DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 061 CS 507 661

AUTHOR Becker, Lee B.; And Others
TITLE Finding Work and Getting Paid: Predictors of Success in the Mass Communications Job Market.
SPONS AGENCY Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.; Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, Princeton, NJ.; National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. School of Journalism.
PUB DATE Aug 91
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (74th, Boston, MA, August 7-10, 1991). Project also supported by Jack O'Dwyer Co.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Employment Patterns; *Entry Workers; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; *Journalism; *Labor Market; *Mass Media; National Surveys; Occupational Information; Occupational Surveys; *Predictor Variables; Salaries

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the determinants of success in occupational entry for persons trained specifically for work in mass communications. Two separate criteria were used to judge success in entry: actual employment and salary and fringe benefits, earned upon employment. Subjects, 2,171 recipients of bachelor's degrees from 77 programs in journalism and mass communications in the United States, completed a 5-page survey instrument. Results showed that graduates' college experiences in media organizations (internship or working on college media), specialization in any area of study, and grade point average were all positively associated with finding a job. Results further indicated that prior experience with the employer was a positive predictor of salary, whereas a generalized job-seeking strategy and gender (female) were negative predictors of salary. Women, however, were more likely to have a job with a large number of benefits than were men. (Three tables of data and 29 notes are included.) (Author/SR)

Finding Work and Getting Paid: Predictors of Success in the Mass Communications Job Market

By

Lee B. Becker*
Gerald M. Kosicki*
Thomas Engleman**
K. Viswanath*

*School of Journalism
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

**The Dow Jones Newspaper Fund
Princeton, NJ

Presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at the annual conference in Boston, August 1991. This research is supported by the Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication, Jack O'Dwyer Co., the National Association of Broadcasters, and the School of Journalism at The Ohio State University.

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the determinants of success in occupational entry for persons trained for work in mass communications. Two separate criteria are used to judge success in entry: actual employment and salary and benefits earned upon employment. The data come from a national survey of journalism and mass communication graduates from 77 programs in journalism and mass communications in the United States. Graduates' college "experiences" were found to be a significant predictor of success. More specifically, experiences in media organizations (internships or working on college media), specialization in any area of study and grade point average (GPA) were all positively associated with finding a job. Prior experience with the employer was a positive predictor of salary, whereas a generalized job seeking strategy and being a woman were negative predictors of salary. Women, however, were more likely to have a job with a large number of benefits than were men.

Finding Work and Getting Paid:

Predictors of Success in the Mass Communications Job Market

Career oriented (or life-span consuming) occupations are distinguishable from other occupations in that job entry is "an experience anticipated and often systematically prepared for."[1] In such cases, educational training is training for the specific tasks or jobs that make up that occupation.

The various mass communications occupations, such as print or broadcast journalism, public relations or advertising, clearly are characterized by job entry that is anticipated and prepared for through an elaborate system of post-secondary level training.[2] A typical program includes many opportunities for learning in environments designed to simulate those of employment and for situations requiring role-playing for anticipated job employment.

Despite this distinguishing characteristic, the learning environments for the career-oriented occupations are not uniform. It is customary for there to be variation between programs at differing settings or institutions and even within a given institution. Program A, for example, may be more theoretically based or follow a particular tradition, while Program B may focus more on job-specific skills or a different scholarly orientation. Similarly, student A at one institution might have excelled in one area of specialization, while student B at that same institution might have achieved a more mundane level of performance or might have chosen a different area of specialization within the same general program.

Despite the potential for these variations in training to have impact on job entry to the occupations, they have received very little attention in the

sociology of work or industrial sociology literature. As Miller has noted, educational qualifications have traditionally been viewed in a more limited fashion.[3] The primary focus of the scholarship is on the role educational certification as an either/or state has played in job selection. The study of media personnel has paid little attention to educational issues generally and has not addressed this specific question of educational specialization.[4]

This paper focuses exclusively on the determinants of success in occupational entry for persons trained specifically for work in mass communications. Two separate criteria are used to judge success in entry: actual employment and salary and benefits earned upon employment. In its simplest form, the paper attempts to determine the characteristics of job seekers that determine success in finding work and compensation for that work.

Theoretical Framework

Occupational entry is seen as being influenced by factors at the societal level, where two types of institutions are seen as affecting each other. The universities produce a large number of graduates each year, differentiating them in terms of such things as grades, specialized training, media contacts (via internships), and simulated activities (campus media). The institutions themselves also can be differentiated on a number of grounds such as official certification (or accreditation), size and nature of instructional differentiation.

Employers respond to this educational and training system by selecting some types of graduates and rejecting others. They also differentially reward those whom they employ by offering salary and benefits on an unequal basis. The employers, lacking their own training system, rely heavily on the university to prepare people for work.[5] The universities rely on employment

prospects as a way of differentiating their training programs from others, such as a general liberal arts curriculum.

