Evaluation Communication of Master's Program
On the Basis of Google Citations

Mike Allen[1]
John Bourhis[2]
Nancy Burrell[3]
Bailey Benedict[4]
Tosin Comfort Adebayo[5]
Maura Cherney[6]
Derrick Langston[7]
Brittney Peck[8]
Samantha Quinn[9]
Riley Richards[10]

This paper provides an assessment of Master's degree programs and faculty research in Communication departments using citations available in Google Scholar. Identification of the Master's degree programs relied on the National Communication Association website. Individual faculty were identified from the web page of the department for the institution. The combined number of citations to faculty publications identifies the top five departments (University of Alabama-Birmingham, California State University-Fullerton, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, Cleveland State University, and California State University-Long Beach) and the top five most cited faculty members (Stella Ting-Toomey, Virginia Richmond, George Cheney, Kimberly Neuendorf, and Brian Spitzberg). The overall set of information provides useful insights for the expectations for Master's program faculty productivity.

Key Words: Master's Degree Programs, Research Productivity, Program Evaluation, Publication Citations

A central consideration for the evaluation of faculty involves some combination of three elements: (a) research, (b) teaching, and (c) service. Institutional priorities determine the relative emphasis of each element, consistent with mission and expectations for the program (Allen, Bourhis, Burrell, Mukarram, Blight, Gross, Lambertz, and Anderson, 2015). The institutional goal involves the creation of a record and set of departmental accomplishments consistent with the expectations. The evaluations involve an examination of two different levels of accomplishment: (a) departmental and (b) individual faculty. The focus on the department becomes how individuals (faculty) combine to establish a record of excellence for the department in achieving the mission set forth in the combination of

[1] UW-Milwaukee
[2] Missouri State University
[3] UW-Milwaukee
[4] Purdue University
[5] UW-Milwaukee
[6] UW-Milwaukee
[7] UW-Milwaukee
[8] UW-Milwaukee
[9] UW-Milwaukee
[10] UW-Milwaukee

departmental and institutional level statement of goals. Individual faculty should provide an identifiable contribution towards the attainment of that goal while achieving some level of individual recognition. The problematic element becomes how to provide "hard" evidence of excellence or achievement capable of evaluation towards those goals.

The normal evaluation criteria for teaching can involve number of student credit hours generated, number of degrees (and minors) earned by students, time spent from admission to graduation, evidence of post-graduate employment or graduate school admission, as well as various teaching evaluations (peer, student and institutional). Service excellence becomes documented by election and participation in various governance bodies (both professional and institutional) combined with community service efforts. All of the contributions become evidence of the value of the department in achieving the mission.

Research excellence is more challenging to demonstrate. Publication evaluation, either by the number and quality (prestige) of the publisher (journal, books, monograph) becomes a set of standards used to interpret the various outcomes. The number of publications, while important, does not demonstrate the value of the work to other scholars. Part of the challenge of publication becomes demonstrating that the published work provided some sense of contribution beyond simply taking up space within a journal. One possible method of examination becomes the use of citation metrics that measure how frequently a work is cited by other scholars. The utility of the article is demonstrated by how useful other scholars found the work in formulating additional questions. One of the important elements becomes the small but important positive relationship of research productivity and teaching effectiveness (Allen, 1996) indicating that goals may reinforce each other. Successful research and successful teaching both involve the ability to explain ideas clearly to an audience not always as expert or as well versed as the author. Both effective teaching and quality research require energetic pursuit of improved outcomes as the result of accumulated experience.

Evaluation of Departments

Departments perform a constant and regular set of evaluations, both internal and external. For example, students provide evaluation of individual instructors each semester and departmental averages (if statistical information is requested) and/or profiles are assembled. The combination of statistical and open-ended responses forms the basis of the file of evaluations. Assembled into a student evaluation portfolio, along with peer teaching assessments, and educational materials generated by the department form the basis for the evaluation of instruction. The departmental evaluation becomes some composite or overall assessment of the instructional quality, based on individual teaching assignments at the section or class level.

