

# Survey of Doctoral Programs in Communication: Updated Report for 2002-2003 Graduates

## A Supplemental Report 2003 Annual Surveys of Journalism & Mass Communication

Amy Jo Coffey • Lee B. Becker • Tudor Vlad

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research  
Grady College of Journalism & Mass Communication  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602  
Tel. 706 542-5023  
[www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/](http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/)

### *2003 Project Sponsors:*

American Society of Newspaper Editors  
Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication\*  
Association of Schools of Journalism & Mass Communication  
Cox Newspapers Inc.  
The Freedom Forum\*  
Gannett  
Hearst Corporation  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation\*  
National Association of Broadcasters  
Newsletter & Electronic Publishers Foundation  
The Newspaper Guild-CWA  
Scripps Howard Foundation  
Grady College of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Georgia

\*Sustaining Sponsor

**Revised and released August 31, 2004**

## Executive Summary

- In the 2002-2003 academic year, the population of 96 communication doctoral programs in the United States granted 512 degrees. Of these, 389 went to domestic students and 123 to students from outside the United States.
- Of the domestic graduates, 58.6% were women in academic year 2002-2003, exactly the same percentage as the previous year.
- The percentage of degrees granted to domestic students who were members of racial or ethnic minorities in 2002-2003 was 20.6%, compared with 19.5% a year earlier.
- In 2002-2003, 36 Black students received doctoral degrees, exactly the same number as in 2001-2002. Twelve of those 36 students earned their degrees from a single university—Howard.
- In 2002-2003 and a year earlier, 11 Hispanic (non-Black) students received the doctoral degree in communication.
- In 2002-2003, 24.0% of the doctoral degrees in the field of communication were awarded to people from outside the U.S. That figure was 19.0% in 2001-2002 and 18.0% in 2000-2001.

## Background

The *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* has provided data over the years on enrollments and number of degrees granted by doctoral programs that are specifically linked to undergraduate journalism education. The 2003 enrollment survey found that 1,512 students were enrolled in the 43 doctoral programs offered by journalism and mass communication programs. Those same programs granted an estimated 222 degrees in the 2002-2003 academic year.

The 43 doctoral programs offered by journalism and mass communication programs are not the only doctoral programs in the broad field of communication.

In the academic year 2001-2002, a separate survey of doctoral programs in the field of communication was conducted under the auspices of the *Annual Surveys of Journalism & Mass Communications* to learn about enrollments in all doctoral programs in communication.<sup>1</sup> The specific goal of the project, funded by a grant from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, was to determine the racial and ethnic characteristics and gender of the students enrolled in and completing their studies in communication doctoral programs. Graduates of communication doctoral programs make up a significant component of the labor pool—or pipeline—for journalism and mass communication faculties around the country. Faculties are likely to become more diverse only if the labor pool is diverse.

The 2001-2002 survey identified 92 doctoral programs that graduated 485 students in academic year 2000-2001. Of those graduates, 390 were domestic, and only 53, or 13.6%, were classified as members of a racial or ethnic minority. (Another 10 were unclassified.) Women made up 50.5% of all graduates and 51.8% of domestic graduates.

In 2003, the data on the racial composition of students in doctoral programs in communication were updated to cover the 2001-2002 academic year using the methodology explained below.<sup>2</sup> This 2004 report further updates the data on doctoral enrollments to include the 2002-2003 academic year.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lee B. Becker, Jisu Huh, Tudor Vlad and George L. Daniels, "2001-2002 Survey of Doctoral Programs in Communication: Examining the Pipeline to Journalism & Mass Communication Faculties," is available on the web at [www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/aejmc2002/doctoralreport.pdf](http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/aejmc2002/doctoralreport.pdf)

<sup>2</sup>Jisu Huh, Lee B. Becker, Tudor Vlad, Nancy R. Mace and Hugh J. Martin, "Survey of Doctoral Programs in Communication: Updated Report for 2001-2002 Graduates," is available on the web at <http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Doctoralsurvey/doc02sum.htm>

## Methodology for 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

Defining the population of doctoral programs in the field, as the 2001-2002 survey had demonstrated, is problematic. No comprehensive list exists. New programs are announced almost each year. Many of the programs are small. The authorization for some of them is shared by more than one unit on campus.

