did not support these hypotheses. T-tests were run for both groups on time devoted to teaching ethics outside a formal advertising ethics course. T-tests were also run for both groups on questionnaire Likert items 1, 3, 20 and 23. These questions had to do with the importance of teaching ethics, with whether the teaching of ethics is the responsibility of the advertising profession or higher education, with whether the only role of the advertising educator is to teach students to sell products,

and with whether the dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "skills first."

Additionally, it was hypothesized that educators with coursework in ethics would be less receptive to the exclusion of ethics education in the advertising curriculum. The data did not demonstrate this. The statement that instruction in advertising ethics should be included in the advertising curriculum did produce a difference in means between educators who had taken any course in ethics (a mean of 1.42) and educators who had not (a mean of 1.7). Of course, with "1" representing "strongly agree" and 5 representing "strongly agree" both groups agreed with the statement. Furthermore, the differences between the means were not statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level.

It was also hypothesized that those educators with a background of coursework in ethics would be less receptive to the exclusive use of the pervasive method in advertising education. Again, there was a difference in the means for the two groups (2.92 for those who never took an ethics course themselves and 3.2 for those who had taken at least one). Still, there was no significant difference between the means. It should also be noted that the scores indicate that both groups tended to disagree with the use of the pervasive method.

In terms of academic degree and attitude toward the pervasive method, no difference between the holders of the master's and the doctorates was found. In fact, rounded off,

the means for both groups were identical (3.1).

Additionally, t-tests were run on all 23 Likert items grouped by degree. No significant differences were found in any of the 23 statement responses.

Also tested were attitudes toward the pervasive method as a function of time devoted to teaching ethics and as a function of where educators ranked the ethics course in terms of importance to the curriculum. No significant differences were found in either case. There were two "time devoted" groups established: those who reported devoting 10 percent or less of their non-advertising ethics courseloads to teaching advertising ethics and those who reported devoting more than 10 percent. Fifty-one respondents devoted 10 percent or less; 19 devoted more than 10 percent. Nonetheless, their mean scores on the pervasive method Likert item were very close (3.2 and 3.0 respectively) and there was no significant difference between the means. Similarly, the rankings (Section II, #5 of questionnaire) produced no significant differences between one group that ranked the advertising ethics course last or second-last (40 respondents) and another group that ranked it first through sixth (23 respondents).

It was also hypothesized that those educators who believe that advertising professionals often encounter ethical dilemmas in their jobs would deem the teaching of advertising ethics more important than those educators who do not agree that advertising professionals face many ethical

dilemmas. This hypothesis found no support in the data. If only two respondents out of 72 said that advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, encounter ethical problems in their advertising careers, and if only 3 respondents out of 72 disagreed that advertising ethics should be included in advertising education, the data offer no reasonable basis for any comparisons.

Out of the 23 Likert items, however, three significant differences were found when respondents were grouped by whether or not they offered a required or elective course in advertising ethics or required course in general ethics or whether they offered none of the aforementioned. (See Table XXXIII to review the frequencies for the two groups.) Table XXXIV (on the next page) shows the differences between the two groups in terms of their means and probabilities that the means are significant. Group I (41 programs) had some type of ethics elective or requirement. Group II (31 programs) had none, although it should be noted that most Group II schools probably have a general ethics course on campus that an advertising student could take, if interested.

TABLE XXXIV

PROGRAMS WITH AN ADVERTISING ETHICS REQUIREMENT AND/OR AN ADVERTISING ETHICS ELECTIVE AND/OR A GENERAL ETHICS REQUIREMENT COMPARED TO PROGRAMS WITHOUT THE AFOREMENTIONED, IN TERMS OF RESPONSES TO THREE PARTICULAR LIKERT ITEMS

	Item #8	Item #10	Item #20
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Group 1	3.05	1.9	4.46
Group 2	2.52	2.81	4.77
T	2.005	3.508	2.467
Probability	.049	.000	.016

Item #8 was the respondent's agreement with the statement that the quality of present instruction in advertising ethics at his/her school is adequate for advertising majors. Although Group 1 already offered some kind of ethics elective/requirement, it still leaned closer to the assessment of "inadequate" than did Group 2.

Item #10 was the respondent's agreement with the statement that a lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors. Group 1 tended to lean closer to agreement with this statement than Group 2. This may have something to do with the fact that three-fourths of

Group 1 are accredited programs. As seen in Chapter III, accreditation limits the number of courses a program must offer but simultaneously encourages the teaching of ethics.

Item #20 states that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services. Both groups disagreed with this statement, with Group 2 a significant bit stronger.

Apart from t-tests run on the Likert item involving the pervasive method and the two "time devoted" groups mentioned earlier, t-tests were also run on the other 22 Likert items and the "time devoted" factor. Items #7 and #20 yielded significant data in terms of mean differences.

Item #7 stated that advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers. Although both "time devoted" groups (the 51 respondents reporting that they devoted 10 percent or less course time to advertising ethics and the 19 respondents reporting that they devoted more than 10 percent) disagreed with the statement, ironically, the group that devoted less time to advertising ethics expressed significantly stronger disagreement on the issue. The mean for the "10 percent or less" group was 4.6; the mean for the "more than 10 percent" group was 3.9. The probability for the 3.607 t-ratio was .000, demonstrating that the mean difference is significant.

Likert item #20 produced a t-ratio of 2.457 at a probability of .016. The mean score for the "10 percent or less" group was 4.7, and for the "more than 10 percent

group 4.35. Therefore, as seen earlier, both groups disagreed that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services. But if one might expect that the more time an educator devotes to teaching advertising ethics, the stronger would be his disagreement with this statement when compared to an educator who devotes less time to advertising ethics--that would be a faulty expectation, at least based on this data. Again it should be noted that both groups do disagree with the statement, but the "less than 10 percent" group's disagreement is significantly stronger.

Finally, a Pearson correlation matrix was produced for each of the 23 Likert items, indicating two high-marked relations. There was high degree of positive association between Likert items #5 and #6. Both items began by stating that advertising ethics education is essential. Item #5 stated that advertising ethics education is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical. Item #6 stated that it is essential to the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession. A Pearson correlation coefficient of .745 was produced. As one would expect intuitively, there is an attitudinal linkage between making the advertising business more ethical and helping the business achieve professional status.