The value placed on teaching by a department varies based on the fundamental structure of the institution. A private institution charging more in tuition finds the economic structure fundamental to the ability to attract and retain students willing to pay a premium for an educational experience. For many private institutions, economic survival requires excellence in instruction as perceived by the students. A department receiving consistently low teaching evaluations, small numbers of majors, and low retention would face difficulty with the administration in this environment.

A great deal of educational effort is spent establishing and promulgating a "reputation" for the department with potential students, alumni, administrators, and colleagues. The question often focuses on how to "objectively" provide evidence that the

claim of a "reputation" represents more than wishful thinking or hope. The need to provide some basis for any claim provides a driving force for various efforts undertaken by professional organizations and news media to generate a series of rankings for programs. The goal of most institutions becomes a focus on hiring the best possible candidate to promote the goals of the organization (Barnett, et al., 2010; Barnett & Feeley, 2011).

The use of the *US News* as well as other popular media evaluations attempt to provide some assessment of programs to provide a means of comparing degrees offered by colleges and universities. The *US News* evaluation considers a number of factors in making the determination of excellence (including student/faculty ratio, class size, acceptance rate, percentage faculty that are full time). What is interesting is that the evaluation of programs often does not directly consider any service or research factors as part of the evaluation criteria. More importantly, the *US News* ranking of graduate programs provides no separate listing for the discipline of Communication.

The National Research Council's (NRC) report (NRC, 2012) dealing with doctoral programs explicitly considers program faculty characteristics related to research (e.g., number of publications, number of citations, number and type of research awards). Similar efforts involve communication scholars examining the implications of various citation patterns to evaluate programs and publications (Allen, Maier, & Grimes, 2012; Beatty, Feeley, & Dodd, 2012; Funkhouser, 1989; Levine, 2010; McBath, 1979). The focus in terms of the program deals with issues regarding the extent to which faculty are involved in mentoring of doctoral teaching assistants and engaged in developing the instructional skill of faculty. A great deal of the NRC's doctoral assessment deals with library support and financial support for the program.

An assessment of Master's programs would require a different set of expectations related to the change related to assignment of faculty duties. The problem is that the NRC focus fails to include a recognition or inclusion of programs offering the Master's degree as a separate entity. The focus on doctoral programs or non-inclusion of Communication degrees as a separate entity fails to contribute to assessments of Master's programs. There exists a general lack of professional organizational emphasis in higher education on faculty in Master's programs. Master's faculty lack the access to resources (doctoral research assistants), usually have increased teaching loads (3 courses a semester rather than 2 courses), and the expectations of a research record for tenure may be reduced. This combined lack of resources, opportunity, and institutional motivation (reward) creates a different professional reality compared to most doctoral programs. Examining and establishing expectations for excellence should consider how institutional design impacts on productivity for some outcomes.

Evaluation of Faculty

The nature of each element (i.e., research, teaching, service) provides a separate consideration and effort at evaluation for faculty. Faculty members are routinely evaluated using a combination of those elements. One of the questions or challenges for institutional logic becomes establishing the relative value for each element. How important is teaching relative to research or service when conducting promotion, tenure, and merit evaluations? Part of the definition of the program and the institution plays out involving the relative importance of the elements of evaluation.