For the 2001-2002 survey mentioned above, the population of schools was identified through two sources: (1) the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* and (2) the National Communication Association's (NCA) Index of Doctoral Programs in Communication.<sup>3</sup> All programs in the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* that reported offering a doctoral degree were included in the population. All programs on the NCA listing were also included. The total number of identified programs was 93.

Of the 93 programs, eight were subsequently eliminated because the identified administrators indicated in their responses to mailed surveys or telephone calls that the programs were no longer active or did not offer a communication degree. Of the remaining 85 programs, returned questionnaires were obtained from 68, or 80.0%.

For the schools that did not respond, IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) data on degrees granted and characteristics of degree recipients for the 2000-2001 academic year were used to measure those two characteristics of students in the programs. No data replacement techniques were used for the other measures in the survey, such as measures of enrollments and of the jobs taken by graduates, since these data are not available from IPEDS.<sup>4</sup> In addition, seven doctoral programs were identified solely through the IPEDS data file. Data for these programs also were included in the final report, leading to a total of 92 identified programs.

IPEDS is the core postsecondary education data collection program of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). It is a system of surveys designed to gather data from all primary providers of postsecondary education, including universities and colleges, as well as from institutions offering technical and vocational education beyond the high school level. IPEDS began in 1986, replacing the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), which began in 1966. The IPEDS system is built

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.natcom.org/ComProg/gpdhtm/gpindexdocst.htm](http://www.natcom.org/ComProg/gpdhtm/gpindexdocst.htm). This web page later was replaced with a new graduate program search tool ([www.natcom.org/ComProg/gpdhtm/Scripts/GradDir2.htm](http://www.natcom.org/ComProg/gpdhtm/Scripts/GradDir2.htm)). The URL for the NCA list now is [www.natcom.org/ComProg/GPDHTML/Doctoral Programs Master List.pdf](http://www.natcom.org/ComProg/GPDHTML/Doctoral%20Programs%20Master%20List.pdf).

<sup>4</sup>See Jisu Huh, Lee B. Becker and Tudor Vlad, "Using the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS), Supplemental Report to the 2001 *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* and 2001 *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates*, available on the web at [www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/aejmc2002/IPEDSReport.pdf](http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/aejmc2002/IPEDSReport.pdf).

around a series of interrelated surveys to collect institutional-level data in such areas as enrollments, program completions, faculty, staff and finances.

Reporting of data for the IPEDS surveys is mandatory for all institutions that receive, are applicants for, or expect to be applicants for federal financial assistance as defined in the Department of Education regulations implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or defined in any Education Department regulation implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

The IPEDS survey findings, released annually through the NCES web site and reported in other publications such as the *Digest of Education Statistics*, include data from three surveys, including the *Completions* survey. The *Completions* data include the number of degree completions by level (associate's, bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and first-professional), by race/ethnicity and gender of recipient, and by 6-digit CIP (Classification of Instructional Program) code. The CIP code is an attempt to identify the area of specialization or study of the graduates. *Completions* survey data are gathered from the previous academic year and reported to IPEDS in the fall or winter of the next academic year.

For 2002-2003, as in 2001-2002, data on doctoral programs in communication were taken exclusively from IPEDS. Because all universities in the United States receiving federal funds are required to file data as part of the IPEDS project, use of the IPEDS reports should be comprehensive across time. In any given year, however, a doctoral program may grant no degrees and thus not be included in the IPEDS count.<sup>5</sup>

IPEDS data on academic year 2002-2003 were gathered from the NCES web site in the spring and summer of 2004 via a new *Dataset Cutting Tool*, a search and filtering mechanism that enables the web site user to customize and download the desired data. The *Completions* data can be filtered by degree award level (doctoral, masters, and bachelors award level) and by major number, which classifies up to two (dual) majors. In 2004 (for academic year 2002-2003), only one institution, Indiana University-Bloomington, had one dual-doctoral degree case. This case was simply added to the data set, which then became the comprehensive data set for all doctoral degrees awarded in academic year 2002-2003 as reported by IPEDS.