The other high-marked correlation was a negative one between Likert items #12 and #8. Item #8 stated that the quality of present instruction in the respondent's school

is adequate for advertising majors. Item #12 stated that the extent of ethics instruction for advertising majors in the respondent's school should be increased. A Pearson correlation coefficient of -.722 was produced. Although the questions are not opposites--since one deals with quality of present instruction and the other deals with extent of present instruction-- a correlation coefficient of -.722 indicates a high-marked negative relationship between extent of ethics instruction and quality of ethics instruction. That is, if a respondent is satisified with the quality of ethics instruction, he may not be as likely to opt for an increase in the extent of advertising ethics instruction. Likewise, if a respondent is not satisfied with quality, he may be likely to call for an increase in advertising ethics instruction. Although in both instances, more variables affecting the decision may be at work than just extent of instruction or the assessment of quality.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

As Fox noted, advertising is "an especially visible manifestation, good ad bad, of the Amercian way of life." (1) Advertising pervades American culture. Billions of dollars are spent annually on advertising.

Students continue to flock to advertising programs. Many are required to take a core curriculum that covers principles of advertising, copywriting, media planning and advertising campaigns. Traditionally, only a few programs have required a course in advertising ethics.

Advertising ethics has been taught largely through the "pervasive method." This means that advertising ethics are taught, both in planned lessons and as advertising ethics questions arise in class, as part of the core and elective advertising courses.

One purpose of this study was to determine if the pervasive method of teaching advertising ethics still prevails and to determine how much time educators estimated they spent teaching ethics in their core and elective advertising courses. Another purpose was to determine current attitudes of advertising educators as they pertain to

the advertising business itself, but predominantly as they pertain to proposed and practiced methods, philosophies and curricular organization in advertising ethics education.

One question examined in this study was whether advertising educators' backgrounds would affect the amount of time devoted to the pervasive method of teaching advertising ethics. There was no significant difference in time devoted to the pervasive method by doctorates versus holders of master's degrees only, by whether or not the respondents had taken ethics courses in college, or by whether the educator respondents perceived themselves as primarily educators or primarily as practitioners first.

It was also hypothesized that accredited advertising programs would have more extensive instruction in advertising ethics than non-accredited programs. The criterion of extensiveness only held true for an elective course in advertising ethics, where significantly more accredited than non-accredited programs offered such an elective.

As expected, the respondents strongly agreed that instruction in advertising ethics should be included in advertising education. Additionally, respondents favored the "principles-first" philosophy of advertising education over the vocational philosophy and agreed that a lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction in their respective programs. Also, more respondents disagreed than agreed with the statement that the best way to teach advertising ethics is as an

ethical topic or question arises in class.

Attitudinal findings concerning the industry itself include that respondents do not believe advertising is predominantly unethical business and that respondents agree there is more pressure than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business.

Approximately three-fourths of 70 study respondents said they devote 10 percent or less time to advertising ethics in their core or elective advertising courses. When asked to rank an advertising ethics course with seven other advertising courses in terms of curricular priority, the advertising ethics course was ranked last. Also, of the 72 programs responding, four percent have an advertising ethics course as a requirement and 21 percent have it as an elective.

Summary and Conclusions

Of the 90 institutions in the sample, 72 responded to the initial survey and follow-up mailing, for an overall response rate of 80 percent. Four percent of those responding to the questionnaire require their advertising majors to take a course specifically devoted to advertising ethics. In comparison, 18 (25 percent) of the 72 programs require their advertising majors to take an ethics course taught outside the advertising sequence. Also, an advertising ethics course is an elective in 15 (21 percent) of the responding programs. Thirty-six (50 percent) of the

responding programs do have either a general ethics requirement or an advertising ethics requirement/elective.

In terms of ethics courses, the data show that accredited programs differ from non-accredited programs in four respects. Accredited programs clearly offer more elective advertising ethics courses--93 percent of all advertising ethics elective courses. This can be attributed, at least in part, to ACEJMC accreditation guidelines that encourage covering ethical issues of advertising.

Next, it should be noted that the 36 programs responding "yes" to at least one of the three questions regarding ethics offerings, when compared to the programs without such offerings, responded significantly more negatively to the statement that the quality of present instruction in advertising ethics is adequate in their respective programs. Perhaps this suggests that those programs already doing something to promote ethics education for advertising majors still feel that "something" isn't enough.

Third, the 36 "yes" respondents, when compared to the respondents that did not offer an advertising ethics requirement, a general ethics requirement, or an advertising ethics elective, tended to more strongly agree that a lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased advertising ethics instruction for advertising majors. Perhaps the answer is to make room.

Finally, in terms of who is already making some room for ethics instruction for advertising majors, when compared to

those programs without the stipulated ethics electives or requirements, the 36 "yes" respondents voiced significantly stronger disagreement with the statement that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services.

In terms of the educators involved with the programs, 78 percent of those responding to the inquiry said they mainly think of themselves as college/university professors who teach advertising rather than advertising professionals who teach advertising. Although the data seem to suggest that as one's professional experience increases, he seems to identify with the latter group, the data do not suggest any profound attitudinal differences between the two groups. Therefore, hypotheses that considered those who identified foremost with the professionals to be more practice than theory oriented and to be less concerned about teaching advertising ethics than their "professor-oriented" counterparts were clearly unsubstantiated. Similarly, an hypothesis that considered the "professional-oriented" to favor the sole role of advertising educator as teaching students to sell products was not substantiated by the data.

The educator's own coursework in ethics and his/her highest academic degree were also considered as possible causes of variance in attitudes toward advertising ethics education. In fact, the data showed absolutely no significant differences in attitudes toward advertising and advertising ethics education based on one group holding the

doctorate and another holding the master's.

It was hypothesized that educators with coursework in ethics would be less receptive to the exclusion of ethics education in the advertising curriculum. In fact, those with ethics coursework and those without it were all strongly in favor of including advertising ethics in the advertising curriculum.

There were, however, two significant differences between respondents who reported devoting 10 percent or less of course time to topics in advertising ethics (51 respondents) and those who reported devoting more than 10 percent (19 respondents). The group that devoted less time to advertising ethics expressed significantly stronger disagreement with the statement that advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers. Also, in response to the statement that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services, the "less than 10 percent" group voiced significantly stronger disagreement. Therefore, an hypothesis stating that the more time devoted to teaching advertising ethics, the stronger one believes that advertising practitioners have considerable ethical problems in their careers would not be supported by the data. Similarly, an hypothesis stating that the more time devoted to teaching advertising ethics, the stronger one believes that the role of the advertising educator is to teach students more than just selling products and services would

also not be supported by the data.