The system is clearly one with checks and balances. The study of hiring practices, then, should lead to a better understanding of the ways in which the trainers and employers interact.

At the individual level, each graduate can be viewed as a product of the training institution. All products are not equal. Some have been trained as journalists, others as public relations workers, others for work in advertising. Some have been certified as excellently qualified (via their grades), while others have been certified as minimally trained. An understanding of how these individual differences in product are reflected in success in the job search, which represents response to the product, provides information about the interaction of trainer and employer.

Even at the individual level, there is little literature upon which one can draw for guidance. Bills and Miller have both reviewed the general literature and concluded, as noted above, that education is most often treated as an either/or variable.[6] Bills concludes, in fact, that experience and skills are a much more powerful predictor of success both in terms of employment and promotion than is formal education.

Becker, Fruit and Caudill's case studies of media personnel decision-making suggest the generalizability of this finding to the media area. Education often was treated as a way of certifying that certain skills were present, but it certainly was not seen as a key determinant in hiring.[7]. Similarly, a survey of media editors and news directors conducted by Becker, Fruit and Caudill showed that a college education was mentioned as a characteristic sought in applicants for entry-level jobs about half as often

as demonstrations of writing skills. When asked specifically, about 30% said they did not care if the hire even had a college degree.

The topic of salary of journalists has received more attention in the communications literature than has employment. Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, in their 1971 national study of journalists, showed that the overall best predictors of high salary were length of time in the occupation, size of the community in which the person worked, being male, scope of managerial responsibilities and region of the country.[8] Weaver and Wilhoit, in their 1982-83 sequel survey of journalists, found that high salary was predicted by number of years in the media, size of the organization, staff unionization, level of managerial responsibilities, years of formal schooling, and being male.[9]

The discrepancy between male and female salaries in communication work has received, quite correctly, much attention.[10] Stone also has shown that salary discrepancies exist, at least in broadcast news, along racial lines.[11] Minority men, Stone reports, are overrepresented in one of the lowest paying jobs in TV news--news camera operators. A 1988 survey of daily newspaper journalists showed that nearly half the Black journalists questioned said the single biggest obstacle to career advancement--and higher pay--was their minority status.[12] Black journalists also were more likely to see "politics" as opposed to merit as the determinant of promotions than were white journalists. Beam, in an analysis of Census Bureau data, found evidence of racial differences in pay of journalists, but the differences became small and statistically nonsignificant once sex, age and education of the newsworker were controlled.[13]

Even without a sophisticated theoretical framework or rich literature, it

is possible to put forward a series of research questions that can be addressed. For example, what is the effect of institutional variation in general and accrediting in particular on the job market success of journalism and mass communications graduation? What can an individual student do at the university to prepare himself or herself for successful entry into the job market? What kinds of job seeking behaviors are most likely to be successful? And do basic locator variables, such as sex of the respondent or race/ethnicity, make any difference in the job market?

From these general research questions, one can put forward hypotheses that are "common sense" or logically derived from the above perspective on the nature of the relationship between educational institutions and industry employers. For example, people with higher grades should be more likely to get jobs than people without, since this is the way the university differentiates between its products.

Similarly, those students who have specialized outside the journalism and mass communications curriculum through a second major should be more likely to find work than those who did not. Those who specialized inside journalism and mass communications should be more successful in finding work within that field than those without a specialty. These expectations are consistent with the general view that specialization and expertise is more highly rewarded than a lack of specialization.

Similarly, those students with training on the campus media should be more likely to find work in the media in which they have gained experience than those who have not taken advantage of these opportunities. A similar reward should come to those who took advantage of internship and other such work programs or in some other way gained relevant experience before

graduation.

Similarly, those students who took advantage of placement services provided by their own universities should have more success in finding work than those who did not. It also is expected that students who searched broadly for work should be more successful than those who narrowed their focus, since a broad search should be successful in tapping the less obvious jobs in the less obvious places.

At the institutional level, those students who come from accredited programs should be more likely to find jobs, since these programs are the ones designated as special or, in some sense, elite.

Two variables that, in a normative or prescriptive sense, should not have an impact on employment prospects are sex and ethnic classification of the student. Any differences that exist after controls for any training experiences reflect biases in the employment system.

These are bivariate expectations. As the sex and ethnic background issues make clear, however, controls need to be introduced to make sure any identified effect is not artificial. Effects are expected to be additive, however, rather than interactive in nature.

These are, as noted, common sense expectations based on the notion of educational institution/employer interactions identified above. Certainly, one can offer counter expectations. For example, some, if not most, educators associated with nonaccredited programs probably would not be willing to concede the superior nature of the accredited programs. The disconfirmation of expectations would suggest that the university/employer relationship is different from how it has been assumed to be.

