



# National Communication Association

National Office  
1765 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

202-464-4NCA  
fax 202-464-4600  
<http://www.natcom.org>

## NCA Doctoral Reputational Study, 2004

**Thomas A. Hollihan, Chairperson  
Doctoral Education Committee, 2003-2004<sup>1</sup>**

In August, 2001, the Doctoral Education Committee (DEC) of the National Communication Association (NCA), sought and gained the agreement of the Administrative Committee of the NCA, to conduct a second reputational study of doctoral programs in communication.<sup>2</sup> The first NCA reputational study had reported its results in April, 1996.<sup>3</sup> The goal was to update that study and to put in place a system where a new study was conducted every three years so that new doctoral programs could be added and so that significant changes occurring in programs (new faculty hires or losses, new curricula, new areas of specialization, new research initiatives, etc.) could be taken into account by evaluators and reflected in program evaluations.

### Methodology of the Study

The DEC deliberated over the design of the study and agreed that all programs that offered the Ph.D. in one or more of the major specialty areas of communication studies would be included. The study thus included the communication programs that were ranked in the first NCA study, those new doctoral programs that had been established since that first study, and the research and doctoral education components (but not the professional training components) of units devoted to the study of mass communication. The units to be ranked were those in which the doctoral programs were

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas A. Hollihan directed the study and is responsible for this final report. He would like to acknowledge the efforts of Justin Acome who coordinated the data collection and analysis and the following USC-Annenberg students who assisted with the study: Caroline Estrada, Emma Lee, Amy Granados, Allie Basker, Hara Hailele -Griffin, Jackson DeMos, Lisa Green, Tal Zavlodaver, Joshua Francis, Tanya Wennmacher, Regina Sumell and Leticia Williams. In addition he would like to acknowledge Dr. Abigail Kaun for her assistance. Communication regarding the study can be directed to: Thomas A. Hollihan, Professor and Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281; [hollihan@usc.edu](mailto:hollihan@usc.edu).

<sup>2</sup> Professor David Swanson, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, chaired the DEC during the 2000-2001 academic year, and drafted the study design in collaboration with Dr. Bill Eadie, San Diego State University, who was at the time the Associate Director of the NCA. Professor Brant R. Burleson, Purdue University chaired the Doctoral Education Committee during the 2001-2002 academic year, and actually got the study underway.

<sup>3</sup>This study was undertaken by the NCA Research Board.

housed administratively. In cases where more than one communication doctoral program existed in the same university the programs were to be identified and ranked separately.

The DEC also agreed that rankings would be organized by the specialty areas in which programs offered doctoral education. An initial communication would go out to chairs, department heads, directors of graduate study, and/or deans for each program asking that each program indicate the areas in which it wished to be ranked. Based on the returns from that mailing, the final list of specialty areas was constructed.

In order to be listed in the survey the DEC determined that an area must be offered by at least 15 doctoral programs. The rationale for selecting 15 as the threshold was that it was believed that areas offered by 15 or more programs reflected disciplinary rather than more local emphases. To prompt respondents to begin thinking about potential areas of specialty an initial list of possible areas was provided.<sup>4</sup> In addition, respondents were invited to add other suggested areas of study. In 2003 a questionnaire went out asking respondents to identify the areas of study in their programs.<sup>5</sup> Sixty-seven doctoral programs responded to this questionnaire by identifying the programs of study that they offered. Based on those responses, the list of specialty areas to be included in the next round of the study was determined. Those specialty areas that were identified by at least 15 programs included:

- Communication and Technology
- Critical/cultural Studies of Communication/Media
- Health Communication
- Intercultural/International Communication
- Interpersonal/Small Group Communication
- Mass Communication Research
- Organizational Communication
- Political Communication
- Rhetorical Studies

Next another round of questionnaires was distributed to the chairs, department heads, directors of graduate study, and deans. Each doctoral program was required to provide the names of at least three of its graduate faculty members who regularly teach, conduct research, and/or direct dissertations in each area in which it wished to be ranked. In addition, each program was asked to provide the names of at least two doctoral

---

<sup>4</sup> The initial list included the following: interpersonal and group communication (including communication in family, developmental, and relational settings); organizational communication; intercultural and international communication; health communication; political communication; communication and technology; rhetorical studies (including theory, history, and criticism); discourse studies (including language pragmatics, discourse analysis, and similar studies); critical, cultural, interpretive studies of communication and media; feminist communication studies; mass communication research (including institutions, effects, media and society); communication law and policy; and advertising and public relations.

<sup>5</sup> Professor Randy Hirokawa from the University of Iowa chaired the DEC in 2002-2003. He issued this questionnaire.

graduates from that area during the last the five years. For new areas of specialization or for new programs, they were to provide the names of at least three current doctoral students that were actively pursuing that specialty. The intent was to focus on ranking specialization areas that actively involved multiple faculty and students. The DEC recognized that some faculty members conduct research and direct dissertations in more than one area of specialization. Thus, doctoral programs were permitted to list a given faculty member as working in two but not more than two specialty areas. The DEC reasoned that someone working in more than two areas was probably not a “specialist” in all those areas. The DEC also recognized that some emeritus faculty members continue to be actively involved in doctoral education after retirement. Departments were permitted to list such faculty members if they were actively conducting research, teaching, or directing dissertations.