Attitudes toward the advertising business itself were represented by five attitudinal statements in the questionnaire. Only three percent of respondents agreed that advertising is predominantly an unethical business. Only eight percent disagreed that knowledge of ethics is essential to the contemporary practice of advertising. Only three percent agreed that advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers. On two other issues regarding the business, however, the consensus wasn't as clear.

Fifty-one percent of the respondents did agree that there is more pressure now than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business. Yet, 25 percent disagreed and 24 percent were undecided. Also, 52 percent said they agreed with the statement that the pressures of the marketplace encourage advertising practitioners to ignore moral questions. However, 39 percent (28 respondents) disagreed. For this statement, one respondent wrote in the margin, "A likely excuse!"

Overall, the educators, most with experience in the field, think advertising is basically an ethical business but not without ethical problems. They think studying advertising ethics is important for the practice of advertising. A slight majority believe that ethical pressure in the business has never been greater and that such pressure can lead practitioners to ignore moral questions.

As one might expect, the educators believe that higher education and not the advertising profession alone bears responsibility for instruction in ethics. Eighty-two percent of respondents agree that higher education should be involved. Similarly, there is widespread agreement that knowledge of ethics is essential to the contemporary practice of advertising (86 percent) and widespread agreement that education can help make the business more ethical (71 percent). Also, there was agreement (66 percent) that education in advertising ethics is essential to the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession. Non-accredited programs tended to place significantly more emphasis on education as a way to help advertising be recognized as a profession than did accredited programs.

Three statements in the questionnaire asked for attitudes regarding the respondents' particular schools in terms of quality of present instruction in advertising ethics, in terms of room in the curriculum, and in terms of increasing the extent of advertising ethics instruction. Half the respondents felt the quality of advertising ethics instruction in their schools was adequate. One-third felt the quality was inadequate. Some weren't sure (17 percent). Yet, about half (53 percent) said that the extent of ethics instruction for advertising majors in their schools should be increased (#12). About one-fourth said the extent of instruction needn't be increased. In essence, it seems that many are satisified with what is being done, although they'd

like to see more be done. However, 75 percent say there is a lack of room in the curriculum for increased advertising ethics instruction. Also of note is that a significantly greater proportion of accredited programs (88 percent), those with curricular "room" restrictions, agreed with the statement that a lack of room in the curriculum is an obstacle for increased ethics instruction as opposed to the proportion of non-accredited programs (67 percent).

The irony of the accreditation process is that, for advertising, one of its principal strengths is also one of its principal weaknesses. By placing a "cap" on the number of journalism courses allowed, the accreditors feel they guard against an "overvocationalized" major. In other words, a liberal education with a limited number of journalism courses is the goal. However, such restrictions tend to ensure that vocational courses are taught--at the expense of courses that have a liberal arts "bent"--advertising ethics for one. As Sandage lamented, "Too much emphasis has been placed on hiring and training craftsmen and not enough on educating for understanding." (2)

Of the remaining Likert items, three can roughly be classified as philosophy statements, four as teaching methods statements, and three as curriculum organization statements regarding advertising ethics education.

Clearly the data show that few educators have taken a course in advertising ethics. Yet, Likert statement #11 was written not just to include the coursework factor but

also the professional experience factor. The statement: Instructors' lack of background in advertising ethics is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors. The consensus: Sixty-seven percent disagreed with the statement. Twenty-three percent agreed. Evidently, whether they were thinking of coursework, professional experience, or both, the majority felt that instructors' backgrounds in advertising ethics would be adequate should the advertising ethics curriculum be expanded. In short, they could meet the challenge.

The matter of advertising ethics instruction organized across disciplines was treated in the questionnaire. One item stated that if advertising majors take an ethics course outside the department, there is no need for additional ethics instruction within the department. Advertising educators (73 percent) disagreed. Only 14 percent agreed. Evidently, the educators believe the advertising major needs more than general, non-advertising-specific ethics instruction. On the other hand, there is no clear-cut mandate--and some uncertainty--as to whether including other departments on campus in the organization of education for advertising majors is a good idea. Another questionnaire item stated that ethics education for advertising majors will be stronger if other departments on campus are involved in its teaching. About one-third agreed, about one-third disagreed and close to one-third were undecided. This question was weak because it did not specify

whether other departments, philosophy for example, would help team-teach advertising courses or would teach a general course in their own departments that advertising majors happen to take. Some feedback indicates that respondents interpreted the question to mean that advertising educators and educators from other departments would share teaching duties. If such is the case, the majority of advertising educators may have some reservations about that arrangement.

In terms of teaching methods, three-fourths of the educators agreed that the lecture method alone would not suffice as the sole means of educating students about advertising ethics. Only 8 percent agreed that the lecture method alone could do an adequate job. Evidently, the educators realize that a diversity of approaches, or at least more than the traditional approach, is necessary.

Is the best way to teach advertising ethics as an ethical topic or question arises in class? Many advertising educators (45 percent) say no. Some (34 percent) say yes. More than a few (21 percent) are undecided. Of course, this statement precludes the use of planned lessons or units on specific advertising ethics topics. Perhaps a follow-up statement should have probed the importance of short, planned lessons. More study is needed in the area of the pervasive method of teaching advertising ethics.

As seen in the literature review, the "dictatorial" method of teaching ethics is not highly recommended. Respondents to this questionnaire also strongly believe that

such "preaching" may not be the best method. Seventy-two percent of respondents disagreed that the best way to teach advertising ethics is to give students specific rules for behavior. Only 11 percent agreed.

As cited earlier, at least one writer believes that a "method" of teaching advertising ethics is to allow the students to pick up an understanding of ethics on their own, without the help of an educator. Seventy-five percent of the 71 educators did not agree that the discovery-without-educator-intervention method was a good one. Given the answers to other items that indicate a strong preference for advertising ethics education, this response is not surprising.

Some educators say that the only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services. Perhaps the statement to that effect in this questionnaire would have been better stated by substituting the word "primary" for "only." In any event, 70 of the 72 respondents disagreed with the statement. Nobody agreed.

As noted earlier, there are two "camps" in terms of philosophy of teaching advertising: principles first and skills first. The respondents to this questionnaire opted for principles (theory, the "why" of advertising). 73 percent agreed with the statement that the dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "principles first." In comparison, only 22 percent agreed that the

dominant philosophy should be "skills first."