It is nonsense, of course, to focus on journalism and mass communication

education as if it possessed a unique relationship between university and employer. At the same time, it is silly to focus exclusively on general characteristics of this relations and not to deal with internal variation. It is the strategy of the analyses that follow to make observations about individual variations within the journalism mass communications system and then allow this work to form the basis for subsequent comparative work that determines to the extent to which journalism is unusual.

Methodology

Data from the 1989 national sample of graduates of journalism and mass communications programs were used to test these hypotheses.[14] The study is the only national source of data of this sort. It has the advantage of a long history; the first such study was fielded in 1964.

As an initial stage in selecting the students to be included in the 1989 survey of graduates, a sample of 77 schools was drawn probabilistically from the Journalism & Mass Communication Directory 1989 or the Journalism Career and Scholarship Guide 1989.[15] The former is published by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC); the latter is a publication of The Dow Jones Newspaper Fund. A combination of these two lists produced 395 unique entries in 1989.[16]

Administrators at the selected schools were asked to provide the names and addresses of students who had graduated between July 1, 1988, and June 30, 1989. In November and December of 1989, 8,041 questionnaires were mailed to the graduates of the 77 programs. A second mailing to nonrespondents was sent in January and February. A total of 4,222 students (52.5%) returned the questionnaires within six to eight months of graduation.[17]

The findings summarized below are based on responses of the 2171

bachelor's degree recipients who completed their programs in journalism and mass communications in April, May or June of 1989.[18] The selection of Spring graduates for these analyses appropriately eliminates time of graduation as a variable, since it would be contaminated in the analyses with length of time since graduation.

The five-page survey instrument included measures of curricular specialization within the journalism/mass communications program, outside specialization in terms of a second major, a self-report of undergraduate grade point average, self reports of participation in internships and work for the various campus media, prior employment with the current employer, and use of various job placement services, including those provided by the journalism and mass communications program itself. Graduates also were asked to indicate which of a list of employer types were contacted in search of a job. The instrument also included measures of sex of the graduate and racial and ethnic classification.

Students were classified as having graduated from a program accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) or from a school not so accredited. This designation was taken from the 1989 AEJMC Directory.[19]

The dependent variables were measured through a series of questions on success in finding work since graduation. Graduates were asked, successively, if they had sought work since graduation, the types of employers they turned to for work, the number of job offers available to them and from which sources, employment status at the time of completion of the interview schedule, when the current job was found, the nature of the work being done, salary earned from the current job, and benefits provided by that employer.

Results

One measure of success in the job market is number of jobs available to the student upon graduation. By self-report, 71.3% of the students had at least one job offer "or concrete job opportunity" upon completion of their studies. About half (52.5%) indicated they had more than one definite job available.[20]

Jobs available is a very "loose" definition of success in the job market. A more stringent one would require them to have actually found work by the time of the survey. Fully 70.9% of the graduates had found full-time work in six to eight months after graduation. Another 10.2% of the graduates were working part-time, while 10.0% were continuing in school. The percent unemployed was 8.9%.[21]

Finding a full-time job is an indicant of success in the job market, but it also is a rather generous one. Some of the people who found work did not find it in the area for which they had been trained. In fact, only 75.5% of the graduates indicated that their job was "one that involves communications activities and skills related to your area of study in college." Similarly, some of the graduates reported they never looked for work because of plans to return to school in the Fall. In addition, some students who found part-time work never looked for anything more, desiring this form of partial-employment.

In the analyses below, graduates were considered to have been successful in the job market if they sought full-time work and found it and the work involved, by the graduate's report, communications skills. Students who sought only part-time work and found it, and the work was in communications also were considered to be successful. Students who opted out of the job market because of continued school plans were dropped from the analyses, leaving 2040

graduates.[22] Of these graduates, 59.0% were classified as successful in their job search. The measure of number of jobs available upon graduation also was examined as a more tolerant measure of job success.[23]

Both measures of success in the job market were regressed on the predictor variables identified above. These include, in order of entry, the social structural variable of accreditation, the experiences of the student while in college (sequence or area of specialization in mass communication, the existence of second major mass communications, grade point average, participation on a college newspaper, yearbook, radio station and television station, internship experience, and prior work experience with the current employer), job search activities (use of journalism, university and general job placement services and employment of a narrow versus very wide job searching strategy), and the social locator variables of sex and race/ethnicity.

The regression of number of jobs available on graduation on these predictor variables was largely unsuccessful. The final equation explained only 3.5% of the variance in the dependent variable. Given the power of the analyses, however, the equation was significant. Only one group of variables, representing experiences in college, added a significant increment of variance. That block, in fact, explained 3.3% of variance. In the final equation, the only significant Betas are for those for having an area of specialization outside journalism (Beta=.08), involvement with the yearbook (.06), and having had an internship (.09), and having specialized in broadcasting (-.08).[24]

The second, more stringent measure of job success produced more encouraging results. The final equation explained 5.1% of the variance in the

dependent variable. As shown in Table 1, two of the blocks of variables produced significant increments in variance explained: experiences in school and job seeking strategies.

