

1-1-2015


Current trends in communication graduate degrees: Survey of communications, advertising, PR, and IMC graduate programs

Keith A. Quesenberry
Messiah University, kquesenberry@messiah.edu

Michael K. Coolsen
Shippensburg University

Kristen Wilkerson
The University of North Carolina System

Follow this and additional works at: https://mosaic.messiah.edu/bus_ed

 Part of the [Advertising and Promotion Management Commons](#), [Communication Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Permanent URL: https://mosaic.messiah.edu/bus_ed/30

Recommended Citation

Quesenberry, Keith A.; Coolsen, Michael K.; and Wilkerson, Kristen, "Current trends in communication graduate degrees: Survey of communications, advertising, PR, and IMC graduate programs" (2015). *Business Educator Scholarship*. 30.
https://mosaic.messiah.edu/bus_ed/30

Sharpening Intellect | Deepening Christian Faith | Inspiring Action

Messiah University is a Christian university of the liberal and applied arts and sciences. Our mission is to educate men and women toward maturity of intellect, character and Christian faith in preparation for lives of service, leadership and reconciliation in church and society.

Current Trends in Communication Graduate Degrees: Survey of Communications, Advertising, PR, and IMC Graduate Programs

Abstract

A survey of 61 master's degree advertising programs reveals significant trends in program titles, curriculum design, course delivery, and students served. The results provide insight for current and planned master's degree programs as research predicts a continued increase in demand for master's education over the next decade. Survey results are compared against overall education trends such as the growth of non-traditional students, increase in online education delivery, and the increase of for-profit universities.

Keywords graduate degree, communications, advertising, public relations, integrated marketing communication

According to annual enrollments, the master's is the fastest-growing degree (Allum & Okahana, 2015). The number of master's degrees awarded has more than doubled since the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) started annual reporting in 1986. The rate of increase of adults with advanced degrees in the United States grew substantially from 10 million in 1990 to more than 17 million in 2009 (Pappano, 2011). Nearly 1.7 million students enrolled in graduate programs in fall 2014. For the first time, the number of applications received was more than two million and the nearly half a million (479,642) incoming graduate students in fall 2014 set a new record for first-time enrollment (Allum & Okahana, 2015).

The CGS survey is sent to all members of the U.S. regional graduate school associations, yet similar master's degree growth has been seen in journalism and mass communications programs (JMC) specifically. Vlad, Becker, and Simpson (2013) reported in the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* that undergraduate enrollments have increased only 1% since 2001, whereas master's degree enrollments in JMC programs increased 30% in the same period. The number of master's programs has also grown from less than 150 to more than 224 in 22 years. This growth of master's education was highlighted in the *New York Times* article "The Master's as the New Bachelor's" (Pappano, 2011).

Other trends in the *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments* indicate a shift from journalism specialization to areas such as advertising and public relations (PR). Enrollment in journalism specializations continue to decline from a high of 34% in 1994 to 26.6% by 2013, while specialization areas of public relations and advertising have increased to a combined 23.9% (Vlad et al., 2013). The percentage of students in strategic communication has also increased over the years (Vlad, Becker, & Kalpen, 2012).

There has been a general growth and demand for these programs in recent years with the shifting economy, increasingly competitive job market, rise of non-traditional students, and changing media environment. Online education has become more common in higher education as the still slowly recovering economy, decreased public funding, escalating tuition, advances in technology, and students' expectations of convenience and flexibility combine to drive this change (Kuruvilla, Norton, Chalasani, & Gee, 2012). Much of the master's enrollment growth

has been driven by non-traditional students. For example, 60% of American active-duty soldiers enrolled in an online course in 2011 versus only 15% a decade before (Peter, 2011). Due to this growth and shift in specialization, this survey aims to uncover the current trends in advertising/PR communications master's degree programs in the United States.

Literature Review

Graduate Education

Employment projections from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate demand for individuals with graduate degrees will continue to increase. The number of jobs requiring a master's degree for entry is expected to grow by 22% between 2010 and 2020 compared with the overall 14% projected growth for all occupations and only 17% projected growth for jobs requiring a bachelor's degree for entry (Bell, 2012). In JMC programs, master's degrees granted were up 20.2% from 2009 to 2010 compared with an increase of 1.4% in undergraduate degrees and a drop of 1.6% in doctoral degrees (Vlad, Becker, & Kazragis, 2011). Master's degrees granted have increased from 6% to 9% in 20 years, while doctorate degrees granted have remained under 1% of total JMC degrees (Vlad et al., 2012).