Unfortunately, decision makers for the advertising curriculum tend to behave as the agency personnel did in the Rotzoll and Christian study: they seem to follow the standard of immediate consequences. (3)

In the Rotzoll/Christians study, agency personnel faced with problematical situations involving ethics, tended to ask about the direct effect of their behavior on the client and on the usual mores that prevail in the agency. (4) This is somewhat analogous to the educator/student/industry relationship. The "client" in this case is the student and the industry. What are their immediate needs? What kind of curriculum will yield the greatest benefits for the industry and for entry-level practitioners? Next, what is the curricular norm? What courses do other advertising programs offer? The answers to these questions inevitably involve employment of the standard "core" curriculum with little emphasis on ethics and a lot of emphasis on preparing students for the vocation of copywriter and account executive, for example. Quality education in advertising ethics, then, is often a luxury not afforded by the standard of immediate consequences. This is perhaps why one respondent wrote, "Are you kidding? They hire talent. Period." in response to the statement that advertising graduates with coursework in ethics have an advantage in the job marketplace.

Recommendations for Further Study

The results of this study have prompted several ideas for further research.

This study primarily focused on the attitudes of advertising faculty toward the teaching of advertising ethics. Since advertising education maintains ties with the advertising industry, it would be a good idea to query practitioners on their attitudes toward the teaching of advertising ethics. Many of the Likert items may reveal interesting data, particularly the item stating that education in advertising ethics is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical. Perhaps a survey of adjunct faculty, the many full-time practitioners who teach a course at a college or university, would be fruitful, since these people have a "taste" of advertising education. In any case, a survey of practitioners could pinpoint what they expect from advertising ethics education in terms of a student "product," in terms of percentage of the curriculum devoted to advertising ethics, and in terms of teaching philosophies and methods.

Regarding knowledge of advertising ethics, what do practitioners expect from entry-level employees? What specific topics do the practitioners deem important to cover in a lesson or lessons in advertising ethics? Do they believe an entire course should be devoted to advertising ethics? Perhaps respondents could be divided into several categories, including those who recently graduated from

advertising programs and those in upper management. In the same vein, the study could include questions about how the advertising industry feels about advertising education in general. How important is it? How much money do they give to support it? In exchange for the support, what is the industry's expectations?

Earlier Rotzoll was quoted as saying that the public's judgment of advertising's ethical standards "places it at or near the bottom in virtually any occupational array." (5) More investigation of public attitudes is needed, particularly as it applies to advertising education. Why does the public not trust advertising? If we learn more about the perceived deficiencies, perhaps we can take steps to correct them. Does the public (or specific publics for that matter, like colleagues in other academic departments) see advertising education as a means for enhancing the image of the advertising industry? Or does the public see advertising education as, to use the words of Cone, indoctrinating students to "exercise their wills and wiles over a public that is entirely unaware of what is being done to it"? (6)

Another area that deserves further inquiry involves the determination of which teaching methods and which organizational approaches to the curriculum, particularly the interdisciplinary approach, work best in advertising ethics education. From this survey, we know that educators do not believe the lecture method alone will do the job. We also

know that the "preachy" or "dictatorial" approach is neither favored by many teachers of general ethics nor favored by the respondents to this survey. From this survey and from the literature review, we also know that advertising education wants and needs some kinds of help from allied disciplines. Some advertising programs do require a general ethics course. (Of course, only three of the 72 responding programs require an advertising ethics course. However, 15 programs do offer advertising ethics as an elective.) What about an interdisciplinary approach to the curriculum? Would other disciplines be willing to team teach a course in advertising ethics? A course sponsored by the philosophy department, for example, would not "count" toward the limited number of credit hours ACEJMC accredited programs are allowed to bestow on their majors. Yet, such a course could be subject-specific (advertising ethics) and could pull high enrollments to justify its existence in the academic marketplace. In addition, such a course would concentrate on "principles first" rather than "skills first."

However, the results of this survey indicate that advertising educators may not be sold on interdisciplinarity. More research needs to be done in this area. Since advertising does permeate and influence our culture, perhaps it is time that departmental boundaries were broken to allow the likes of psychologists, sociologists and philosophy teachers to bring their perspectives to bear on ethical considerations in advertising. A feasibility study on

reorganizing the advertising ethics curriculum along interdisciplinary lines and an investigation of successful teaching techniques under the current curriculum are in order. Included in this investigation should be an assessment of the so-called "pervasive" method of teaching advertising ethics. This study showed that, for reasons that ranged from "a lack of room in the curriculum" to "I doubt if it could stand on its own" separate advertising ethics courses are shunned in favor of touching on ethical topics in all courses. Yet, most advertising educators spend 10 percent or less of their course time on advertising ethics. Furthermore, doubt has been cast on how much of that time devoted is actually devoted to planned lessons in advertising ethics, and while 45 percent of the respondents say the best way to teach advertising ethics is <u>not</u> as an ethical topic or question arises in class, 34 percent agree that the "arises" method is best; 21 percent are unsure. This study could identify what advertising educators need to know to create better lesson plans for manageable topics in advertising ethics.

A study that would take a lot of work would involve a content analysis of the pervasive method. A content analysis of syllabi of advertising courses from throughout the nation would probably not be of much use, since, to use a sports metaphor, "game plan" does not always mean "execution." In other words, a syllabus, say in Advertising Copywriting, may call for a certain percentage of time to be devoted to the

ethical ramifications of writing copy, but, in reality, how much time was actually spent on the topic? Probably the only way to determine just how much time is devoted to advertising ethics, what topics are covered, and what teaching methods are being employed would be to use student reporters (participant observation method with the study, while in progress, not revealed to the educator) to report the data. Such a study would be difficult to organize and requests for permission would probably be a bureaucratic nightmare. Nonetheless, some very important data would be collected. Of course, important in such a study would be input from students. What do they, the principal benefactors of advertising education, think about the teaching of advertising ethics?

Another useful study might examine the benefits and drawbacks of accreditation. Why do some programs not seek accreditation? The accrediting agency's limitation on coursework forces advertising programs to make choices between at least eight potential course offerings. Such a forced choice situation is found in this survey.

Conclusion

You can tell the ideals of a nation by its advertisements. Perhaps you can also tell the ideals of the advertising community by its educational standards.

After reviewing the literature and completing the survey process, this educator is convinced that our student

"consumers" deserve a general ethics course, a communication ethics course, an advertising ethics course, and planned ethics lessons in all other advertising courses.