The normal comparison when addressing institutions usually involves some comparison based on research since teaching and service metrics for comparison remain

underdeveloped. The lack of any sort of metric permitting comparison across institutions for service or teaching contributions make the focus of institutional comparison related to metrics involving research inevitable. Similarly, faculty teaching at Master's programs may be excellent but become excluded from recognition when evaluations involve only faculty teaching in doctoral programs. When examining faculty, the goal often becomes establishing some normative view of publication productivity (Stephen & Geel, 2007). Numerous efforts to evaluate faculty productivity in terms of quantity and associated institutional reputation exist (Bolkan, et. al., 2012; Edwards, Watson, & Barker, 1988a, 1988b; Hickson, Bodon, Turner, 2004; Hickson, Stacks, & Amsbary, 1989, 1992, 1993; Hickson, Stacks, & Bodon, 1999; Hickson, Turner, & Bodon, 2003; Stephen, 2008, 2009, Watson, Edwards, & Barker, 1989). The evaluations end up targeting or prioritizing primarily doctoral programs.

Departmental numbers (e.g., degrees granted, student credit hours, external contract dollars) tend to be aggregated at the level of the department. The aggregation of such information provides little direct ability to make direct inferences or statements about individual faculty. The move makes individual faculty evaluations or representations move more towards research efforts. Part of this move becomes associated with the issue of the ability to identify the affiliation of individual faculty since authorship carries a particular set of easily identifiable parameters.

Part of the challenge becomes how to evaluate the appropriate level of productivity in terms of research for a faculty member teaching at a Master's program. The use of doctoral program comparison data provides a basis failing to reflect the institutional reality of the person teaching a much larger instructional load with fewer support resources. The problem becomes more severe when faculty teach in institutions where other departments offer doctoral degrees. The comparison of the communication faculty to other faculty teaching in departments offering doctoral degrees may cause difficulty. Individual faculty could be held to a standard at the university or college level that reflects the design or circumstances not reflected when teaching in a Master's degree environment. Evaluation of the research productivity of Communication departments and individual faculty members at terminal Master's programs may improve the measurement and understanding of excellence for the scholarly contributions of both departments and faculty.

Method

Selection of Institutions Included in the Analysis

The institutions chosen for analysis were taken from the National Communication Association list of programs offering Master's degrees in Communication.[1] Every institution on the list was examined for potential inclusion in the analysis. Some institutions currently offer doctoral degrees and were not included because the inclusion of a doctoral program would fundamentally change the nature of the role and responsibilities of the faculty within that department. A program offering a doctoral degree should be reviewed and compared to other doctoral programs and not Master's level programs. M.A. programs that were interdisciplinary without a clear focus or track on communication were similarly excluded from this analysis. A program dealing with business communication where the focus was on a combination of business courses and communication courses was not considered as a communication degree.

Programs focusing primarily on the production of communication media/film, journalism, or entirely on public relations were not included in the analysis. The focus on the

production of film, digital video material, website design, or other very applied and practical outcomes remains different from a liberal arts communication department. Part of the challenge of the inclusion of departments focused on the production of communication artifacts becomes the difficulty of providing a metric that equates creative work to published scholarly work. A publication and ultimately citations to that publication provides a marker of the value of the work. Finding such a simple metric is much more difficult when trying to evaluate the value of generating a web page. Inclusion of these departments would be unfair, since the goal of the program, and therefore the faculty, often has little with published academic work.

Collection of Faculty Information

After departments were identified, the web page for the institution and department was used to identify faculty considered as part of that program. Every institution and department had an accessible web page and listed members of the faculty. While the structure and nature of the web pages differed, the essential information necessary for this investigation was available.

A person listed as faculty was included if they were represented as ranked as an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or rank of Professor. A person was not included if they were listed as a: (a) visiting professor, (b) instructor, (c) clinical professor, (d) practicing faculty, (e) an administrator with primary responsibility outside the department (dean, provost, director of a program outside the department), (f) listed as an emeritus faculty, (g) listed as part-time or ad hoc, and (h) faculty from other departments cross-listed as part of the program.

The goal involved representing permanent faculty that contributed to the graduate education in the Master's program. In some departments faculty were listed by whether or not they had graduate status, only faculty listed as having graduate status were included in this analysis. When no separate listing was provided, the assumption was that all tenure track faculty were contributing to the Master's program and included, unless some notation existed on the departmental web page.