During the spring of 2004 programs provided the names of their faculty, recent graduates, and/or current students in the areas of specialization offered in their doctoral programs. From the information provided by these respondents the final questionnaire was constructed. This questionnaire was distributed to the department contact provided by each program. Each department contact was asked to distribute the final questionnaires to the members of their doctoral faculty. Every member of every doctoral program included in the study was thus invited to evaluate the reputations of any of the doctoral programs in any of the areas of study in which they felt themselves knowledgeable. The questionnaires were coded so that respondents could not evaluate the doctoral program in which they were currently teaching.

For each program and specialty area, the raters were provided with the name of the university, the name of the department, and a list of graduate faculty members identified by the department. In addition, the names of students or recent graduates were provided. Raters were then asked to rate each department in a given specialty area by responding to the following three questions.

- Scholarly quality of program faculty (mark one)
  - 1) \_\_\_ Distinguished
  - 2) \_\_\_ Strong
  - 3) \_\_\_ Good
  - 4) \_\_\_ Adequate
  - 5) \_\_\_ Marginal
  - 6) \_\_\_ Not sufficient for doctoral education
  - 9) \_\_\_ Don't know well enough to evaluate
- Program effectiveness in educating researchers (mark one)
  - 1) \_\_\_ Extremely effective
  - 2) \_\_\_ Reasonably effective
  - 3) \_\_\_ Minimally effective
  - 4) \_\_\_ Not effective
- Quality change, last five years (mark one)
  - 1) \_\_\_ Better than 5 years ago
  - 2) \_\_\_ Little or no change in the last 5 years

### 3) \_\_\_Poorer than five years ago

All three of these items are taken from the National Research Council (NRC) Study of doctoral programs. The NRC uses mean responses to the first item, about faculty quality, to array the departments from the highest to lowest mean score. Mean responses to the other two questions are then reported to provide additional information about the ranked programs. Following the NRC practice, the DEC elected to list all programs in each specialty arrayed in rank order based on the scholarly quality of the program question.

### **The Study Provokes Controversy**

This study provoked significant controversy within the discipline. The issues that were raised in objection to the study were varied and often presented with great passion. First, several program directors and/or faculty members expressed objections to the decision to limit the areas of specialization to those areas that were offered by at least 15 programs. They argued that no study of the field could be credible if it failed to include one or more of the areas that were offered in their program. Those areas of specialization that were mentioned but that fell short of the required 15 programs included: advertising, applied communication studies, argumentation studies, communications policy studies, discourse analysis studies, feminist studies, media history, media law, and public relations. In this study, none of these areas of specialization garnered more than 12 responses, and some had as few as 2 from the 67 programs that responded to the initial survey asking programs to list their areas of specialization. Nonetheless several irate respondents argued that they could personally list more than 15 programs offering concentrations in these areas. In that many programs did not respond to this questionnaire this is, of course, possible, but perhaps they did not have the required number of current faculty, recent graduates and/or students. The requirement for 15 programs in a specialty area was admittedly arbitrary – it could have been set at 10 or it could have been 25 – but these were the conditions established by the DEC and approved by the NCA Administrative Committee. In that many departments construct their areas of emphasis in unique and sometimes idiosyncratic ways that best display the strengths of their faculty and in response to the unique situations on their home campuses (particularly the case in those universities offering multiple doctoral programs focused on some specializations related to communication studies), no single description of specialty areas would likely please most, let alone all programs in the field.

Second, several expressed objection to the decision to limit faculty to no more than two areas of specialization. They argued that many of their best known and most productive faculty actively contribute to three or more areas of specialization and that they should therefore be able to list them as many times as they saw fit. Some also argued that this limitation uniquely punished smaller programs that had fewer faculty members and were forced to ask people to teach a broader range of courses, while simultaneously rewarding large programs who could distribute more faculty names across a wide range of specializations. Again the decision to limit faculty members to two areas

of specialization was arbitrary, and given that these complaints may have merit this limitation will have to be reconsidered by future researchers when this study is repeated.

Third, some objected to the study because they felt that some of their peer institutions were “gaming” the study in some way or another. Complaints were made about the fact that some departments listed faculty from other disciplines, listed adjunct or part-time faculty, listed people who were now in administration rather than in the classroom, etc. Given that the questionnaires were constructed according to data provided by each individual program, the faculty list was no different and it is assumed that these data were provided according to the rules of the study and were as accurate as the other data provided by the programs. Again, when this study is repeated there should be a discussion regarding whether additional rules and/or guidelines ought to be imposed on respondents.