One respondent objected to an entire course in advertising ethics, saying that "such segregation would create an academic ghetto." Perhaps such reasoning would be valid if both ethical concerns and the practice of advertising did not pervade our society. But I cannot help feeling, similar to a research course on the graduate level, that an advertising ethics course would make other advertising courses more meaningful. Just as graduate students begin to see the importance and pervasiveness of research in the many theory courses they take, so students of advertising ethics would emerge from that so-called "ghetto" seeing the importance and pervasiveness of advertising ethics.

Just as the fear of an "academic ghetto" is unfounded, in my estimation, so is the fear that other disciplines will violate the advertising "turf" should they share in the teaching (and the research) of advertising ethics. After all, advertising, like the process of communication itself, is not an isolated phenomenon to be cloistered in one academic department. The advertising educator who can work with the philosophy teacher, the psychologist, and the sociologist, for example, may even end up learning himself.

The opportunity is this: to immerse oneself in the "right and wrong" of the business you long to enter; to

develop a critical consciousness; to examine one's own values and see where and how various facets of the advertising business fit into those values. When one respondent ranks the advertising ethics course last in curricular priority and writes, "The market demands certain knowledge from students and we must meet those demands first," then we must question the standard of immediate consequences that lends creedence to the market's demands.

Earlier, it was argued that advertisers and the general public believe the public is not comprised of helpless dupes, "but armed with reason, guile and a certain savvy about how to make one's way in the market." (7) Assume that students have this power of reason, sense of guile and a certain savvy about how to make one's way in the academic market. If such is the case, what is a "quality" education in terms of advertising ethics?

As even the most judicious and perspicacious of consumers, students need some guidance. In this survey, it was clear that few educators opted for the student learning about advertising ethics on his own. Similarly, few respondents felt that the student should be taught advertising ethics in the "dictatorial" fashion. After all, sometimes there are no completely right or wrong answers.

As noted earlier, the editors of Ethics Teaching in Higher Education recommended in 1980 that the teaching of ethics be given a far more central role in the curriculum than it has had in recent decades. (8) As another decade

elapses, the formal opportunities to pursue moral questions, at least for advertising education, often remain scant and episodic.

Advertising educators can't seem to include a full ethics course in the curriculum and they don't devote a comparatively large block of time to advertising ethics in other advertising courses. Still, by virtue of the mean closest to "strongly agree" of all 23 Likert item means on the questionnaire, they believe that instruction in advertising ethics should be included in advertising education.

Perhaps the most revealing of responses came when educators were asked to list specific topics to cover in a lesson or lessons on advertising ethics. The assumption here was that given little time to devote to teaching advertising ethics, the educators--beyond whatever ethical questions happened to crop up in class--would have specific advertising ethics topics ready to cover. Some did. One respondent included a list of 37 specific topic possibilities. (Most of those were included in Table IX.) A few of the educators cited one or more of these topics as well. But apart from this one respondent, most respondents provided general topic areas that could not be covered in one or a few lesssons or they provided no input at all. Of course, one must recognize that the respondents are busy people. It is much easier to circle responses to Likert items than to think about and describe specific topic areas to be covered in lessons on

advertising ethics.

To assess quality in advertising ethics education, we must go back to the four purposes that should mark all courses in ethics: stimulating the moral imagination, developing skills in the recognition and analysis of moral issues, eliciting a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibility, and learning to tolerate and to resist moral disagreement and ambiguity. (9)

As one survey respondent wrote, "Not that it (advertising ethics) is less important, but how to design a course is another matter." Granted, it is easier to teach skills and rationalize such teaching as having immediate consequences. It is much more difficult to structure lessons and courses using the four purposes listed above, let alone attempt to evaluate students on their learning regarding those four purposes. But it might be worth it. The watchwords of Callahan and Bok bear repeating:

> ...The teaching of ethics in professional schools ought to prepare future professionals to understand the types of moral issues they are likely to confront in their chosen vocations, introduce them to the moral ideals of their profession, and assist them in understanding the relationship between their professional work and that of the broader values and needs of the society. (10)

Especially if the very ideals of that society are expressed in its advertisements.

ENDNOTES

1 Clifford G. Christians, Kim B. Rotzoll and Mark Fackler, Media Ethics, (New York: Longman, Inc., 1987), p. 208.

2 Charles F. Frazer, "Advertising Ethics: The Role of the Educator," Journal of Advertising, 8 (Winter 1979) p. 45.

3 Kim B. Rotzoll and Clifford Christians, "Advertising Agency Practitioners' Perceptions of Ethical Decisions," Journalism Quarterly, 57 (Autumn 1980), pp. 427--428.

4 Ibid.

5 Kim Rotzoll, "Future advertising education: ideas on a tentative discipline," Journalism Educator, (Autumn 1985) p. 37.

6 Fairfax M. Cone, With All Its Faults, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969) p. 3.

7 Christians, p. 126.

8 Ethics Teaching in Higher Education, eds. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, (New York: Plenum Press, 1980)

9 Ibid., p. 300.

10 Ibid.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ardoin, Birthney. "The Teaching of Ethics in Advertising Curricula: An Analysis of ACEJMC Accredited and Non-Accredited Programs and Programs in Business Administration." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. 66th, Corvallis, OR. ERIC: 232 162; CS 207 641. 10 pages.

Baker, Samm S. The Permissible Lie, Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company, 1968.

Benson, George C.S. Business Ethics in America, Lexington, MA: Heath and Company, 1982.

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Bowers, Thomas A. "A Perspective on Advertising Accreditation Standards." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism. 65th, Athens, OH. ERIC: ED 218 614; CS 206 944. 14 pages.

Carey, James W. "A Plea for the University Tradition." Journalism Quarterly. 55 (Winter 1978), pp. 846--855.

Carty, James W. Jr. "Should J-schools teach ethics?" Journalism Educator. 33 (April 1978).

Christians, Clifford G.; Rotzoll, Kim B.; Fackler, Mark. Media Ethics, New York: Longman, Inc., 1987.

Christians, Clifford G., and Covert, Catherine L. Teaching Ethics in Journalism Education, New York: The Hastings Center, 1980.

Cone, Fairfax M. With All Its Faults, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.

De Mott, John. "Journalism courses are essential part of liberal education." Journalism Educator. (Autumn 1984), pp. 31--33.

Doerner, Russell C. "Advertising program revised to prepare for needs of 1990's." Journalism Educator. (Spring 1984) pp. pp. 18--20.

Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum, Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1968.