The final equation, however, includes only four significant Betas. Having had an internship and having a high grade point average are positively associated with finding work involving communication skills. Having used a university or a general placement service are negatively associated with success.

The slight improvement in the ability of the independent variables to explain the second, more stringent measure of success suggests that perhaps an even more careful measure is in order. To this end, a third measure of job success was created using a more traditional definition of communication work. Those students earlier considered successful who actually found work with newspapers, wire services, radio, television, public relations agencies and departments, advertising agencies and departments, magazines or book publishers were considered to have been successful in this more strigent definition. Others were classified as unsuccessful. With this procedure, 61.1% of the graduates were classified as unsuccessful, while the remaining 38.9% have not found jobs in this more strict definition of the communications field.

This third measure of job market success is used in the second equation shown in Table 1. Here, the amount of variance explained is 11.9%, with three out of the four blocks explaining a significant increment in variance. The only exception is the social locator group consisting of sex and race/ethnicity.

The final equation includes 11 significant Betas. Those students from

accredited programs are more likely to have found work with the communications industries than are those who were from unaccredited programs. Within the college experience block, having a print specialization, having specialized in advertising, having had prior work with one's current employer, having had an internship, having worked for one's college newspaper, and having a high grade point average are all associated with finding a job within the communications industry. Having used a university placement service or a general placement service are negatively related with finding work within the communication industry, while having used the journalism placement service and looking widely for work are positively associated with success. Neither race nor gender is associated with success in finding work.

In sum, then, if the final equation is used as a criterion, the nature of the program and the experiences of the students in college work much as expected. Accrediting and the type of specialization chosen by the student while in college plays a role in determining success in the job market. Experience on the college newspaper and grade point average are also associated with job market success. Two of the four types of job seeking strategies are positively associated with success, while two are negative. It may well be that those students who opt for the services of a university or a general placement service do so because of difficulty in finding a job (for some other reason) or because they wish to look outside traditional communication areas.

The two equations shown in Table 1 treat specialization within the journalism curriculum as a series of additive variables predicting to job market success. This may be, in fact, a rather simplistic view of the role of these variables in explaining job market success. An alternative strategy is

to perform separate analyses for each of the five specialization types. This is the tactic represented in Table 2. The criterion variable used in these analyses classifies students as having been successful in their job search if they reported holding a job with a traditional communications industry employer. In four of the five equations shown in the table, the equation is a significant predictor of job market successes.

For news editorial students, accrediting is not related to job market success, though the college experience block, and particularly having had an internship and having a high grade point average, are related to success. Two other relationships are worth noting, though they do not reach statistical significance: having prior experience with the current employer and having worked for the college newspaper. Job seeking strategies follow the same pattern as those shown for all students combined in Table 2, though only two of the four are significant with the reduced degrees of freedom represented by the analyses in Table 2.

For the broadcasting students, accrediting is positively associated with job market success, as is the college experiential variable of having worked for the college radio station. The general and university placement services are associated with a lack of success.

For public relations students, accrediting once again is associated with job market success, as is having had an internship and (though not to a statistically significant degree) having worked for the college newspaper.

Accrediting is associated with job market success for those students not in these traditional specializations, as is an internship and work for the college yearbook. The pattern of relationships for the job seeking strategies is the same as that overall.

Only for advertising is the picture in Table 2 not very clear. Accrediting and the college experiential variables are not related to success. The pattern for the job seeking strategies is the same as that identified in Table 2, but the block is not significant overall.

These individual analyses by area of specialization do seem to provide some further insight into the predictors of job seeking success. For print majors, the college newspaper is particularly important, while for broadcasting radio plays this role. For public relations students the internships play this role, while for those students in less traditional or less well differentiated programs, internships and college yearbook work serve as predictors. Only for print news majors does grade point average actually make a difference.

As has been argued above, finding a job is only the first step in determining actual job market success. Getting real compensation for that work also is important. That compensation comes in the form of salary and benefits.

In the overall sample, the median weekly salary among graduates with a job was $327. Among those graduates with a full-time job, the median weekly salary was $342. Of 10 listed benefits, the graduates with full-time work, on average, reported having 3.9 of them available to them.[25] The most common benefits available were basic medical coverage, major medical coverage, dental coverage, and life insurance, all available to between 50 and 60% of the graduates. No other benefit was available to more than 40% of the survey respondents.

Salary and number of offered benefits were used as criterion variables in the regression analyses shown in Table 3 for graduates with full-time jobs.[26] The equation is different from that shown in Tables 1 and 2 in that the

measure of job success used in the second equation of Table 1 (and in Table 2) is entered as the first variable and the sector of the communication industry within which the job is held is entered as a series of dummy variables. Both the equation for salary and the equation for benefits, Table 3 shows, are significant.