Fourth, a few colleagues expressed regret that a ranking study was being conducted at all. They argued that such studies were a disservice to the field because they were subjective, did not reflect real differences in educational quality across institutions, and invited deans, university provosts, or even potential students to make intellectually lazy judgments about the quality of different departments. Clearly, these arguments have some merit. A reputational study is just that – a study of the reputations of various programs and not a study of the intrinsic quality of these programs. One can almost certainly receive a great education in a program that does not yet enjoy a strong reputation or a less challenging education in a program that boasts a great reputation. Also these data could be misused. On the other hand, most academic disciplines routinely conduct these kinds of studies, university administrations increasingly expect and even demand such data, and the members of the DEC after careful reflection decided that it weakened our discipline in comparison to others that we lacked such data. Furthermore, the DEC noted that the NRC intends to include communication studies in its next rankings of doctoral programs. They also observed that the NRC will not be evaluating programs in as many specialty areas, that it will only conduct a survey once in every decade (so programs will have to wait many years before they can improve their position), and that it may also have other methodological characteristics that disadvantage some programs in our field (e.g., the NRC will attempt to “count” publications in a few selected journals but many of the important journals in which communication scholars publish their work will not be included). As a result, the DEC and the NCA Administrative Committee decided that this study should proceed.

A small number of doctoral programs that originally supplied information identifying their areas of specialization, faculty members, and recent graduates or current students elected to withdraw from the study to communicate the depth of their concerns regarding the study design and procedures. These programs withdrew from the study before any of the results were tabulated or any of the rankings were known.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> These programs included: the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Georgia; the School of Journalism and Communication, University of Oregon; the S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications, Syracuse University; and the College of Journalism and Communications, University of Florida.

In that the DEC intends to repeat this study in three years, it is important that a conversation about the design and methodology of future studies be encouraged, and that this conversation includes a persons and voices representing a wide range of different disciplinary perspectives. The DEC intends to engage the officers of the Council of Communication Associations in these discussions to assure that future studies address these concerns and that they reflect the breadth of the different lines of inquiry in the discipline.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The most serious problem with this study, and a problem that was revealed in each round of questionnaires, is that the response rate was a disappointment. Many factors probably contributed to the poor response rate. First, producing a mailing list of all the doctoral programs and their directors or contact persons proved to be a significant challenge.<sup>7</sup> It was difficult even to determine how many doctoral programs exist in communication. Some departments, for example, participate in interdisciplinary doctoral education programs that were identified by the DEC in the preliminary mailings, but in many cases these programs were not considered by their sponsoring departments as within the purview of this study. In some other instances doctoral programs that were initially listed for inclusion have become inactive or have merged with other programs. Even when programs were identified, the DEC often lacked information about the current director or program head; phone numbers were no longer accurate and email addresses no longer worked. These problems significantly delayed the study, and these delays contributed to the poor response rate.

Second, repeated mailings, emails, and phone contact with departments often failed to result in completed questionnaires. In some cases this may have been because the programs actively decided not to participate in the study either because they objected to the study or its methodology or because they were concerned that it would not capture or reflect the strengths of their program very effectively. In other cases, however, it is clear that the questionnaires either never got into the hands of the right person in the department, or they got to the right person but somehow disappeared into a stack of work to be completed at a later date but that did not surface in time for the program to be included in the study. As a result, many programs failed to identify their specialty areas and their faculty members and thus were not included in the final questionnaire. Several of the programs that were not included did, after the questionnaires had already been printed and circulated, contact the researchers in an attempt to be added to the study.

---

<sup>7</sup> Professor Marshall Scott Poole of Texas A&M University worked very hard to put together a list of doctoral programs and contacts, and it was this list that was used for this study.

Unfortunately, once the final questionnaire was in the hands of the respondents it was impossible to accommodate these requests.<sup>8</sup>

In the final wave of questionnaires for the study we distributed 1,165 surveys to the department chair, program director, or contact person provided to us. Each of these questionnaires was to be circulated to all doctoral faculty listed as teaching in each program. We received back 376 completed surveys, for a response rate of approximately 33%. Several factors likely accounted for this poor rate of return for this final questionnaire. First, this questionnaire did not go out in the mail until late May, after many school academic years had ended. This was certainly a major problem because some faculty members were likely already away from campus for the summer holiday. The delayed mailing was a result of the multiple contacts necessary to have departments provide names of their faculty members and students and/or recent graduates. The researchers could not wait until fall because by that time there would have been so many faculty moves (new hires and departures) that every department would have to be contacted all over again for current information.

Second, the questionnaire was 84 pages long and a careful and thorough respondent would expect to spend at least an hour finishing the questionnaire. That is obviously a major time commitment that discouraged some from responding. Furthermore, to return the questionnaire by mail meant finding a large envelope and adding extra postage. This may have inhibited some respondents from participating in the study. The researchers contemplated using a Web based survey, and discussed doing so with survey consultants, but were advised that it would be even more unlikely that respondents would make the effort and persist to complete a study this long and time consuming on the Web. Thus, the rate of return might have been even worse than it was with this study.