Dunn, Watson S., and Barban, Arnold M. Advertising: Its Role in Modern Marketing, Hinsdale, IL: The Dryden Press, 1982.

Ethics Teaching in Higher Education. Edited by Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Fox, Stephen. The Mirror Makers, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1984.

Frazer, Charles F. "Advertising Ethics: The Role of the Educator." Journal of Advertising. (Autumn 1985) pp. 43--46.

Frazer, Charles F., and Biglow, William F. "Popular Perceptions of Advertising Practitioners: 'I Don't Get No Respect.'" Proceedings of the 1983 Convention of the American Academy of Advertising. Lawrence: KS.

Gardiner, John J. "Building Bridges Between Disciplines: Collaboration in an Information Processing University." Paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference for Improving University Teaching. Heidelberg, Germany, July 15--18, 1986.

Geller, Max A. Advertising at the Crossroads, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985.

Gordon, George N. "The Making of a Consumer." Ethics and the Press. Edited by John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney. New York: Hastings House, 1975.

Gossage, Howard L. "The Gilded Bough: Magic and Advertising." Harpers. (July 1961), pp. 363--370.

Harris, Michael R. Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education, Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1970.

Hirschorn, Michael W. "Programs in Advertising and Public Relations Fuel Growth of Journalism-School Enrollment." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 34 (October 14, 1987), p. A36.

Hoover, Kenneth. College Teaching Today, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Kaufman, Louis C. Essentials of Advertising, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1987.

Krugman, Dean M. and Ferrell, O.C. "Comparing the Ethical Beliefs of Advertising Agency Practitioners to Corporate Practitioners." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism. 62nd, Houston, TX, (August 5--8, 1979). 20 pages.

Lancaster, Kent M. "Teaching Economic and Social Aspects of Advertising." Advertising Working Papers. Urbana, IL: No. 13 (November 1982).

Levitt, Theodore. "Advertising and Its Adversaries." Business Ethics. Edited by Milton Snoeyenbos, Robert Almeder and James Humber. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1983.

Marquez, F.T. "Agency presidents rank courses, job opportunities." Journalism Educator. 35 (July 1980), pp. 46--47.

Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America. Edited by Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White. New York: The Free Press, 1957.

Mayer, Martin. Madison Avenue U.S.A., New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1958.

Mencher, Melvin. "Agenda for Journalism Education." Nieman Reports. (Autumn 1982), pp. 47--48.

Merrill, John C. "Do we teach ethics--or do we teach about ethics?" Journalism Educator. 33 (July 1978) pp. 59--60.

Momeyer, Richard W. "Teaching as a Moral Activity." Teaching Philosophy. 3 (Fall 1979).

Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders, New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1957.

Pease, Otis. "Advertising, Its Ethics and Its Critics." Frontiers of Advertising Theory and Research. Edited by Hugh Sargent. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books, 1972.

Phelan, John M. "Locating Ethics in Mediaworld." Teaching Values and Ethics in College. Edited by Michael J. Collins. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Planning for Curricular Change in Journalism Education. A report on the Project on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education. Eugene, OR: School of Journalism, 1984.

Rivers, William L.; Schramm, Wilbur; Christians, Clifford G. Responsibility in Mass Communication, New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Rizzuti, Carol J. "Who Should Teach Ethics?" Teaching Values and Ethics in College. Edited by Michael J. Collins. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Rosen, Bernard and Caplan, Arthur L. Ethics in the Undergraduate Curriculum, New York: The Hastings Center, 1980.

Rothschild, Michael L. Advertising, Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1987.

Rotzoll, Kim. "Future advertising education: ideas on a tentative discipline." Journalism Educator. (Autumn 1980). pp. 37--41.

Russell, Thomas and Verrill, Glenn. Otto Kleppner's Advertising Procedure. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Sandage, C.H.; Fryburger, Vernon; Rotzoll, Kim. Advertising Theory and Practice, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1979.

Schwarzlose, Richard A. "Socratic method adds zest to ethics, law classes." Journalism Educator. 33 (April 1978) pp. 9--13+.

Sloan, Douglas. "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum, 1876--1976." Ethics Teaching in Higher Education. Edited by Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Stankey, Michael J. An Interprofessional Perspective on Advertising Education. Unpublished dissertation. Urbana, IL, 1982.

Stanley, Robert H. and Steinberg, Charles S. The Media Environment, New York: Hastings House, 1977.

Stewart, Daniel K. "Upgrading needed for ad education." Journalism Educator. 40 (Winter 1986), pp. 50--53.

Taylor, Ron. "Advertising studies increase in South." Journalism Educator. 42 (Spring 1987), pp. 25--27.

Weir, Walter. Truth in Advertising...and other heresies, New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Wright, John S. "Working Adpeople and Educators Must Agree on a Basic Curriculum." Advertising Age. (November 13, 1980).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS IN STUDY SAMPLE

Frank B. Kalupa, Chairman
School of Communication
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Sylvia Broady
Department of Journalism and Public Communications
University of Alaska at Anchorage
Anchorage, AK 99508

Clifford M. Brock,
Associate Director
Journalism Department
School of Communication
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Bob Hoskins, Dean
College of Communications
Arkansas State University
State University, AR 72467

James B. Tucker, Chairman
Department of Journalism
California State University, Fresno
Fresno, CA 93740

Edgar P. Trotter, Chair
Department of Communications
California State University, Fullerton
Fullerton, CA 92634

H.J. Warr
Communication Division
Seaver College
Pepperdine University
Malibu, CA 90265

Dennis E. Brown, Chairman
Department of Journalism and Mass Communication
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA 95192

Joanne Arnold
School of Journalism
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Richard Tino or George Garrigues
Department of Mass Communications
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, CT 06602

Stanley D. Bogue
Department of Communication
Florida International University
Bay Vista Campus
North Miami, FL 33181

James W. Welke, Chairman
Department of Communication
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816

Joseph R. Pisani, Chairman
Department of Advertising
College of Journalism and Communications
University of Florida
Gainsville, FL 32611

Stan Harrison, Coordinator
School of Communication
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL 33124

Churchill Roberts, Chairman
Department of Communication Arts
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514

Jack Fought, Chair,
Advertising Sequence
Division of Communication
Bradley University
Peoria, IL 61625

W. Manion Rice
School of Journalism
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

Tom Duncan, Coordinator
Department of Journalism
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

Candiss Baksa Vibbert,
Director of Undergraduate Studies
Department of Communication
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Louis J. Wolter
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
Drake University
Des Moines, IA 50311