Initially, having a communication industry job is negatively associated with one's salary, while attending an accredited program is positively associated with salary. School experiences, search behaviors and industry sectors also are associated with salary, as is one of the locator variables.

In terms of the final equation, having a job in the communications industry and accrediting drop out as predictors. What remain are prior experience with the employer, having a broadcast major (a negative predictor), having an advertising major (a slight positive predictor), employing a very general job seeking strategy (a negative predictor), and working for a weekly newspaper, a television station or a radio station.

The industry findings are not contaminated by the inclusion of the type of major in the final equation, subsequent analyses showed. In other words, with the other factors controlled, taking a job with a weekly, with radio or with television is associated with receiving low pay. Advertising and newspaper work, as well as public relations work, are not signficantly associated with salary, controlling for the other factors. Inclusion of size of community of the employer (in a subsequent regression analysis) did not change this finding.

Strongly negatively related to salary is sex of the respondent: women get less pay then do men. From a base salary (the constant in the equation) of $14,381, women earn less than men by a factor of $1,638, controlling for the

effects of training, industry worked in, grade point average, and the whole host of other variable shown in Table 3. The finding is discouraging, to put it mildly.

While 9.7% of the variance in salary is explained by the regression equation, 6.2% of the variance in benefits is so explained. School experiences, and particularly grade point average (positive) and broadcast major (negative), are related to benefits. Having used a university placement service is positively associated with benefits received, while being employed for a weekly newspaper and for radio is negatively associated with benefits. Sex of the respondent is positively associated with benefits. Women get less pay for their work, but they get more benefits. The increment in number of benefits from the constant of 1.68 attributable to being a woman is .43.

Separate analyses of salary and benefits within employer type were not conducted because of small sample sizes. Several of these groups employed fewer than 100 of the graduates. Such an analyses can be performed only with the increased number of cases that might be possible with the merging of future graduate survey results with those from 1989.

Summary and Conclusions

This paper focused on the determinants of job success in the mass communication industry. The data for this study came from a national survey of journalism and mass communication graduates from 77 programs in journalism and mass communications in the United States. Two indicators were used as criteria of success: number of jobs upon graduation and salary and benefits.

Three separate criteria of success in finding a job were used. Labeled as successful were those with a number of jobs available upon graduation, those who found full-time work involving communication skills, and those who met a

more rigorous definition of having found work in selected fields of communication.

On all three criteria, graduates' college "experiences" were found to be a significant predictor of success. More specifically, experiences in media organizations (internships or working on college media), specialization in any area of study and grade point average (GPA) were all positively associated with finding a job.

When success was examined separately for those in the various areas of specialization in communications studies, the picture was not dissimilar. Clear predictors emerged for the print journalism, broadcasting and public relations fields. Having had an internship and GPA emerged as significant predictors in the case of print. Accreditation and some kind of hands-on experience emerged as significant predictors in broadcasting and public relations. Using the university placement services emerged as an additional predictor for broadcasting.

The picture for salaries and benefits was less clear. Prior experience with the employer was a positive predictor, whereas a generalized job seeking strategy and being a woman were negative predictors of salary. Women, however, were more likely to have a job with a large number of benefits than were men. A high GPA may also fetch higher benefits.

One can draw some tentative generalizations from the analyses. Some key determinants of success, at least in finding a job in the communication industry, appear to be prior experiences in the media, either through simulated exercises--working on the college paper or radio station--or through internships, specialization in area studies and doing well academically.

Both specialization and prior experience (skills) are factors that are

also emphasized in more specialized occupations, often called "professions," such as law, medicine, accounting and so on.[27] This may be a reflection of the changes in the larger social environment. Increasing urbanization and complexity of social system has led to dependence on secondary channels of communication to maintain social control. One consequence of this phenomenon is the emergence of a class of "professional communicators" who have undergone specialized training.[28] While occupations in mass communication do not meet the strict definition of a "profession," the data reported here suggest they are now requiring certain minimum requirements such as high achievement, specialization and skills through simulated or actual work environment.

Two distinct social classifications of the college graduates, their sex and their race or ethnic classification, were examined. Race seems to not being related to success in the job market, nor is it a predictor of salary. This suggests that those who argue that racial or ethnic subgroups are getting special breaks in the job market are incorrect. They also are not be penalized, but the lack of a differential suggests that communications organizations are unlikely to change much in the future in terms of racial and ethnic diversification.

The negative effect of sex of the student on salary earned after graduation is striking. The female students are getting paid substantially less than their male counterparts, even after training and job-seeking behaviors are eliminated as explainers. The fact that women have jobs offering more benefits does not compensate for this salary finding.