Third, by the time the questionnaire was in the hands of faculty respondents there had already been significant discussion in the community (on list-serves, via email conversations, in open meetings at conferences, etc.) detailing the objections to the study. Also, in the perception of many, studies such as this one create “winners” and “losers.” Faculty members in programs that do not have confidence that such a study will

---

<sup>8</sup> The following programs failed to provide information identifying their areas of specialization, faculty, recent graduates, or students and were thus not included in the final questionnaire. The reasons for their non-participation are varied and often unknown: Department of Rhetoric, University of California, Berkeley; School of Communication, University of Hawaii, Manoa; Institute of Communication Research, University of Illinois; School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Iowa; Manship School of Mass Communication, Louisiana State University; Philip Merrill College of Journalism, University of Maryland; Program in Media Arts and Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Department of Communication Studies, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor; School of Journalism, University of Missouri, Columbia; Department of Communication Studies, and the Media, Technology & Society Program, Northwestern University; E.W. Scripps School of Journalism, Ohio University; Department of Communication Studies, Regent University; School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of South Carolina; Department of Speech Communication, University of Southern Mississippi; School of Communications and Theater, Temple University; College of Communication and Information, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Department of Communication, University of Utah; and Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University.

strategically help their program may in fact become discouraged from taking the time to complete the questionnaire and participate.

Finally, some department contacts may never have circulated the questionnaires to all of their faculty members. During the course of the study several faculty members contacted the researchers for copies of the questionnaire, often asserting that their chairperson or program director had failed to provide them with a copy. There were also reports of boxes of surveys that were damaged at the post office. The researchers corrected these situations when notified but it is possible that some surveys did not reach their intended destinations.

Assessing the possible biases in the results due to a 33% response rate is a challenge. An examination of the distribution of the respondents to the final questionnaire reveals no obvious patterns that would suggest evidence of bias. It does appear that some programs either did not receive the questionnaires, did not distribute them to faculty, or perhaps faculty members might have collectively decided not to respond. Eleven doctoral programs out of ninety-two participating in the study returned no questionnaires. On the other hand, in only one program did every faculty member respond to and return the questionnaire. There seemed to be no remarkable difference with regard to who responded to the questionnaire, however, in terms of areas of study, geography, faculty size, programs that ended up to be more highly rated, etc. One should also consider when evaluating the response rate that this study did not attempt to structure a sample of a portion of doctoral faculty in the field of communication. Instead, questionnaires were sent to the entire population of doctoral faculty in communication. Given this distinction, the 33% response rate is arguably less troublesome.

A final concern that might be raised about the study is that more respondents chose to evaluate some programs than others, and thus, the relative weight of a single negative evaluation score was greater for programs falling near the bottom in each area of specialization. One must bear in mind that this is a study of reputations. When respondents can identify by name the scholars and know the research programs undertaken by the faculty members in some programs they will more likely evaluate those programs. When they do not know the faculty in a program or their research very well they are less likely to evaluate that program. This difference is, in effect, an evaluation of a program's reputation. In the case that exhibited the greatest variance in the number of respondents, the program that ranked first in its area of specialization was evaluated by 229 respondents, but the program that ranked last in this area of specialization was evaluated by only 81 respondents.

As has already been observed, a study such as this cannot presume to measure the other objective qualities of a program: the caring of the faculty, the strength of the cohort groups, the collegiality experienced, the job placements, etc. Data such as that offered in this study is the stuff of arguments, but it should not and does not stand on its own weight. It must be placed in the broader context of the claims that can be offered about the comparative strengths and weaknesses of different doctoral programs. Talented



academic leaders will be charged with determining their strategies for using such data in a manner that best advantages their own institutions both now and into the future.

The evaluations of individual programs and areas of specialization are included in the attached charts.

## Reputational Study of the Doctoral Programs in Communication - 2004

 Ranking Doctoral Programs Based on Specialty Area: **Communication and Technology**