With the dramatic growth has come a shift in demographics of those earning graduate degrees. Between 1987 and 2007, the number of graduate students 40 years of age and older increased 87% compared with the 58% overall increase in graduate enrollment. Projections suggest the increased growth of non-traditional students will continue for at least the next decade. Many U.S. graduate schools are responding with flexible graduate programs designed for older students delivered in a variety of formats (Bell, 2009).

The last 20 years has also seen growth of for-profit colleges and universities. Master's degrees at for-profit institutions have increased nearly 10-fold in the 10 years from 1986-1987 to 2006-2007. The authors of the CGS Graduate Degrees Report indicate that convenience is the most likely driver of this growth with more flexibility in class schedules and course delivery (Bell, 2009).

Online course delivery has grown. The Sloan Consortium's survey of online learning reports that 31% of higher education students take at least one course online and 65% of higher education academic leaders say online learning is a critical part of their long-term strategy (E. Allen & Seaman, 2011). However, JMC program administrators indicate they are facing challenges and issues, including budgeting, adding new technology, and enrollment decreases (Vlad et al., 2011).

JMC programs face challenges in adapting current curricula to the evolving labor market (Vlad et al., 2011). JMC workers need to be innovative, entrepreneurial, flexible, competitive, highly educated, lifelong learners, resourceful, persistent/resilient, and internationally minded (Claussen, 2011). Dane Claussen, Editor of *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, has raised alarm about master's degree programs using the same admissions processes and criteria and the same credits and degrees as they did 30 years ago (Claussen, 2010).

Four overall trends in graduate education seem to be emerging: (a) increase in demand for master's degrees, (b) a rise of non-traditional students, (c) growth of for-profit universities, and (d) expansion of online education. Are current and planned programs consistent with these overall trends?

Advertising Education

Many significant studies have been conducted on the topic of advertising education. Some of the earliest studies include a study by Link and Dykes in 1959 that described advertising courses at colleges and universities with schools or departments of journalism. Clarke's 1960 *Bibliography of Advertising and Marketing Theses for the Doctorate in United States Colleges and Universities 1944-1959* listed dissertations by institution. In 1962, C. L. Allen conducted a "Survey of Advertising Courses and Census of Advertising Teachers" for the American Academy of Advertising (Ross et al., 2006).

Hileman in 1968, 1970, and 1972 published a three-article series on advertising graduate education, "A Guide to Graduate Study," in *Linage Magazine* (Ross et al., 2006). In 1990, Ross and Schweitzer published a comprehensive study, "25-Year Advertising Enrollments," in *Journalism Educator* (Ross & Schweitzer, 1990). Later, Richards and Taylor in 1996 published a ranking of advertising programs by advertising educators in the *Journal of Advertising Education* (Richards & Taylor, 1996).

A recent study focused on advertising education was the 2006 Ross, Osborne, Richards, and Fletcher publication "Advertising Education: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow." The authors noted that a comprehensive study of advertising education had not been conducted in decades. That study identified the programs in the United States that offer advertising-related majors, minors, or concentrations. This list of programs is what was used to determine the institutions to be surveyed in this study (Ross, Osborn, & Fletcher, 2006).

Ross et al. (2006) defined advertising education as collegiate courses in advertising designed to prepare students to enter the advertising profession. The authors identified approximately 147 colleges and universities with advertising education programs. This survey follows the Ross et al. list of institutions offering advertising education programs. Ross and Richards are also the editors of the annual reference "Where Shall I Go to Study Advertising and Public Relations?" on which the list of colleges and universities in "Advertising Education: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow" is based.

Despite this cohesive definition of advertising education, the names of advertising programs vary greatly. In 2006, Ross et al. noted that titles of advertising programs had become varied as they merged with other disciplines, switched schools, or responded to changes in the industry. Over time, advertising programs moved out of business schools into JMC schools. Business schools moved advertising programs toward management technique, whereas journalism and communication programs concentrated more on function and creation (Ross, 1973). The 2006, Ross et al. report identified nine different advertising program titles (Ross et al., 2006).

Despite the separation of business and communication schools, recently there has been a call for renewed integration of communication and business skills. In *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, Claussen (2011) called for advertising and public relations graduates to know as much as possible about marketing, accounting, finance, economics, and business law. Ponschock and Becker (2009) in the *International Journal of Business Research* called for a blur of boundaries between traditional academic departments for today's cooperative and collaborative business environment. This thought of combining disciplines is not completely new. Ross (1973) published an article "Advertising Education" stating the need for more campus cross-fertilization.