This paper began with the observation that the employment of graduates of journalism and mass communications graduates tells much about the nature of the relationship between educational and communications institutions. The data

suggest that accreditation, one of the means by which educational institutions set themselves off as special, is not a strong or consistent predictor of success in the job market. Somewhat more consistent is grade point average, which is the way by which universities designate the quality of their products. One would hardly argue, however, that grades are extremely important in predicting success in employment, given the data in hand.[29]

At the same time, the specialized training of the universities and the provision of opportunities for role playing in the job through college media outlets and internships generally do seem to have a payoff for the student. Once again, however, it is not as powerful of a predictor of success as one might imagine, based on the kinds of dialogue that is common in education and industry circles.

In the end, it is important to note how little of the overall variance in job seeking success has been explained by the analyses presented here. There is much that is unmeasured, such as the way the graduate presents himself or herself on interviews, the determination of the applicant, the sheer enthusiasm for the task before him or her, and even much of the aptitude for that task. Some of these things will always remain difficult to measure. Others simply need to be better anticipated. As is usually the case, much is left to be known.

Endnotes

1. See Lee Taylor, Occupational Sociology. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968) p. 244. Professional occupations with their clear career orientation place heavy emphasis on specialized training, usually at the university. Kultgen has noted that it is a frequently listed defining characteristic of a profession to involve the application of skill based on theoretical knowledge that is acquired by extensive training and education. See John Kultgen, Ethics and Professionalism. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

2. See Lee B. Becker, Jeffrey W. Fruit and Susan L. Caudill, The Training and Hiring of Journalists. (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987) for a discussion of this system and Wm. David Sloan, "In Search of Itself: A History of Journalism Education," in Wm. David Sloan ed. Makers of the Media Mind (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990) pp. 3-22.

3. Joanne Miller, "Jobs and Work," in Handbook of Sociology, Neil J. Smelser (ed). (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1988), pp. 327-359.

4. James S. Ettema and D. Charles Whitney, "Professional Mass Communicators," in Charles R. Berger and Steven H. Chaffee eds. Handbook of Communication Science (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987) pp. 747-780. Becker, Fruit and Caudill, op. cit., is an exception and reviews other relevant literature. The increasing specialization of mass communications education over time is documented in Lee B. Becker, "The Changing Context of Socialization to Newswork," paper presented to the Seventh International Conference on Culture and Communication, Philadelphia, October 1989.

5. A survey of daily newspaper hiring in 1985 by the Dow Jones Newspaper Fund showed that recent college graduates made up 25% of the hires that year, and 85% of those graduates had a journalism degree. The survey is reported in The Dow Jones Newspaper Fund Journalism Career and Scholarship Guide 1990 (Princeton, NJ: Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, 1990). Analyses of data from a supplement to the Current Population Survey showed that 71% of the "editors and reporters" who became "editors and reporters" in 1986 in all media (either moving from another career or entering for the first time) had no prior experience in the field. Such first-time entrants made up 76% of the persons becoming "public relations specialists" that year and 76% of those becoming "advertising and related sales workers." See Elizabeth McGregor, "Entry Level Jobs: Defining Them and Counting Them," Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 34 (4): 27-33 (Winter 1990-91). More detailed data from this same study are reported in Max L. Carey, "Characteristics of Occupational Entrants," Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 33 (2):9-17 (Summer 1989).

6. David B. Bills, "Educational Credentials and Promotions: Does Schooling Do More Than Get You in the Door?" Sociology of Education, 61:52-60 (January 1988); Miller, op. cit..

7. Becker, Fruit and Caudill, op. cit.

8. John W.C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski, William W. Bowman. The News People (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976).

9. David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, The American Journalist. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986).

10. See Sue Lafky, "Economic Equity and the Journalistic Work Force," in Pamela J. Creedon ed. Women in Mass Communication (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989), pp. 164-179; Conrad Smith, Eric S. Fredin, and Carroll Ann Ferguson, "Sex discrimination in earnings and story assignments among TV reporters," Journalism Quarterly, 65:3-11, 19 (1988); and Conrad Smith, Eric S. Fredin, and Carroll Ann Ferguson Nardone, "Sex Discrimination in the TV Newsroom--

Perception and Reality," in Pamela J. Creedon ed. Women in Mass Communication (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989), pp. 227-246. It is interesting to note that a survey of Canadian radio journalists shows no evidence of salary differences by sex. See George Pollard, Decision Acceptance Among Radio Newsworkers (Brewer, ME: Cay-Bel Publishing Co., 1989).

11. Vernon A. Stone, "Pipelines and Dead Ends: Jobs Held by Minorities and Women in Broadcast News," Mass Comm Review, 15 (2&3):10-19 (1988).

12. Lee Stinnett (ed.), The Changing Face of the Newsroom (Washington, DC: American Society of Newspaper Editors, 1989).

13. Randal A. Beam, "Women and Racial Minorities in the Media Labor Force, 1970-80." Paper presented to the Minorities and Communication Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Norman, OK, 1986.