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.79	1.76	1.72
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Sciences	1.90	1.67	1.61
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	1.95	1.71	1.57
California, University of-Santa Barbara	Department of Communication	2.14	1.85	1.47
Stanford University	Department of Communication	2.19	1.85	2.06
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.57	1.89	1.97
Texas, University of-Austin	Communication Studies Department	2.60	1.95	1.69
Texas A&M University	Department of Communication	2.65	2.08	1.76
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.66	2.17	1.60
Cornell University	Department of Communication	2.77	2.25	1.61
Indiana University	Department of Telecommunications	2.79	2.19	1.90
Pennsylvania State University	College of Communications	2.80	2.09	1.72
Texas, University of-Austin	Department of Radio-TV-Film	2.86	2.18	1.83
Ohio State University	School of Journalism and Communication	2.90	2.15	1.74
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Dept of Language, Literature, and Comm	2.94	2.26	2.21
SUNY - Buffalo	Department of Communication	2.94	2.30	1.88
California, University of-San Diego	Department of Communication	3.06	2.38	1.68
Rutgers University	Department of Communication, SCILS	3.08	2.29	2.14
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	3.29	2.45	1.99
Texas, University of-Austin	School of Journalism	3.33	2.34	2.03
SUNY - Albany	Department of Communication	3.36	2.52	1.49
Minnesota, University of	Department of Rhetoric	3.37	2.46	1.71
Colorado, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.39	2.35	1.91
New York University	Department of Culture and Communication	3.45	2.38	1.96
Kent State University	School of Communication Studies	3.62	2.67	2.05
Ohio University	School of Telecommunications	3.68	2.49	2.05
North Carolina, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.72	2.60	2.02
Connecticut, University of	Communication Sciences Department	3.73	2.76	1.87
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.81	2.70	2.06
Massachusetts, University of-Amherst	Department of Communication	3.86	2.61	2.03
Miami, University of	School of Communication	3.98	2.96	1.91
Southern Illinois University	College of Mass Comm and Media Arts	4.02	2.78	1.97
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	4.12	2.90	2.03
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	4.22	2.96	1.75

Reputational Study of the Doctoral Programs in Communication - 2004

Ranking Doctoral Programs Based on Specialty Area: **Critical-Cultural Communication**

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Pennsylvania, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.62	1.55	1.86
California, University of-San Diego	Department of Communication	1.98	1.81	1.78
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	2.11	1.87	1.66
Colorado, University of	Department of Communication	2.20	1.92	1.60
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.39	1.96	1.63
Stanford University	Department of Communication	2.41	1.96	2.07
Texas, University of-Austin	Communication Studies Department	2.47	2.03	1.99
New York University	Department of Culture and Comm	2.52	2.14	1.93
Massachusetts, University of-Amherst	Department of Communication	2.53	2.08	1.88
Pittsburgh, University of	School of Arts and Sciences	2.62	2.08	1.60
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech and Comm	2.74	2.17	1.80
Iowa, University of	Department of Communication Studies	2.74	2.13	1.81
Bowling Green State University	School of Communication Studies	2.90	2.35	1.80
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.92	2.29	1.64
Indiana University	School of Journalism	2.93	2.17	1.90
Texas, University of-Austin	Department of Radio-TV-Film	2.97	2.09	1.95
Pennsylvania State University	College of Communication	3.04	2.35	1.69
Indiana University	Department of Comm and Culture	3.05	2.34	1.88
Texas, University of-Austin	School of Journalism	3.11	2.29	1.97
Ohio University	School of Communication Studies	3.13	2.44	1.76
South Florida, University of	Department of Communication	3.14	2.33	1.78
Colorado, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.16	2.47	1.92
Ohio University	School of Telecommunications	3.22	2.61	1.88
New Mexico, University of	Department of Comm and Journalism	3.25	2.51	1.92
Minnesota, University of	Mass Communication Department	3.26	2.51	2.11
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.40	2.45	2.20
Southern Illinois University	College of Mass Comm and Media Arts	3.43	2.69	1.67
Washington State University	Edward R. Murrow School of Comm	3.53	2.62	1.82
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Department of Speech Communication	3.54	2.65	1.90
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	3.74	2.72	1.93
Minnesota, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.78	2.60	2.25
Georgia State University	Department of Communication	3.91	2.84	1.74
Miami, University of	School of Communication	4.92	3.42	2.26

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Pennsylvania, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.71	1.67	1.67
Pennsylvania State University	Department of Comm Arts and Sciences	1.71	1.63	1.19
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Sciences	1.73	1.56	1.66
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	2.04	1.71	1.40
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Communication	2.05	1.78	1.70
Kentucky, University of	College of Comm and Info Studies	2.08	1.85	1.75
Texas A&M University	Department of Communication	2.29	1.98	1.73
Purdue University	Department of Communication	2.33	1.81	1.60
Rutgers University	Department of Communication, SCILS	2.42	2.22	1.50
Ohio University	School of Communication Studies	2.68	2.10	1.50
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.84	2.19	1.92
Ohio State University	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.84	2.33	1.99
Oklahoma, University of	Department of Communication	2.95	2.23	1.71
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.96	2.21	2.09
New Mexico, University of	Department of Comm and Journalism	3.05	2.50	1.94
Arizona, University of	Department of Communication	3.20	2.30	2.02
Washington State University	Department of Communication	3.41	2.57	1.86
South Florida, University of	Department of Communication	3.43	2.63	2.19
North Carolina, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.47	2.63	2.00
Connecticut, University of	Communication Sciences Department	3.70	2.62	1.91
Indiana University	Department of Telecommunications	3.93	2.71	2.22
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	4.03	3.01	1.60
SUNY-Buffalo	Department of Communication	4.03	2.91	2.03
SUNY- Albany	Department of Communication	4.07	2.85	2.04
Miami, University of	School of Communication	4.26	3.16	2.35
Minnesota, University of	Mass Communication Department	4.34	3.06	2.05
Memphis, University of	Department of Communication	4.43	3.11	2.10
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	4.84	3.21	1.96