The 2006, Ross et al. study found that from 1964 to 2005, there was a 30% increase in graduate programs for advertising students. The authors noted the trend toward diversity of program names, a decrease in programs in marketing, and the increase in JMC programs. The authors also noticed a general trend in the merger of advertising and public relations programs into integrated marketing communication and other titles (Ross et al., 2006). Vlad et al, also noticed JMC schools becoming less likely to use traditional labels to describe their programs, but noted the differences may be more in terms of terminology than of curriculum (Vlad et al., 2011).

Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to identify the current trends in advertising, public relations, and marketing communications graduate programs in the United States as reported and perceived by the faculty at institutions offering advertising education. Specifically, the study set out to answer these questions:

- **RQ1:** What types of master's degrees are offered in advertising education programs (e.g., MS, MA, MBA, and/or certificates)?
- **RQ2:** What are the graduate program titles of master's degrees offered in advertising education programs?
- **RQ3:** What are the curriculum requirements for master's degrees offered in advertising education programs?
- **RQ4:** What are the advertising education master's degree program designs in terms of schedule, delivery, and focus?
- **RQ5:** What are the admission requirements for master's degrees in advertising education programs?
- **RQ6:** What is the makeup of the student and faculty population in master's degrees of advertising education programs?
- **RQ7:** What are the greatest challenges and opportunities in graduate advertising education?

Method

Sample

A survey of faculty members was conducted to obtain empirical data on current and future designs of master's degrees in advertising education. The sampling frame included all 147 of the schools in the United States listed in Ross et al.'s (2006) "Advertising Education: Yesterday—

Today—Tomorrow.” The Ross et al. list consisted of schools with programs designed to educate students interested in a career in advertising (see Appendix B for the complete list; Ross & Richards, 2011). The schools included in the sampling frame fulfilled these requirements:

1. The school indicates a recommended sequence of courses in advertising/public relations;
2. The school’s catalog lists an advertising or advertising/public relations program;
3. The school requires at least three specifically titled advertising/public relations courses;
4. The college or university is regionally accredited;
5. The school provides the number of advertising and/or advertising/public relations students and graduates.

A total of 147 U.S. higher education institutions were contacted via email (in December, 2011) with an invitation to complete a self-administered online survey. A reminder email was sent in January 2012. Then, in February 2012, a final email reminder was sent, and the survey remained open until the end of the month. No incentive was promised. Among the 147 survey schools, 61 (41%) were ACEJMC-accredited programs (Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 2012) and 137 (31%) were schools included in the Vlad et al. (2011)*Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments*. A total of 61 responses were collected representing a response rate of 41%. The first survey question was a qualifier designed to limit respondents to schools that currently offered or planned to offer master’s degree programs. Survey respondents were asked to provide school affiliations. Among the 61 respondents who completed the survey, 36 (59%) indicated school affiliations, whereas 25 (41%) chose to preserve their right to anonymity.

Macias, Springston, Weaver, and Neustifter (2008) published a content analysis of 46 communication journals and 565 surveys over 13 years. The average mean response rate for email was found to be 30%. The authors concluded by stating, “With the exception of personal interviews, which are not often practical, it appears that yielding minimum response rates of 50% . . . is often not realistic in contemporary times.” It was determined that this survey response rate was acceptable for the study.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire comprised of 24 fixed-alternative and open-ended questions. Answers in each question were randomly placed (see Appendix A). Response choices for the fixed-alternative questions were constructed using an informal content analysis of program websites, and where appropriate, an additional “Other” option was offered for a write-in response. After the survey was designed, it was pretested by a small group of faculty. Feedback was obtained, and changes to answer options were implemented.

Results

Based on survey results, several trends and commonalties emerged from the analysis of the data. To address **RQ1**, data analysis was performed on the survey results. Of faculty respondents, 66% offered or planned to offer an MA, 31% offered or planned to offer an MS, and only 2% offered or planned to offer an MBA degree program (see Figure 1). This may be the result of a continued

trend of advertising education programs moving away from business schools and into JMC schools. It is also useful to note that only 3% of faculty respondents indicated offering graduate certificates and 5% indicated offering a PhD.

Figure 1. Types of graduate degrees offered.

RQ2 explored program names. The diversity of program titles seen in the Ross et al. (2006) study was also seen in these results. In response to name of degree offered, 25% of faculty respondents indicated “Communications,” 21% indicated “Advertising,” 21% indicated “Public Relations,” 13% indicated “Integrated Marketing Communication,” 11% indicated “Strategic Communication,” and the remaining 10% of respondents indicated “Other.” In the “Other” category, the most frequent names written were “Advertising & Public Relations” and “Mass Communication.” This points to the trend of advertising and public relations programs merging following the industry’s move to integrate services. At the bottom of the list of degree names were “Corporate Communication” with 3%, “Marketing Communication” with 2%, and “Technical Communication” with 2% (see Figure 2). This diversification has left JMC programs without a consensus on graduate program titles.