14. For recent reports on these surveys, see Lee B. Becker and Thomas E. Engleman, "Class of 1987 Describes Salary, Satisfaction Found in First Jobs, Journalism Educator, 44 (Autumn 1988), pp. 4-10; 27; Lee B. Becker and Thomas E. Engleman, 1988 Grads Like First Jobs; Median Salary Increases," Journalism Educator, 45 (Spring 1990), pp. 22-27; and Lee B. Becker, "Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Graduates 1989: Summary Report," unpublished manuscript, School of Journalism, The Ohio State University, July 1990.

15. Journalism & Mass Communication Directory Volume 8 1990 (Columbia, SC: The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1990); The Dow Jones Newspaper Fund Career and Scholarship Guide 1990, op. cit.. Schools nominate themselves for inclusion in the former; colleges and universities are included in the latter if they offer a program of study leading to work in print journalism.

16. See Lee B. Becker, "Enrollments Increase in 1989, But Graduation Rates Drop," Journalism Educator, 45 (Autumn 1990), pp. 4-15.

17. All but 3.6% of the responses were received by the end of March of 1990. Responses were tabulated if they arrived by the end of May 1990.

18. Of the 33,080 degrees estimated to have been granted by journalism and mass communication programs in 1988-89, 92.0% (30,425) received bachelor's degrees. The majority (61.5%) of bachelor's degrees are granted by these programs in the Spring. Lee B. Becker, Journalism Educator (1990), op. cit.

19. Journalism & Mass Communication Directory Volume 7. (Columbia: SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1989) p. 72.

20. It isn't possible to determine what biases may exist in the measures of jobs available and employment as a result of nonresponse. Graduates are encouraged to reply to the questionnaire so as to provide feedback to journalism educators about the job market. One can argue as convincingly that people without work would be more likely to reply so as to complain as that

people with work would be more likely to respond so as to brag. All responses, in any case, are confidential. The following footnote also is relevant.

21. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its most recent report on employment rates of college graduates, reported that 73% of the 1986 graduates had found full-time work a year later. Graduates in communications (not just mass communications) did a bit better, with 78% employed full-time. See Thomas A. Amirault, "The Class of '86: One Year After Graduation," Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 34 (2):10-31 (1990).

22. Employment data on 16 students were not available; these graduates similarly were dropped from the analyses.

23. Some students reported having in excess of 10 jobs; the range of scores was truncated to 4 or more so as to prevent the extreme cases from unduly influencing the analyses.

24. Specialization within journalism and mass communication was treated as a dummy variable in which students were classified as having majored in news editorial journalism (including magazine and photojournalism), broadcasting (including broadcast journalism), advertising and public relations.

25. The benefits were: basic medical coverage, major medical coverage, dental coverage, use of a company car, maternity/paternity leave, a retirement plan other than Social Security, prescription drug coverage, life insurance, child care and disability insurance.

26. Six graduates reported incomes that compute to under $5200 annually, for reasons that are not clear from the responses. These six graduates were dropped from the analyses.

27. See Kultgen, op. cit., and Andrew Abbott, The System of Professions. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), and Magali Sarfatti Larson, The Rise of Professionalism. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

28. James W. Carey, "The Communications Revolution and the Professional Communicator," Sociological Review Monograph, No. 13, pp. 23-38 (1969).

29. The finding is consistent with that reported by Becker, Fruit and Caudill, op. cit.

Table 1

Predicting Likelihood of Successful Job Search
in Communication Jobs
With Hierarchical Multiple Regression.

	Measure of Success in Finding an Appropriate Job:					
	Self Designated			Traditional Classification		
Predictors	r	beta	Inc.R2	r	beta	Inc.R2
Institutional:						
Accredited Program	.04	-.01	.00	.16*	.09*	2.62*
School Experiences:						
Broadcast Major	.00	-.01		.03	.05	
Print Major	.05*	.03		.16*	.12*	
PR Major	.02	.04		-.08*	-.01	
Ad Major	-.02	.01		.04	.09*	
Prior Work	-.01	-.03		.06*	.05*	
Prof. Internship	.15*	.14*		.18*	.14*	
College TV	.02	.02		.02	.01	
College NP	.08*	.05		.16*	.08*	
College Yrbook	.04	.03		.04	.02	
College Radio	.02	.01		.04	.03	
Second Major	.04	.03		.04	.01	
GPA	.09*	.06*	3.63*	.11*	.06*	7.42*
Placement:						
Placement-University	-.05*	-.05*		-.10*	-.09*	
Placement-General	-.09*	-.08*		-.10*	-.08*	
Placement-Journalism	.05*	.05		.10*	.07*	
Job Search Strategy	-.02	-.04	1.08*	.08*	.07*	1.72*
Locator:						
Race (Minority)	-.04	-.04		-.05*	-.04	
Gender (Female)	.02	.02	.00	.00	.01	0.16
Total R2			5.05*			11.91*

*=p≤.05

n=1,708 n=1,712

Table 2

Predicting Likelihood of Successful Job Search
in Communication Industries, by Major,
With Hierarchical Multiple Regression.