Reputational Study of the Doctoral Programs in Communication - 2004

Ranking Doctoral Programs Based on Specialty Area: **Intercultural-International Communication**

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
California, University of-Santa Barbara	Department of Communication	1.96	1.74	1.53
New Mexico, University of	Dept of Communication and Journalism	2.29	1.93	1.59
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.19	1.97	1.77
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Sciences	2.29	2.01	1.89
Maryland, University of-College Park	Department of Communication	2.51	2.06	1.79
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.56	2.10	1.66
Pennsylvania State University	Dept of Communication Arts and Sciences	2.63	2.12	1.59
Massachusetts, University of-Amherst	Department of Communication	2.87	2.28	2.04
Oklahoma, University of	Department of Communication	2.75	2.28	1.95
Arizona State University	Hugh Downs School of Communication	2.85	2.28	2.00
Texas, University of-Austin	Department of Radio-TV-Film	3.10	2.32	1.94
Ohio University	School of Telecommunications	3.20	2.34	1.95
New York University	Department of Culture and Communication	2.91	2.46	1.88
Washington State University	Edward R. Murrow School of Comm	3.25	2.49	1.89
California, University of-San Diego	Department of Communication	3.42	2.50	1.94
Denver, University of	Dept of Human Communication Studies	3.52	2.53	1.92
Indiana University	School of Journalism	3.40	2.54	1.88
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.62	2.56	2.13
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Communication	3.61	2.57	2.01
Indiana University	Dept of Communication and Culture	3.49	2.58	2.08
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	3.48	2.58	1.85
Howard University	Dept of Communication and Culture	3.01	2.59	1.94
Southern Illinois University	College of Mass Comm and Media Arts	3.49	2.60	1.75
North Carolina, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.56	2.60	2.07
Colorado, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.53	2.60	1.99
SUNY-Buffalo	Department of Communication	3.47	2.66	2.06
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.89	2.69	2.05
Texas, University of-Austin	School of Journalism	3.74	2.72	2.06
Minnesota, University of	Department of Communication Studies	4.13	2.77	2.25
Indiana University	Department of Telecommunications	3.79	2.77	2.06
Miami, University of	School of Communication	3.50	2.78	2.01
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Department of Speech Communication	3.46	2.84	1.97
Minnesota, University of	Mass Communication Department	4.26	2.95	2.16
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	4.24	2.97	1.84
Wayne State University	Department of Communication	4.13	3.05	2.10
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	4.28	3.13	2.02
Memphis, University of	Department of Communication	4.34	3.14	2.07

## Reputational Study of the Doctoral Programs in Communication - 2004

 Ranking Doctoral Programs Based on Specialty Area: **Interpersonal-Small Group Communication**

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
California, University of-Santa Barbara	Department of Communication	1.70	1.63	1.78
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	1.76	1.61	1.67
Pennsylvania State University	Dept of Comm Arts and Sciences	1.87	1.76	1.50
Purdue University	Department of Communication	1.92	1.79	1.79
Iowa, University of	Department of Communication Studies	1.92	1.88	1.92
Texas, University of- Austin	Communication Studies Department	1.95	1.79	2.16
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Sciences	1.97	1.77	1.84
Colorado, University of	Department of Communication	2.21	1.98	1.58
Arizona State University	Hugh Downs School of Communication	2.30	2.02	1.67
Arizona, University of	Department of Communication	2.62	2.09	1.97
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.67	2.13	2.17
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.78	2.20	2.09
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	2.81	2.29	1.90
Rutgers University	Department of Communication, SCILS	2.81	2.22	1.60
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Communication	2.83	2.25	1.83
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	Department of Communication Arts	2.90	2.14	2.45
Ohio State University	School of Journalism and Comm	2.91	2.31	1.81
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.03	2.36	1.97
South Florida, University of	Department of Communication	3.05	2.33	1.94
Ohio University	School of Communication Studies	3.07	2.37	1.64
Oklahoma, University of	Department of Communication	3.11	2.32	1.80
Maryland, University of-College Park	Department of Communication	3.18	2.45	1.86
Missouri, University of-Columbia	Department of Communication	3.47	2.50	1.73
Nebraska, University of-Lincoln	Communication Studies	3.49	2.51	1.78
Kent State University	School of Communication Studies	3.64	2.74	2.09
Minnesota, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.69	2.63	2.23
SUNY-Albany	Department of Communication	3.76	2.75	1.98
Wayne State University	Department of Communication	3.78	2.80	1.93
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	3.81	2.95	1.69
Louisiana State University	Department of Communication Studies	3.92	3.09	2.12
Kentucky, University of	College of Comm and Info Studies	3.97	3.06	2.39
Connecticut, University of	Communication Sciences Department	4.04	2.82	2.04
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	4.09	2.98	1.70
California, University of-San Diego	Department of Communication	4.12	2.95	2.11
New Mexico, University of	Department of Comm and Journalism	4.25	2.96	2.12
Denver, University of	Department of Human Comm Studies	4.36	3.01	1.99
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Department of Speech Communication	4.37	3.00	2.10
Duquesne University	Dept of Comm and Rhetorical Studies	4.58	3.12	1.95
Miami, University of	School of Communication	4.59	3.29	2.12