Figure 2. Names of graduate degrees offered. IMC = Integrated Marketing Communication.

In the category of courses and credits required for graduation, question three results indicated more consensus. Approximately half (49%) of faculty respondents indicated master’s programs that require 12 courses for graduation, with roughly 81% indicating between 10 and 12 courses ($M = 11.57$ courses; see Figure 3). Nearly half (44%) of faculty respondents indicated requiring 36 credits for graduation, with 82% indicating between 30 and 36 total credits required for graduation ($M = 35.64$ credits; see Figure 4). In terms of the time it takes to complete master’s degrees, over half (55%) indicated that full-time students complete these degree requirements in 24 months ($M = 24.35$ months), whereas 47% of faculty respondents indicated that it takes part-time students 36 months ($M = 32.56$ months) to complete graduate degree requirements. It is interesting that 35% indicated that their graduation requirements can be completed within 24 months on a part-time basis.

Figure 3. Number of courses required for graduation.

Figure 4. Number of credits required for graduation.

RQ3 results indicated a diversity of assignment elements with consensus around several. Of faculty respondents, 82% indicated use of exams, 77% indicated use of research-based writing assignments, and 67% indicated use of group projects in master's degree programs. Of faculty respondents, 66% indicated master's programs that use problem-based (case study) and experiential-based (real client) project assignments. Critical review writing assignments (articles/books) were indicated to be used in master's programs by 64% of faculty respondents. More than half (54%) of faculty respondents indicated master's program use of finished creative-based projects (see Figure 5).

Figure 5. Types of assessment elements in graduate programs.

Only 44% of faculty respondents indicated the use of grading rubrics in their program. Although exams were the most popular form of assessment, only 11% indicated the use of a comprehensive exam as a final requirement for the program. Instead, 64% of faculty respondents indicated the master's program uses a capstone project as a final requirement, and 56% indicated the program requires a master's thesis (see Figure 6; some schools used more than one listed requirement).

Figure 6. Final requirement for graduate programs.

RQ4 looked further into program design, schedule delivery, and curriculum focus. Results indicated substantial agreement on certain areas. The majority of faculty respondents (79%) indicated that their program curriculum is varied (i.e., required courses plus electives with a flexible order) and that curriculum operates within the traditional semester schedule (70%). Only 20% of faculty respondents indicated offering a year-round schedule, 13% said the overall program schedule is based on weekend/evenings, and only 7% indicated offering accelerated programs. The majority of faculty respondents (75%) also indicated that the program focuses on a balance of theory and practical application. Only 20% of indicated a program focus on practical application, and only 5% indicated a program focus on theoretical research (see Figure 7).

Figure 7. Focus of graduate curriculum.

RQ5 looked into admission requirements. Roughly half of faculty respondents (51%) said the master's program offers rolling admission, while 39% indicated a cohort model. The most indicated requirements for admission included GREs (79%), minimum grade point average (GPA; 72%), letters of recommendation (72%), admissions essay (70%), and resume/curriculum vitae (CV; 61%). Only 8% indicated that the master's program requires a minimum level of work experience, and 5% had a portfolio requirement (see Figure 8).

Figure 8. Admission requirements for graduate programs.

RQ6 evaluated student population. More than three fourths (77%) of faculty respondents indicated that at least half of their master's program students are traditional versus working professionals. Of faculty respondents, 40% indicated that 75% or more of master's degree program enrollments are made up of traditional younger students versus older working professionals (see Figure 9).

Figure 9. Percentages of traditional students in graduate programs.

In the category of instruction, tenured and non-tenured full-time faculty are integral. Of faculty respondents, 90% recorded the use of tenured faculty to support the master's program, and 69% indicated the use of non-tenured full-time faculty. Under half (46%) said the master's program uses adjunct part-time faculty to support instruction. Only 3% indicated program use of teaching assistants (see Figure 10).

Figure 10. Type of faculty support for graduate programs.

In the category of course delivery, an overwhelming majority of faculty respondents indicated a course delivery via traditional classroom (82%). Only 11% indicated the use of online delivery mode, and 10% indicated courses are delivered via a hybrid mode (see Figure 11; some schools indicated use of more than one delivery mode).

Figure 11. Graduate program delivery modes.