The net impact of the application of the standards varied from institution to institution. For some programs, the number of faculty shrunk from a relatively large number to a very small number of contributors when considering the categorization of the instructional staff in terms of such criteria. Other programs essentially were not effected greatly by the application of these set of standards.

For each faculty member, the year of earning the doctoral degree was recorded. Many institutions list that as part of the web page. A search of the NCA and International Communication Association database, along with the name entered in Dissertation Abstracts International provided the basis of establishing the date of degree.

Collection of Citation Information

The names of each faculty member were used to search for citations of published research using *Google Scholar*. Whenever possible, the vita or other information (like institutional affiliation) was used to supplement and identify relevant publications. For each article authored by the particular faculty member the number of citations were identified and added to create a citation score for each person. *Google Scholar* is not entirely complete, no index can provide information for every article or book published, but the size of the

inclusion and material makes *Google Scholar* the most complete and largest set of available citations.

For each department, all the relevant members of the faculty were identified and the number of citations for each person summed to create a score for the department. The department score represents the overall sum of all citations listed in *Google Scholar* to each author individually.

Results

Ranking by Institutional Departments

Examination Using Total Combined Citations. According to the citation counts, the top ten Master's research programs are: University of Alabama-Birmingham, California State University-Fullerton, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, Cleveland State University, California State University-Long Beach, Boston University, San Diego State University, University of Delaware, Northeastern University, and the University of Texas-El Paso. A complete listing of programs is available in Table 1.

Examination Considering Faculty Size. Among institutions the variability in the average number of faculty is relatively large. The size of the programs across the entire set of institutions ranges from a single individual to a high of 26 faculty in the department. For total citations, the number of faculty in the department plays a significant role because a larger number of faculty permits more publications and a larger total number of combined citations. Table 1 provides a consideration of faculty based on average faculty citations on a per faculty basis, essentially taking the total number of citations and dividing by faculty size.

The results indicate that only one program would not remain in the top 10 (CSU-Long Beach). The reason for this was that CSU-Long Beach has a large faculty (26). Considering the top 20, three programs drop out based on average (#18, Illinois State, #19, CUNY-Baruch, and #20 Arkansas-Fayetteville). All programs have a sizable faculty number (Illinois State with 17, CUNY-Baruch with 14, Arkansas-Fayetteville with 11). The three programs added to the top 20 are Hartford (#11), St. Louis (#19), and Kansas State (#20) and all have a small number of faculty (Hartford has 4, St. Louis has 7, and Kansas State has 6).

Examination Considering Faculty Size and Duration. The consideration of the age of faculty (measured in years, post-doctoral degree) provides a crude measure of the average number of citations per year to each faculty member. The impact of considering age on the top twenty compared to average per faculty has nineteen of the twenty remaining the same although the rank order does shuffle. One institution drops out of the top twenty, Louisville, indicating an older faculty. The institution added, Wyoming, is one with relatively few faculty, but the average per year indicates a younger but productive faculty in the Department of Communication.

The overall summary based on the three different approaches (total number, average number per faculty member, average per faculty member per year) indicates general agreement among the various methods of evaluation. While some changes in the rankings occur, the general agreement among the various methods indicates a consistency in the quality of the faculty.

Ranking of Individual Faculty

Considering individual faculty teaching at a Master's program, the top cited scholar was Stella Ting-Toomey from California State University-Fullerton with 13,363 combined career citations. The next nine rounding out the top ten were Virginia Richmond (Alabama-Birmingham, 10,028), George Cheney (Colorado-Colorado Springs, 9,430), Kimberly Neuendorf (Cleveland State, 9,628), Brian Spitzberg (San Diego State, 9,214), James Katz (Boston University, 9,185), Matthew Nisbet (Northeastern, 6,345), Arvind Singhal (Texas, El-Paso, 5,352), Michael Cummingham (Louisville, 5,158), and Scott Caplan (Delaware, 4,548). No institution had more than one in the top ten, although the 11th rated faculty member is Timothy Levine from Alabama-Birmingham.