Edward J. Forrest
Department of Mass Communications
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

William Fudge
Department of Mass Communications
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

Len N. Reid
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Martin Block, Director
Department of Advertising
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60201

Kim B. Rotzoll, Head
Department of Advertising
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Dean Trevor Brown
School of Journalism
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Carl F. Galow
Department of Communication
Valparaiso University
Valparaiso, IN 46383

J. Thomas Emmerson, Chairman
Department of Journalism and Mass Communication
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011

Charles Pearce
Department of Journalism
and Mass Communication
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506

Robert J. Illidge, Chair
Department of Journalism
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS 67208

Edmund B. Lambeth, Director
School of Journalism
Univeristy of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

J. William Click, Director
School of Journalism
Louisana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Eric J. Zanot
College of Journalism
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 10742

Department of Admissions
Department of Communications
Simmons College
Boston, MA 02115

William E. Francois
Journalism Program
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202

Karen Stohl, Undergraduate
Studies Office
School of Journalism &
Mass Communication
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Donald Avery
Department of Journalism
University of Southern
Mississippi
Hattiesburg, MS 39406

Tim Bengtson, Chairperson,
Advertising Sequence
School of Journalism
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Robert McGaughey, Chairman
Department of Journalism
and Radio-TV
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

Carolyn Stringer
Department of Journalism
Western Kentucky
University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

R. Stephen Craig, Chair
Department of Journalism
and Broadcasting
University of Maine
Orono, ME 04473

School of Mass
Communication and
Public Relations
Boston University
Boston, MA 02215

Bruce Vanden Bergh, Chair
Department of Advertising
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Melva Moline, Chair
Mass Communications
Department
Moorhead State University
Moorhead, MN 56560

Will Norton, Chairman
Department of Journalism
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

Guy W. Tunnicliffe, Chair
School of Journalism
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65205

Dean Guy Banville
Department of Journalism and
Mass Communication
Creighton University
Omaha, NE 68178

Dean Neal Copple
College of Journalism
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE 68588

Travis Linn, Dean
Donald W. Reynolds School
of Journalism
University of Nevada at
Reno
Reno, NV 89557

Edward C. Stephens, Dean
School of Public
Communications
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13210

Vernon A. Keel, Director
School of Communication
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, ND 58202

Robert Richardson
E.W. Scripps School of
Journalism
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Ray Tassin, Chairman
Department of Journalism
Central State University
Edmond, OK 73034

Marlan D. Nelson, Director
School of Journalism and
Broadcasting
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Arnold Ismach, Dean
School of Journalism
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Jim Rundstrom, Chairman
Department of
Journalism
Kearney State College
Kearney, NE 68849

Department of Journalism
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

J. Sean McCleneghan
Department of Journalism
and Mass Communications
New Mexico State
University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Richard R. Cole, Dean
School of Journalism
University of North
Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

David Brunton
School of Journalism
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242

Department of
Communication Arts
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH 45469

Sandra Martin
Department of Mass
Communications
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, OK 73106

Elizabeth Yamashita,
Director
School of Journalism and
Mass Communication
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019

William E. Gibbs
School of Communications
Pennsylvania State
University
University Park, PA 16802

William Goodrich
College of Journalism
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Gerald Egan
Department of Journalism and Mass Communication
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007

Program Coordinator
Department of Mass Communication
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, SD 57069

John DeMott
Department of Journalism
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

Alex Nagy
Department of Mass Communications
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Ron Taylor, Head
Department of Advertising
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

Matt Morrison, Adviser
Advertising Sequence
Department of Communication
Abilene Christian University
Abilene, TX 79699

Reg Westmoreland, Chairman
Department of Journalism
North Texas State University
Denton, TX 76203

Jim Morris, Chairman
Department of Advertising
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX 75275

Roger E. Bennett
Department of Journalism
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, TX 78666

Jack Raskopf, Chairman
Department of Journalism
Texas Christian University
Forth Worth, TX 76129

Hower Hsia
Department of Mass Communications
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409

Michael Sewell, Chairman
Department of Mass Communication
Texas Wesleyan College
Forth Worth, TX 76105

John D. Leckenby, Chair
Department of Advertising
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712

Dennis Martin
Department of Communication
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602

Linda H. Scanlan
Department of Journalism
Norfolk State University
Norfolk, VA 23504

George T. Crutchfield,
Director
School of Communications
Viginia Commonwealth
University
Richmond, VA 23284

Alexis S. Tan, Chair
Department of
Communications
Washington State
University
Pullman, WA 99164

W.R. Summers, Jr.
School of Journalism
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Ivan L, Preston, Head,
Advertising Sequence
School of Journalism and
Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53704

William J. Roepke
Department of Journalism
and Telecommunication
University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY 82071

Lawrence Bowen, Chair,
Advertising Sequence
School of Communications
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Janet Dooley
School of Journalism
Marshall University
Huntington, WV 25701

John H. Crowley, Head
Advertising Sequence
College of Journalism
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Gary Coll, Chairman
Department of Journalism
University of Wisconsin--
Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901

L.W. Gilleland, Chairman
Department of Journalism
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT COVER LETTER

Dear Colleague:

In Where Shall I Go to College to Study Advertising? you are listed as the contact person for your advertising program. Please complete the attached questionnaire or give it to the advertising faculty member most knowledgeable about the content of advertising education at your institution.

The questionnaire asks for information on ethics instruction available to advertising majors; it is part of a doctoral dissertation dealing with advertising education.

Your cooperation is important. Failure to return the completed survey by the deadline will detract from the value of the study to advertising educators.

All data collected will be reported in compiled form and the information reported by your institution will not be revealed as coming from you or your institution. The code number on the questionnaire is for keeping track of responses. It will be removed upon receipt of the questionnaire.

A copy of the summarized findings of this study will be sent to participants who request a copy by separate letter.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by March 22, 1988. Refer questions to:

John Ellerbach
School of Journalism & Broadcasting
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078--0195

Sincerely,

John Ellerbach

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER FOLLOW-UP

Dear Colleague:

Here's a second helping of an important survey on the teaching of ethics in advertising. I hope you will partake. Perhaps the first one I sent was either misdirected or misplaced. Please complete the attached questionnaire or give it to the advertising faculty member most knowledgeable about the content of advertising education at your institution.

The questionnaire asks for information on ethics instruction available to advertising majors; it is part of a doctoral dissertation dealing with advertising education.

Your cooperation is important. Failure to return the completed survey by the deadline will detract from the value of the study to advertising educators.