Online enrollments in the United States have continued to increase from 9.6% of total enrollment in fall 2002 to 31.3% of total enrollment in fall 2011 (E. Allen & Seaman, 2011). Studies have shown that teaching online requires a different pedagogy, so it is important to look at how these programs are delivering e-learning (Boling, Hough, Krinsky, Saleem, & Stevens, 2011). Of faculty respondents offering online or hybrid programs, 56% indicated having asynchronous master's programs (i.e., students/faculty do not have to be online at the same time). Another 33% indicated having synchronous master's programs (i.e., requiring students/faculty to be online at specific times), and the final 11% of faculty respondents described master's programs with a combination of both delivery methods (see Figure 12). Overall, 22% indicated the master's program has residency requirements.

Figure 12. Online education programs designs.

Technology learning tools have become an increasing part of education delivery. Of all faculty respondents, 75% indicated use of a learning management system, such as Blackboard or Moodle. The next most popular learning tool reported was email (69%), followed by discussion boards (44%) and social media (39%). The remaining tools indicated were blogs (33%), video conferencing (21%), podcasts (8%), and instant messaging (7%). None of the respondents indicated use of Wikis (see Figure 13).

Figure 13. Types of technology learning tools used by graduate programs.

RQ7 collected open-ended responses to faculty's greatest challenges in master's education. Several common themes emerged. Despite the majority of faculty respondents indicating a balance of theory and practical application, many reported a struggle with this balance. There was also a common challenge to find and fund more faculty to meet the needs of programs. Many also noted the challenge of keeping courses current in the ever-changing new media environment. More than half indicated having a final thesis requirement, but there were numerous direct responses indicating that it is a challenge to get students to complete their thesis after passing the classes.

Discussion

Building on research in advertising education and trends in higher education, this study found potential gaps in existing advertising education master's programs. The majority of faculty respondents indicated programs awarding MA degrees with just one third offering MS degrees. Will this change as the industry shifts toward online advertising methods where analyses and tracking is more of a science?

When it comes to titles of programs, there seems to be no agreement. This may reflect a diversity of program content, or it may be a lack of agreement on discipline title. Moving away from "Advertising" does reflect an overall trend in the industry. Many advertising agencies now favor names reflecting integration of services. Yet, industry groups such as the "American Advertising Federation" and the "American Association of Advertising Agencies" have not changed their names. The major trade magazines are also still called "Advertising Age" and "Adweek" (Quesenberry, 2011).

In what ways does this title diversity affect student recruitment? How is it viewed by the industry? Should academic associations and journal publications change their titles? Should organizations and trade publications do the same? Or, as Vlad et al. (2011) indicated, are the name changes more of a switch in terminology rather than curriculum?

Despite the shift to non-traditional students, faculty respondents still indicate a high percentage of traditional students enrolled in master's programs. This could be by choice or a result of less flexible course design. Non-traditional students are more likely to enroll when they can benefit from the time and place flexibility of online instruction (Arbaugh & Duray, 2002). Students value flexibility to arrange work, school, home, and social schedules (Mahoney, 2009).

There is some flexibility. Half of faculty respondents indicate master's programs with rolling admission and a balance of theory and practical application. Yet, nearly 70% indicate that a traditional semester schedule and 80% indicated courses delivered via traditional classroom. This despite increasing reports stating students in online learning environments perform at levels equal to, or even better than, face-to-face instruction (Quesenberry, 2012).

Will traditional universities and colleges adjust graduate programs to meet the needs of the growing non-traditional student enrollments, or will the rising for-profit education institutions continue to step in? Professional organizations may also step up to meet demand. For example, the Mobile Marketing Association has called for the establishment of a Mobile Marketing Certification program to be offered by the professional association (Conrad & Becker, 2009).

Over the next decade, higher education will continue to experience increases in demand for master's degrees, a rise in non-traditional students, a change in skills required for professional jobs, and growth in online education delivery. Now is the time to look at the current state of graduate advertising education programs and consider how they will fit into this new education landscape.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has limitations. The response rate may limit generalizability of findings. Based on a response of 61 surveys, this is not a complete picture of all 147 advertising education programs in the United States. However, the lower number of responses could be due to not all advertising education institutions offering or planning to offer graduate programs.

Because of the diversity of program titles, further studies may find it useful to delve deeper into the curricula of these degrees. Are the areas of study diverse? Or have we not agreed on what to call similar programs? With the growth of non-traditional student populations and online education, further studies may find it useful to look into the design and methods of student education delivery. In spite of limitations, the study does provide implications and insight into the future of graduate advertising education programs.

Appendix A

Study Questionnaire

Current Trends In Marketing and Communication Graduate Programs: Survey of marketing communication graduate programs and their curriculum design.