In 2004, the broadly defined communication field included 34 CIP codes.<sup>6</sup> Under the 1990 CIP Codes, only 14 CIP classifications defined the communication field. In the 2004 report, communication

---

<sup>5</sup>Universities are supposed to enter a 0 in this case, but there is no way to guarantee that the cell in the electronic form was not simply left blank.

<sup>6</sup>NCES began requiring its revised "CIP Code 2000" filings with its Winter 2004 data collection cycle. Changes in the CIP Code system may have altered the way an institution filed in 2004 for academic year 2002-2003, and may affect how a field is defined in the IPEDS dataset in the future. The changes are summarized in the **Appendix 1**.

was defined using all the subfields of CIP general code 09, "Communications," and 10, "Communication Technologies." The subfield of 23, "English Language and Literature/Letters" called "Speech and Rhetorical Studies" (23.1001) was also used. The broad classification categories remained unchanged from the 1990 CIP Code, although many of the individual CIP codes within the category did change.

One significant change in CIP codes for 2000 (first used in 2002-2003) was the modification of the 10 "Communication Technologies" Code. The category subclassifications scheme was expanded and one of the original subcategories, "Education/Instructional Media Technology," was transferred out of "Communication Technologies" to field 13, "Education." The new code of 13.0501 replaced the CIP 10.0101. No communication doctoral program had used the 10.0101 code in 2000-2001 or 2001-2002, however, so loss of this category scheme to "Education" should have had no impact.

## Findings

In 2002-2003, the IPEDS data list 94 different entries for doctoral programs (**Table 1**) in communication, based on the CIP 10, 11 and 23.1001 codes. These filings are for those who received their degrees in the July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003 period. As the table shows, the most common classification was "Communication Studies/Speech Communication and Rhetoric," accounting for 39 of the programs (down from 42 of the programs in academic year 2001-2002, under a previous classification name). The second largest classification, consistent with past years, was "Speech and Rhetorical Studies," with 23 programs. Ten programs were classified as "Mass Communication/Media Studies," and seven were classified as "Journalism" (an unchanged CIP code).<sup>7</sup>

The 94 IPEDS filings do not represent 94 unique universities or even 94 distinct programs. For example, the University of Texas at Austin reported data using four different CIP codes. At some universities, a single CIP filing represents more than one program; at some universities, a graduates of a single program are filed with different CIP classifications.

In **Table 2** the 94 doctoral programs for which IPEDS data were reported in 2002-2003 are merged with the IPEDS listings for the three previous years. Also included in the table are units reporting doctoral programs in the 2003 *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*,

---

<sup>7</sup>Doctoral degree programs do not exist under all 34 CIP codes. Some of the codes may be used only at other degree levels.

programs identified from the 2004 NCA list, and programs included in the 2002 Doctoral Survey.<sup>8</sup> Lack of data for some of these programs can be due to the absence of graduates for the academic years mentioned. Doctoral programs at Georgia State University, North Dakota State University, and the University of Miami are relatively new programs, and it seems likely that the universities did not file data, though they were supposed to enter "0" for the CIP since a program is in place. SUNY-Albany has an interdisciplinary program for a doctoral degree in Sociology/Communication. Communication graduates from this program most likely are filed under the sociology CIP code.

In 2002-2003, Michigan Technological and the University of Texas-Arlington filed data for doctoral programs. The Michigan University had done so the year earlier, and the UT-Arlington program filed data in 2000-2001. While these programs were eliminated in last year's report on the presumption they were erroneous fillings, their home base has now been located and the programs have been included. Data for them has been retrieved from previous years and included in subsequent tables in this report.<sup>9</sup>

**Appendix 2** is a listing of 96 doctoral programs in the field of communication along with an identification of the home departments. Only programs using a communication CIP code or expected to do so in the future are included.

**Table 3** shows the number of degrees granted by the communication programs in 2002-2003, broken down by CIP code, gender and race/ethnicity. Just over half of the doctoral degrees in communication were conferred in 09.0101, "Communication Studies/Speech Comm and Rhetoric" (51.4%). The next highest percentage of doctoral graduates, 22.1%, was reported under 23.1001, "Speech and Rhetorical Studies." Howard University granted 12 degrees to Black students in 2002-2003, more than any other single university. Many of the listed doctoral programs are dominated by students from outside the United States. SUNY-Buffalo (six of eight graduates), Ohio State University (three of four), University of New Mexico and University of South Carolina (two of three graduates each) are illustrative.