The list in Table 2 provides every faculty member with 1,000 or more career citations. The number of scholars and number of different institutions provides a frame for understanding the range of contributions from many different Master's program faculties to research in the discipline. Many of the scholars listed demonstrate large contributions to the scholarly thinking of research in the discipline. The average citation rate per faculty member across a career ranges from about 1,000 in the top ten institutions to about 100 in more mid-range programs to less than 25 for most programs with smaller number of combined citations.

The University of Alabama-Birmingham has five faculty (Richmond, Levine, Park, McCornack, Morrison) on the list, the University of Texas-El Paso has four faculty (Yang, Ruggerio, Peterson, Singhal) as does California State University-Long Beach (Kearney, Plax, Cargile, Ma). The University of Colorado-Colorado Springs (Cheney, Planalp, Shockley-Zalabak), Cleveland State University (Neuendorf, Ableman, Ray) and Texas Christian University (Witt, Ledbetter, Schrodt) each contribute three faculty members to the list.

Comparison to Doctoral Programs

Comparing the pattern of results to that of doctoral programs (Allen, et. al., 2013, see Table 1, p. 61) indicates that the top Master's program would be ranked as the 9th most published graduate program. The second ranked Master's program, California State University-Fullerton would be ranked 10th, and three universities (University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, Cleveland State University, and California State University-Long Beach) would all receive a 14th place ranking. Essentially, ten of the Master's programs would appear in the top 20 programs when compared to doctoral level institutions. The results indicate that the level of contribution by Master's faculty in terms of research citations is significant and evidence of serious contributions of the faculty in those programs to research.

Examining individuals, the top-rated Master's faculty in terms of citations (Stella Ting-Toomey) would be the second most cited faculty member if she were employed at a doctoral program (only Marshall Poole at the University of Illinois-Urbana had more citations, using the Allen, et al., 2013 data from Table 3, p. 65). Examining the top five, Richmond would appear as the sixth most cited doctoral scholar, Cheney would appear as the sixth most cited scholar, as would Neuendorf and Spitzberg. Nine of the top Master's level scholars would appear in the top 25 most cited individuals if working at doctoral degree granting institutions with doctoral degree granting institutions.

The comparisons, conducted both using departmental and individual analysis indicate that the top Master's faculty compare favorably with faculty at doctoral level

programs in terms of scholarly citations. However, the average level of contribution when comparing the programs clearly indicates that many of the Master's institutions do not provide the same level of average contribution to research as measured by citations. The greater variability and number at the smaller end is what creates the difference.

Discussion

Every department within an institution needs to establish guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of the combined efforts of faculty. A central question often asked of administrators becomes the evaluation of a department relative to other departments. The sense of the "horse race" or the need to provide a sense of a department being "above average" provides a certain level of justification. A part of the justification becomes an examination of how the department fits within national norms or as compared to other similar programs. Institutions should examine the goals for the program and for faculty in determining how best to provide desirable outcomes. The data provided in this report demonstrates one method or approach at establishing normative expectations for one measure of research impact.

A Master's program with a terminal focus, where the students have no expectation of continuing for a doctoral degree, remains divergent from other Master's programs with an expectation of continuation on for doctoral work by a serious number of students. Not all Master's programs offer or expect students to move on to the next degree. However, a Master's program with that level of aspiration probably will have faculty whose *vitae* and research efforts more closely resemble or approach doctoral level programs. The match between the elements of faculty achievement and ultimately student career goals requires some consideration and investigation. Some programs clearly have a record of generating or attracting a number of scholars with substantial research records (e.g., University of Alabama-Birmingham, California State University-Fullerton, Cleveland State University, California State University-Long Beach, University of Colorado-Colorado Spring and Texas Christian University). An examination of how those departments have generated an environment that encourages research excellence would provide some additional information on how such cultures evolve and maintain.