1. Does your college/university currently offer a graduate degree (MS, MA, MBA) in an area of professional communication (corporate, management, strategic, marketing,

- advertising, PR, technology, IMC or similar)? Yes No No, but there are plans/discussions for one. (Answer questions below about the proposed program)
2. What type of degree(s) is offered? (Indicate all that apply) MA MS Marketing MBA Certificate Other (Please write in)
 3. What is the name of the degree offered? Corporate Communication Strategic Communication Communication Management Integrate Marketing Communication Marketing Communication Technology Communication Communications Public Relations Advertising Other (Please write in)
 4. How many credits and courses are required for graduation? (Please fill in exact amount) Credits Courses
 5. What is length of time that the typical student is expected to complete all requirements for the program? (Leave blank if part-time is not offered) Months (full-time) Months (part-time)
 6. Please indicate the type of curriculum for the graduate program. Set curriculum (Prescribed courses in set order) Varied curriculum (Required courses plus electives with flexible order)
 7. Describe the schedule of the overall graduate program (Check all that apply) Traditional Semester Weekend/Evening Accelerated Year Around Other (Please write in)
 8. What would you consider to be the focus of the graduate program? Theoretical research Practical application Balance of theory and practical application
 9. What percent of your current enrollment are traditional students as opposed to working professionals? (If a future program whom do you plan to target (Please write in)
 10. How do new students enter the program? Cohort model Rolling admission Independent study Other (Please write in)
 11. What are the admission requirements for the graduate program? (Check all that apply) GRE GMAT Minimum years of related work experience. Minimum undergraduate GPA/Transcripts Entrance essay Letters of recommendation Resume Other (Please write in)
 12. What is the final requirement of the program? Master's thesis Capstone (final) project Other (Please write in)
 13. Please specify the number and type of faculty allocated to support the program. Tenured Non-tenured (full-time) Adjunct (part-time) TA
 14. How would you describe the delivery mode of your program? Traditional classroom Online/Distance Learning Hybrid/Blended
 15. If an online or hybrid program, what best describes your form of online delivery? Asynchronous (participants do not have to be online at the same time) Synchronous (requires participants to be online at specified times)
 16. If an online or hybrid program what residency (on-campus) requirements do you have? None Weekend One week Other (Please write in)
 17. What practices (if any) do you follow to ensure academic integrity in online education?

 18. What types of learning tools are used in the program? (Check all that apply) Learning Management System (Blackboard, Moodle, etc.) Discussion boards Blogs Wikis Podcasts Video conferencing (WIMBA, WEBEX, Adobe Connect, etc.) Email

__ Instant messaging (Online chat) __ Social media (Facebook, Twitter) __ Other (Please write in)

19. What elements do you use to access student learning and assign grades? (Check all that apply) __ Exams __ Research writing assignments (hypothesis/research questions) __ Critical review writing assignments (reviews of books/articles) __ Problem based projects (plans or proposals based on case studies) __ Experiential projects (plans or proposals for real clients) __ Collaboration (group projects) __ Creative (created finished marketing/advertising/communication materials) __ Grading rubrics __ Other (Please write in)
20. What was your greatest challenge in developing the graduate program? _____
21. What is your greatest challenge in maintaining the graduate program? _____
22. If you had the opportunity, what is the one thing you would change about the current program? _____
23. Please indicate your school name, department, school and position/title:
University/College _____ Department _____ School _____
Position/Title _____
24. Please list the core (required) courses in your graduate program. _____

Appendix B

Study Schools

Schools from Ross, Osborn, and Fletcher (2006) Advertising Education: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow.

Schools listed with “ACEJMC” are ACEJMC Accredited Programs as of 2012 (Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 2012).

Schools with Vlad et al. are in 2010 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communications Enrollments

Schools with an “*” indicated their affiliation in response to this survey, 36 out of 61 respondents or 59%. The other 25 respondents or 41%, choose to remain anonymous

- **Alabama** *University of Alabama—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Samford University—Vlad et al.
- **Arizona** Northern Arizona University—Vlad et al.
- **Arkansas** Arkansas State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Harding University—Vlad et al., University of Arkansas—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Arkansas Little Rock—Vlad et al.
- **California** California State University-Fresno—Vlad et al., California State University-Fullerton—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., San Diego State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., San Jose State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Colorado** *University of Denver—Vlad et al., University of Northern Colorado—Vlad et al.
- **Connecticut** University of Bridgeport—Vlad et al., University of Hartford—Vlad et al.
- **District of Columbia** Howard University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.