All data collected will be reported in compiled form and the information reported by your institution will not be revealed as coming from you or your institution. The code number on the questionnaire is for keeping track of responses. It will be removed upon receipt of the questionnaire.

A copy of the summarized findings of this study will be sent to participants who request a copy by separate letter.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by April 20, 1988. Refer questions to:

John Ellerbach
School of Journalism & Broadcasting
Oklahoma State University Stillwater, OK
74078--0195 (405) 624--6354

Sincerely,

John Ellerbach

(second mailing)

APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SURVEY OF INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TEACHING OF ADVERTISING ETHICS

This questionnaire seeks information on ethics instruction for advertising majors. It is part of a doctoral dissertation. The questionnaire should be completed by the advertising faculty member most knowledgeable about the content of advertising education at your institution.

All data will be summarized. Information from your school will not be revealed as coming from you or your school. The questionnaire code number helps keep track of responses and will be removed upon receipt of the questionnaire. A copy of the findings will be sent to participants who request one.

Your cooperation is needed. Failure to return this questionnaire by the deadline will detract from the study's value to educators. Please return the completed questionnaire by April 20, 1988 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Refer questions to John Ellerbach, School of Journalism & Broadcasting, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078. Phone: (405) 624-6354.

SECTION I

1. Is your school/department accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC)? Yes_____ No _____ Pending _____

2. How many years of professional advertising experience do you have? _____years How many years of teaching experience?
_____years

3. Are you a full-time faculty member? Yes_____ No_____

4. Have you ever taken a course in advertising ethics? Yes_____ No_____ Have you ever taken any course in ethics?
Yes_____ No_____

5. What is the highest academic degree you have earned?

Bachelor's_____ Master's_____ Doctorate_____

6. Do you usually think of yourself mainly as: (mark one)
_____College/University Professor who teaches advertising

_____An advertising professional who teaches advertising

SECTION II

1. Are your school's advertising majors required to take a course specifically devoted to advertising ethics?
Yes_____ No_____

2. Are your school's advertising majors required to take any non-advertising course in ethics? Yes_____ No_____

3. Does your school offer a course in advertising ethics as an elective? Yes_____ No_____

4. Apart from any courses with advertising ethics as their main focus (if any), about how much time do you devote to teaching advertising ethics in the advertising courses you teach? Less than 5 percent _____ Between 5 and 10 percent _____ Between 10 and 20 percent _____ Between 20 and 30 percent _____ Over 30 percent _____

5. Listed below are eight advertising courses. Please rank them in order (1,2,3...through 8) from most important to the curriculum (1) to least important (8). Please use each number only once.

_____Principles of Advertising
_____Consumer Behavior
_____Advertising Management
_____Advertising Copywriting
_____Advertising Research
_____Advertising Campaigns
_____Advertising Ethics
_____Media Planning

6. In #5 (directly above) why did you rank the Advertising Ethics course where you did? _____

_____

7. What specific topics do you believe are essential to cover in a lesson or lessons on advertising ethics? Please list and, if necessary, briefly explain. Please attach another sheet if necessary.

SECTION III

Indicate agreement or disagreement with the statements below by circling one abbreviation (only one) for STRONGLY AGREE (SA), AGREE (A), UNDECIDED (U), DISAGREE (D), or STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD).

1. Instruction in advertising ethics should be included in advertising education.

SA A U D SD

2. Advertising is predominantly an unethical business.

SA A U D SD

3. Instruction in ethics is the responsibility of the advertising profession and not higher education.

SA A U D SD

4. Knowledge of ethics is essential to the contemporary practice of advertising.

SA A U D SD

5. Advertising ethics education is essential if we are to make the advertising business more ethical.

SA A U D SD

6. Education in advertising ethics is essential to the movement of advertising toward recognition as a profession.

SA A U D SD

7. Advertising practitioners seldom, if ever, have ethical problems in their advertising careers.

SA A U D SD

8. The quality of present instruction in advertising ethics in my school is adequate for advertising majors.

SA A U D SD

9. Advertising ethics instruction can be accomplished adequately by the lecture method alone.

SA A U D SD

10. A lack of room for additional, required courses in the curriculum is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for my advertising majors.

SA A U D SD

11. Instructors' lack of background in advertising ethics is an obstacle to increased ethics instruction for advertising majors.

SA A U D SD

12. The extent of ethics instruction for advertising majors in my school should be increased.

SA A U D SD

13. If advertising majors take an ethics course outside the department, there is no need for additional ethics instruction within the department.

SA A U D SD

14. Advertising graduates with coursework in ethics have an advantage in the job marketplace over advertising graduates without that coursework.

SA A U D SD

15. The dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "PRINCIPLES (theory, the "why" of advertising) FIRST."

SA A U D SD

16. The best way to teach advertising ethics is as an ethical topic or question arises in class.

SA A U D SD

17. Ethics education for advertising majors will be stronger if other departments on campus are involved in its teaching.

SA A U D SD

18. There is more pressure now than ever for ethical behavior in the advertising business.

SA A U D SD

19. The best way to teach advertising ethics is to give students specific rules for behavior.

SA A U D SD

20. The only role of the advertising educator should be to teach students to sell products and services.

SA A U D SD

21. Advertising majors can pick up an understanding of ethics on their own, without the help of an educator.

SA A U D SD

22. The pressures of the marketplace encourage advertising practitioners to ignore moral questions.

SA A U D SD

23. The dominant philosophy in teaching advertising should be "SKILLS (vocational, the "how to" of advertising) FIRST."

SA A U D SD

THANKS. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED SURVEY BY APRIL 20, 1988.

VITA

John Raphael Ellerbach

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ADVERTISING EDUCATORS TOWARD THE TEACHING OF ADVERTISING ETHICS IN SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS OF JOURNALISM

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Dubuque, Iowa, December 2, 1952, the son of Raphael and Virginia Ellerbach.

Education: Graduated from Hempstead High School, Dubuque, Iowa, in June 1971; attended University of Iowa 1971--72; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English from the University of Dubuque in June 1975; received Master of Arts degree in mass communication from Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, in December 1982; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1988.

Professional Experience: Director of Public Relations, Iowa Hospital Association, Des Moines, Iowa, 1983--1986; Radio news reporter and free-lance writer, Sheboygan, Wisconsin, 1976--1980; English teacher, American School of Lima, Peru, 1980--1981; Lecturer, Oklahoma State University, School of Journalism and Broadcasting, 1986--1988.