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Pennsylvania, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.42	1.53	1.65
Stanford University	Department of Communication	1.78	1.78	1.97
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Sciences	1.80	1.60	1.79
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.11	1.87	1.66
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.19	1.76	2.19
Texas, University of-Austin	School of Journalism	2.23	1.96	1.92
Alabama, University of	College of Comm and Info Sciences	2.37	2.00	1.72
Pennsylvania State University	College of Communications	2.46	2.01	1.59
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	2.48	2.06	1.61
Ohio State University	School of Journalism and Communication	2.49	2.11	1.70
Indiana University	Department of Telecommunications	2.50	2.03	1.76
Arizona, University of	Department of Communication	2.67	2.24	1.52
North Carolina, University of	Department of Comm Studies	2.75	2.12	1.90
Minnesota, University of	Mass Communication Department	2.79	2.08	1.90
Indiana University, School of Journalism	School of Journalism	2.85	2.19	2.01
Massachusetts, University of-Amherst	Department of Communication	2.87	2.32	1.84
California, University of-Santa Barbara	Department of Communication	2.94	2.20	2.25
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.99	2.37	1.81
Maryland, University of-College Park	Department of Communication	2.99	2.35	1.81
Texas, University of-Austin	Department of Radio-TV-Film	3.02	2.30	2.10
Cornell University	Department of Communication	3.08	2.26	1.85
Purdue University	Department of Communication	3.13	2.41	2.01
Kent State University	School of Communication Studies	3.27	2.56	1.99
Oklahoma, University of	Department of Communication	3.28	2.55	1.81
Colorado, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.31	2.51	1.94
Florida State University	Department of Communication	3.39	2.55	1.82
Washington State University	Edward R. Murrow School of Comm	3.42	2.53	2.00
Ohio University	School of Telecommunications	3.48	2.61	1.88
Kentucky, University of	College of Comm and Info Studies	3.55	2.67	2.06
Connecticut, University of	Communication Sciences Department	3.63	2.74	1.94
Howard University	Department of Communication and Culture	3.64	2.74	1.92
Miami, University of	School of Communication	3.73	2.87	1.93
Missouri, University of-Columbia	Department of Communication	3.82	2.71	2.06
Southern Illinois University	College of Mass Comm and Media Arts	3.82	2.80	1.97
Georgia State University	Department of Communication	3.84	2.88	1.83
SUNY-Buffalo	Department of Communication	4.01	2.95	2.00
Bowling Green State University	School of Communication Studies	4.05	2.91	2.02
New Mexico, University of	Department of Comm and Journalism	4.13	2.96	2.06
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	4.76	3.30	2.13

## Reputational Study of the Doctoral Programs in Communication - 2004

 Ranking Doctoral Programs Based on Specialty Area: **Organizational Communication**

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Texas A&M University	Department of Communication	1.46	1.51	1.51
California, University of-Santa Barbara	Department of Communication	1.83	1.69	1.43
Colorado, University of	Department of Communication	2.08	1.85	1.66
Arizona State University	Hugh Downs School of Communication	2.17	1.99	1.61
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.19	1.89	1.99
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	2.36	1.98	1.91
Purdue University	Department of Communication	2.37	1.96	2.19
Texas, University of-Austin	Communication Studies Department	2.48	1.88	1.71
Ohio University	School of Communication Studies	2.80	2.30	1.49
South Florida, University of	Department of Communication	2.94	2.39	2.02
Michigan State University	College of Communication Arts & Science	2.96	2.32	1.99
Rutgers University	Department of Communication, SCILS	3.00	2.24	1.74
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	3.07	2.49	1.64
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	3.10	2.32	2.13
SUNY-Buffalo	Department of Communication	3.17	2.57	2.02
Missouri, University of-Columbia	Department of Communication	3.69	2.54	1.75
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Comm	3.73	2.63	1.88
New Mexico, University of	Dept of Communication and Journalism	3.89	2.66	2.07
Howard University	Dept of Communication and Culture	3.99	3.05	2.00
Washington State University	Edward R. Murrow School of Comm	4.14	2.79	1.99
SUNY-Albany	Department of Communication	4.27	2.91	1.94
Duquesne University	Dept of Comm and Rhetorical Studies	4.29	3.05	2.02
Kent State University	School of Communication Studies	4.39	2.90	1.92
Wayne State University	Department of Communication	4.39	2.88	2.27
Miami, University of	School of Communication	4.51	3.04	2.03
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	4.53	3.00	1.91
North Dakota, University of	School of Communication	5.18	3.42	2.15