- **Florida** Florida Gulf Coast University, Florida International University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *Florida State University, University of Central Florida—Vlad et al., University of Florida—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Miami—Vlad et al., University of North Florida—Vlad et al., University of South Florida—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of West Florida—Vlad et al.
- **Georgia** Brenau University—Vlad et al., *University of Georgia—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Hawaii** Hawaii Pacific University—Vlad et al.
- **Idaho** University of Idaho—Vlad et al.
- **Illinois** Bradley University—Vlad et al., Columbia College Chicago—Vlad et al., DePaul University—Vlad et al., Northwestern University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *Roosevelt University—Vlad et al., Southern Illinois University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Illinois—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Western Illinois University—Vlad et al.
- **Indiana** Ball State University—ACEJMC, Butler University, Purdue University, Purdue University Calumet, University of Evansville, University of Southern Indiana—ACEJMC
- **Iowa** *Drake University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Iowa State University—Vlad et al., Morningside College—Vlad et al.
- **Kansas** *Kansas State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Pittsburg State University—Vlad et al., University of Kansas—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Washburn University—Vlad et al., Wichita State University—Vlad et al.
- **Kentucky** Murray State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Kentucky—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Western Kentucky University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Louisiana** Louisiana State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Loyola University New Orleans—Vlad et al.
- **Maryland** Loyola College—Vlad et al.
- **Massachusetts** *Boston University—Vlad et al., *Emerson College—Vlad et al., *Suffolk University—Vlad et al.
- **Michigan** Central Michigan University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Ferris State University, Grand Valley State University—Vlad et al., *Michigan State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Oakland University—Vlad et al., Western Michigan University—Vlad et al.
- **Minnesota** Bemidji State University—Vlad et al., St. Cloud State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Minnesota—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., College of St. Thomas—Vlad et al.
- **Mississippi** University of Southern Mississippi—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Missouri** Southeast Missouri State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Southwest Missouri State University, University of Missouri—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Webster University—Vlad et al.
- **Nebraska** Creighton University—Vlad et al., Hastings College—Vlad et al., Midland Lutheran College—Vlad et al., University of Nebraska—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Nebraska at Kearney—Vlad et al., University of Nebraska at Omaha—Vlad et al.
- **Nevada** University of Nevada-Reno—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **New Mexico** New Mexico State University—Vlad et al., University of New Mexico—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **New Jersey** *Rowan University—Vlad et al.

- **New York** *Baruch College, City University of NY—Vlad et al., Buffalo State College, SUNY College—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., College of New Rochelle, *Ithaca College—Vlad et al., Marist College—Vlad et al., *St. Bonaventure University—Vlad et al., *Syracuse University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **North Carolina** Appalachian State University—Vlad et al., Campbell University—Vlad et al., *Elon University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of N C at Chapel Hill—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Ohio** Ohio University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Xavier University—Vlad et al., Youngstown State University—Vlad et al.
- **Oklahoma** Oklahoma City University—Vlad et al., Oklahoma State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Southeastern Oklahoma State University, University of Central Oklahoma—Vlad et al., University of Oklahoma—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Oregon** *University of Oregon—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Pennsylvania** Bloomsburg University—Vlad et al., *Duquesne University—Vlad et al., Lock Haven University—Vlad et al., Pennsylvania State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Point Park University—Vlad et al., Temple University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **South Carolina** *University of South Carolina—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **South Dakota** South Dakota State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of South Dakota—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Tennessee** East Tennessee State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Middle Tennessee State University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Memphis—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Tennessee—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Tennessee at Chattanooga—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Texas** Abilene Christian University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Midwestern State University—Vlad et al., *Southern Methodist University—Vlad et al., *Texas Christian University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., Texas State University—San Marcus—ACEJMC, *Texas Tech University—Vlad et al., Texas Wesleyan University—Vlad et al., University of Houston—Vlad et al., University of North Texas—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Texas at Arlington—Vlad et al., University of Texas at Austin—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Texas at El Paso—Vlad et al., University of Texas—Pan American—Vlad et al., *West Texas A&M University—Vlad et al.
- **Utah** Brigham Young University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Virginia** *Liberty University—Vlad et al., *Radford University—Vlad et al., Virginia Commonwealth University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Washington** *Washington State University—Vlad et al.
- **West Virginia** Bethany College—Vlad et al., Marshall University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *West Virginia University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al.
- **Wisconsin** Marquette University—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., University of Wisconsin—Vlad et al., University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh—ACEJMC—Vlad et al., *University of Wisconsin-Whitewater—Vlad et al.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication . (2012). ACEJMC accredited programs 2012–2013. Retrieved from <http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/STUDENT/PROGLIST.SHTML>
- Allen, E., Seaman, J. (2011). Going the distance: Online education in the United States (The Sloan Consortium). Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/goingthedistance.pdf>
- Allum, J., Okahana, H. (2015). Graduate enrollment and degrees: 2004 to 2014. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools. Retrieved from http://cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/E_and_D_2014_report_final.pdf
- Arbaugh, J. B., Duray, R. (2002). Technological and structural characteristics, student learning and satisfaction with web-based courses. *Management Learning*, 33, 331-347.
- Bell, N. (2009). Data sources: Non-traditional students in graduate education. *The CGS Communicator*. Retrieved from <http://www.cgsnet.org/benchmarking/reports/2009-reports>
- Bell, N. (2012). Data sources: Strong employment growth expected for graduate degree recipients. *GradEdge*. Retrieved from <http://www.cgsnet.org/data-sources-strong-employment-growth-expected-graduate-degree-recipients-0>
- Boling, E. C., Hough, M., Krinsky, H., Saleem, H., Stevens, M. (2011). Cutting the distance in distance education: Perspectives on what promotes positive, online learning experiences. *Internet and Higher Education*, 15, 118-126.
- Claussen, D. (2010). If your master's students aren't doing as well as they (or you) did twenty to thirty years ago, it's probably because they wouldn't and don't. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 64, 349-352.