	News-Editorial			Broadcasting		
Predictors	r	beta	Inc.R2	r	beta	Inc.R2
Institutional:						
Accredited Program	.07	.07	.01	.13*	.09*	1.56*
School Experiences:						
Prior Work	.12*	.09		.00	.02	
Prof. Internship	.28*	.21*		.06	.04	
College TV	-.04	-.06		.08	.03	
College NP	.17*	.09		.07	.07	
College Yrbook	.06	.02		-.03	-.05	
College Radio	.06	.03		.18*	.17*	
Second Major	-.07	-.03		.09	.06	
GPA	.16*	.12*	12.22*	.14*	.10	5.86*
Placement:						
University	-.04	-.06		-.12*	-.12*	
General	-.15*	-.12*		-.07	-.06	
Journalism	.13*	.11		.02	.02	
Job Strategy	.05	.09	2.94*	.01	.00	1.70
Locator:						
Race (Minority)	-.03	.00		-.03	-.01	
Gender (Female)	.02	.01	.00	.01	.00	.00
Total R2			15.70*			11.91*

*=p≤.05

n=366 n=313

Table 2, Continued.

Predicting Likelihood of Successful Job Search
in Communication Industries, by Major,
With Hierarchical Multiple Regression.

	Advertising			Public Relations			Other Areas		
Predictors	r	beta	Inc.R2	r	beta	Inc.R2	r	beta	Inc.R2
Institutional:									
Accredited Program	.05	.02	.00	.16*	.10	2.42*	.16*	.11*	2.42*
School Experiences:									
Prior Work	.02	.03		.05	.05		.04	.05	
Prof. Internship	.12	.08		.19*	.16*		.21*	.15*	
College TV	-.06	-.06		.03	.06		.04	.04	
College NP	.05	.05		.10	.09		.12*	.05	
College Yrbook	.04	.05		-.04	-.05		.11*	.10*	
College Radio	.02	.03		-.04	-.05		.00	-.07	
Second Major	.03	.04		.03	.00		.07	.03	
GPA	.06	.04	2.61	.06	-.01	4.48	.05	.03	6.31*
Placement:									
University	-.11	-.14*		-.10	-.08		-.07	-.11*	
General	-.11	-.13*		-.07	-.06		-.04	-.07	
Journalism	.06	.08*		.09	.07		.10*	.07	
Job Strategy	.05	.06	3.32	-.01	.00	1.08	.19*	.16*	3.52*
Locator:									
Race (Minority)	-.07	-.07		-.04	-.05		-.06	-.05	
Gender (Female)	.07	.09	1.10	-.03	-.02	.27	.02	-.02	.31
Total R2			7.32			8.25*			12.57*

*=p≤.05

n=271 n=332 n=425

Table 3

Predicting Starting Salary and Level of Benefits
With Hierarchical Multiple Regression.

Predictors	Starting Salary r	beta	Inc.R2	Level of Benfits r	beta	Inc.R2
Institutional:						
Job Success (Tradit.)	-.06*	.03	.31*	-.02	.06	.04
Accredited Program	.07*	.06	.65*	-.02	-.03	.03
School Experiences:						
Prior Work	.10*	.09*		.04	.04	
Prof. Internship	.02	.04		.01	.01	
College TV	-.08*	-.03		-.10*	-.06	
College NP	-.05	-.03		-.03	-.04	
College Yrbook	-.08*	-.05		-.03	-.02	
College Radio	-.06*	.01		-.07*	.00	
Second Major	.04	.03		.03	.03	
GPA	.01	.01		.08*	.06*	
Print Major	-.03	-.02		.00	-.02	
Broadcast Major	-.09*	-.08*		-.12*	-.08*	
PR Major	.05	.00		.04	-.02	
Ad Major	.09	.07	3.58*	.02	-.02	3.08*
Placement:						
University	.01	.00		.10*	.09*	
General	-.01	.01		.01	-.01	
Journalism	-.00	.01		-.01	-.02	
Job Strategy	-.14*	-.12*	1.52*	-.01	-.01	.73*
Industry Sector:						
Daily NP	.00	-.06		.03	.00	
Weekly NP	-.12*	-.12*		-.08*	-.10*	
TV	-.08*	-.10*		-.05	-.03	
Radio	-.08*	-.09*		-.11*	-.11*	
Public Relations	.06*	.03		.03	-.02	
Advertising	-.00	-.06	2.03*	.02	-.03	1.66*
Locator:						
Race (Minority)	.04	.04		.03	.02	
Gender (Female)	-.10*	-.13*	1.56*	.11*	.08*	.64*
Total R2			9.65*			6.19*

*-p≤.05

n=1,401