University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Pennsylvania, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.32	1.39	1.68
Stanford University	Department of Communication	2.17	1.78	1.94
Texas, University of-Austin	Communication Studies Department	2.29	1.91	2.02
Wisconsin, University of-Madison	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.36	1.71	2.21
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.36	2.10	1.77
Texas, University of-Austin	School of Journalism	2.40	1.89	2.00
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	2.41	1.90	1.69
Maryland, University of-College Park	Department of Communication	2.50	1.99	1.49
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	2.54	1.93	1.90
Pennsylvania State University	Department of Comm Arts and Sciences	2.66	1.97	1.87
Ohio State University	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	2.75	2.21	1.53
Texas A&M University	Department of Communication	2.91	2.14	2.12
Oklahoma, University of	Department of Communication	2.93	2.19	2.12
North Carolina, University of	Department of Comm Studies	2.98	2.24	1.68
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	2.99	2.33	1.76
Missouri, University of-Columbia	Department of Communication	2.99	2.38	1.67
Indiana University	School of Journalism	3.05	2.33	2.09
Pennsylvania State University	College of Communications	3.10	2.32	1.85
Minnesota, University of	Mass Communication Department	3.30	2.55	2.06
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Communication	3.55	2.49	1.68
New York University	Department of Culture and Comm	3.68	2.85	1.89
Colorado, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.70	2.72	1.65
North Carolina, University of	School of Journalism and Mass Comm	3.72	2.44	1.75
SUNY- Albany	Department of Communication	3.81	2.69	2.36
Miami, University of	School of Communication	3.90	2.87	1.93
Wayne State University	Department of Communication	3.98	2.66	2.34
Southern Illinois University	College of Mass Comm and Media Arts	4.22	2.92	2.08

University	School/Department	Scholarly Quality of Program Faculty	Program Effectiveness in Educating Researchers	Quality Change in Last 5 Years
Georgia, University of	Department of Speech Communication	1.74	1.77	1.44
Texas, University of-Austin	Communication Studies Department	1.75	1.79	1.70
Pennsylvania State University	Department of Comm Arts and Sciences	1.80	1.58	1.81
Minnesota, University of	Department of Communication Studies	1.87	1.57	1.87
Southern California, University of	Annenberg School for Communication	1.95	1.91	1.60
Iowa, University of	Department of Communication Studies	2.15	1.89	2.28
Maryland, University of-College Park	Department of Communication	2.16	1.80	1.42
Indiana University	Department of Communication and Culture	2.36	2.11	2.05
Pittsburgh, University of	School of Arts and Sciences	2.37	1.98	1.83
North Carolina, University of	Department of Communication Studies	2.41	2.02	1.61
Texas A&M University	Department of Communication	2.56	2.06	2.25
Kansas, University of	Communication Studies	2.61	2.02	1.80
Memphis, University of	Department of Communication	2.65	2.40	1.37
Illinois, University of-Urbana-Champaign	Department of Speech Communication	2.73	2.16	1.90
Colorado, University of	Department of Communication	2.90	2.20	1.80
Georgia State University	Department of Communication	2.91	2.28	1.44
Washington, University of	Department of Communication	2.93	2.17	2.04
Ohio University	School of Communication Studies	3.01	2.41	1.87
Arizona State University	Hugh Downs School of Communication	3.30	2.47	2.12
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Department of Speech Communication	3.35	2.62	2.06
Minnesota, University of	Department of Rhetoric	3.37	2.38	1.92
Purdue University	Department of Communication	3.42	2.54	2.13
Massachusetts, University of-Amherst	Department of Communication	3.42	2.51	2.03
New Mexico, University of	Department of Comm and Journalism	3.47	2.68	2.00
Louisiana State University	Department of Communication Studies	3.53	2.52	1.79
Nebraska, University of-Lincoln	Communication Studies	3.54	2.51	2.10
Arizona, University of	Department of Communication	3.55	2.61	2.10
Wayne State University	Department of Communication	3.58	2.68	2.07
Missouri, University of-Columbia	Department of Communication	3.66	2.61	1.96
Florida State University	Department of Communication	3.70	2.76	1.92
Denver, University of	Department of Human Comm Studies	4.01	2.86	2.14
Howard University	Department of Comm and Culture	4.08	2.86	1.99
North Dakota State University	Department of Communication	4.27	2.91	1.86
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Dept of Language, Literature, and Comm	4.31	2.90	2.37
Duquesne University	Dept of Comm and Rhetorical Studies	4.52	3.02	1.76
Miami, University of	School of Communication	4.79	3.19	2.05