- Claussen, D. (2011). Criteria for excellent graduates ratcheting up. So what are you going to do for your increasing number of average ones? *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66, 211-214.
- Conrad, C., Becker, M. (2009). Education & training equals professionalism: Is it time to explore professional certification in the mobile marketing industry? *Mobile Marketing Association*. Retrieved from <http://mmaglobal.com/articles/education-training-equals-professionalism-it-time-explore-professional-certification-mobile>
- Kuruvilla, A., Norton, S., Chalasani, S., Gee, M. (2012). Best practices in initiating online programs at public institutions. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 4, 121-127.
- Macias, W., Springston, J. K., Weaver, R. A. L., Neustifter, B. B. (2008). A 13-year content analysis of survey methodology in communication related journals. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 30, 79-94.
- Mahoney, S. (2009). Mindset change: Influences on student buy-in to online classes. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 10, 75-83.
- Pappano, L. (2011, July 22). The master's as the new bachelor's. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com.ezproxy.messiah.edu/2011/07/24/education/edlife/edl-24masters-t.html>
- Peter, T. (2011, November 11). For U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan, online courses fill a valued niche [Special issue: Online learning]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B17-B19.
- Ponschock, R., Becker, G. F. (2009). Blurred boundaries: A case for systemic thinking in the business curriculum. *International Journal of Business Research*, 9(6), 154-158.
- Quesenberry, K. A. (2011, March). Pre-conference session II: Integrated marketing communication integrated marketing communication in segmented schools. *American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings*, 2.
- Quesenberry, K. A. (2012, March). Special topics session: Can online education beat the classroom? The latest methods, programs and curriculum design. *American Academy of*

Advertising Conference Proceedings, 183-184.

Richards, J. I., Taylor, E. G. (1996, Summer). Ranking of advertising programs by advertising educators. *Journal of Advertising Education*, pp. 13-21.

Ross, B. I. (1973). Advertising education. *Journal of Advertising*, 2(2), 18-21.

Ross, B. I., Osborn, A. C., Fletcher, A. D. (2006). *Advertising education: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow*. Lubbock, TX: Advertising Education Publications.

Ross, B. I., Richards, J. I. (2011). Where shall I go to study advertising and public relations? Advertising and public relations programs in colleges and universities (Vol. XLV). Lubbock, TX: American Academy of Advertising.

Ross, B. I., Schweitzer, J. S. (1990). Most advertising programs find home in mass communication. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 45, 3-8.

Vlad, T., Becker, L., Kalpen, K. (2012). 2011 Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments decline, reversing the increase of a year earlier, and suggesting slow growth for future. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 67, 333-361.

Vlad, T., Becker, L., Kazragis, W. (2011). 2010 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments grow, reversing stagnation of recent years. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66, 300-324.

Vlad, T., Becker, L., Simpson, H. (2013). 2013 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments. Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Georgia. Retrieved from http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/Enrollment_Survey/Enrollment_2013/2013EnrollCombined.pdf

Author Biographies

Keith A. Quesenberry is an assistant professor of marketing in the Department of Management and Business at Messiah College. His research interests include storytelling and digital media in marketing and education.

Michael K. Coolsen is an associate professor of marketing in the John L. Grove College of Business at Shippensburg University. His research interests include consumer psychology and the consumer-brand relationship.

Kristen Wilkerson is an adjunct assistant professor at the University of North Carolina, Asheville. Her primary research interests lie in the areas of advertising ethics and creative strategy.