**Table 4** summarizes these data on race/ethnicity and gender for the communication doctoral programs for academic years 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003. The table shows estimates for 2000-2001 based both on the survey of doctoral programs (supplemented with IPEDS estimates if necessary) and based only on IPEDS reports.

---

<sup>8</sup>The NCA listing was based in part on the 2003 report from this project. See Jisu Huh, Lee B. Becker, Tudor Vlad, Nancy R. Mace and Hugh J. Martin, "Survey of Doctoral Programs in Communication: Updated Report for 2001-2002 Graduates," available on the web at <http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Doctoralsurvey/doc02sum.htm>.

<sup>9</sup>The Michigan program is now prominently presented on the university's web site. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning confirmed and identified the UT-Arlington filing.

In terms of gender, the data remained nearly unchanged over the previous year, based on the IPEDS filings. The percentage of female graduates in 2002-2003 was 57.6%, compared to 57.9% in 2001-2002. In 2000-2001, 51.1% of the graduates had been women. Among domestic graduates, women were 58.6%, compared to 58.6% in 2001-2002 and 53.8 in 2000-2001.

Nearly one fourth of doctoral degrees in communication programs in the United States in 2002-2003 were awarded to nonresidents. The percentage of nonresident aliens receiving doctoral degrees has increased during the past three years, from 18.0% of all doctoral degrees awarded in 2000-2001, to 19.0% in 2001-2002, and to 24.0% of doctoral degrees granted in 2002-2003.

### **Concluding Comments**

The percentage of domestic graduates who were members of racial or ethnic minorities in academic year 2002-2003 was 20.6%. In 2001-2002 the figure had been 19.5%, while it was 19.7% a year earlier. The calculation is based on the presumption—possibly false—that all those students of “unknown” racial or ethnic classification were minorities. Blacks make up the largest minority group, followed by Asian-Pacific Islanders and Hispanics.

A first step in understanding the characteristics of graduates of communication programs across the country is defining the population itself. This is a more difficult task than many would presume. This analysis of federal data reports on graduates of doctoral programs, combined with the work of two previous years, takes a major step in that direction.

The best estimate is that 96 such programs existed in academic year 2002-2003. These are spread geographically across the country. They also are diverse in terms of foci, at least as reflected in the federal filings. The largest groups are classified as “Communication Studies/Speech Communication and Rhetoric,” and as “Speech and Rhetorical Studies.” The remainder include programs in advertising, journalism, and radio and television broadcasting.

In terms of racial and ethnic characteristics of the students, however, the programs are not overly diverse. While large numbers of students in these doctoral programs come from outside the United States, those who are domestic do not reflect the diversity of the United States. The population of the U.S. in the 2000 Census was nearly 31% minority. The population of the undergraduates in journalism and mass communication programs in the fall of 2003 was about 28% minority, and about 24% of those receiving bachelor’s degrees were minorities. In contrast, only 21% of the domestic doctoral degree recipients in the broad field of communication in 2002-2003 were minorities. The figure hasn’t changed in any appreciable way in three years.

The picture for gender is quite different. The U.S. population in 2000 was 51% female, and the population of undergraduates in journalism and mass communication programs around the country in the autumn of 2003 was 65% female. Of those earning bachelor's degrees, 65% also were female. Of the 2002-2003 domestic doctoral degree recipients, almost 59% were female. The figure is up several percentage points from a few years ago.

Clearly the pipeline to faculties in journalism and mass communication is not as diverse as the U.S. population or as the student population in the field. This suggests that change in the characteristics of the faculties in journalism and mass communication is not likely to be great in the near future and that students in journalism and mass communication will be taught by faculty who are not like them.

What diversity exists in terms of race and ethnicity is largely dependent on a single doctoral program. One-third of the African-American doctoral degree recipients in 2002-2003 received their degrees from Howard. The pipeline would be much more "white" if it were not for the considerable efforts of Howard and its faculty.

Having a faculty as diverse as the population is important to the students in the journalism and mass communication classrooms in the country. It also is important to the scholarship in the field. The questions posed and the answers found through that scholarship are likely to be influenced by those who ask them.

Changing the pipeline has to be a top priority of the field of communication.