The challenge of identifying how to compare programs remains difficult. Clearly, compared to doctoral programs, faculty at Master's programs generate research with collectively and, on average, fewer citations. Most doctoral program faculty teach two classes per semester and work with doctoral students as part of research teams. Essentially, the efforts of the faculty member become enhanced when research assistance is readily available and a reduced teaching load exists. Qualitatively, the doctoral students have more training (usually most doctoral students have already earned a Master's degree) and experience as well as career goals more aligned with the motivation and expectation of generating high quality research. Faculty at a Master's program teach more classes (three or four per semester) with less ability to devote effort to graduate education. In addition, a Master's faculty member typically has less research resources in the department where the Master's student may have a terminal nonacademic focus for future employment and not be focused on developing research skills.

The evaluation provided in this analysis fails to consider two major aspects of evaluating individuals and departments: (a) teaching and (b) service efforts. Both efforts represent criteria and outcomes of serious consideration for programs. The problem of generating some level of comparison between departments remains difficult and not yet

articulated in a meaningful manner. Many institutions view the evaluation of instruction as part of a personnel issue and therefore do not make available information about individual instructors or even departments. The fear of a negative evaluation becoming public provides for a need to protect both a department and individual faculty from embarrassment. In addition, new faculty may need to adapt the new institutional norms and require a bit of experience to improve effectiveness in instruction.

Various educational or pedagogical practices require serious effort and meta-analyses to examine the provide evidence for the effectiveness of programs (Gayle, et al., 2006; Preiss & Allen, 1990, 2006). For example, the use of distance learning required (Allen, et al., 2002; Allen, et al., 2004; Allen, et al., 2013), the examination of classroom interaction and race (Bradford, et al., 2006; Cooper & Allen, 1998), the use of forensics to teach critical thinking (Allen, et al., 1999; Allen, Trejo, Bartanen, Schroeder, & Ulrich, 2004), efforts to reduce homophobia (Allen, et al., 2014), and service learning (Novak, et al., 2007) should all be considered. The implementation of various curricular issues often requires a serious effort at evaluation

Part of the challenge becomes the nature of the Master's program's responsibility and requirements differentiated from the doctoral program. In part, the other aspect of departments where the program offers no graduate education remains yet another element needed to understand how to generate and evaluate faculty. The undergraduate degree institution (whether private or public) provides a valuable contribution in instruction but may or may not focus on the need for faculty to conduct published research. In addition, the quantity and/or quality standards are probably not going to be as focused as institutions that represents the primary evaluation of a faculty member as one related to research. In particular, a private institution may view the primary criteria for evaluation as instructional. Unlike the public doctoral institution with a much lower tuition, the focus on service provided for the fee required may change the institutional resource model. A private institution with a set of instructors viewed as poor or inaccessible may find difficulty over the longer term attracting students.

A remaining challenge becomes to articulate metrics for the comparison of teaching and service to permit a greater understanding of the contribution of faculty to institutions and the profession. The inability to provide data and information restricts the comparisons to those activities or pursuits that carry some public or accessible means of articulation and accumulation. The reason research metrics become pursued for inter-institutional comparison simply reflects the ability to articulate a metric and provide a means for relatively accessible information. Much of teaching and service contributions (or evaluation of excellence) involve contributions that are not nearly as accessible. What this means is that the relative instructional merits of a program remain unclear. Similarly, the lack of information on service contribution provides no ability to compare institutions on that basis as well.

One of the challenges of the use of this kind of metric becomes the sensitivity to the ranking based on one scholar or two with exceptional records. For example, the addition of Stella Ting-Toomey (13,363 citations) to any program virtually guarantees the program a top five institutional ranking for combined citations. Similarly, the addition or deletion of any of the top ten scholars listed can change the ranking of the program dramatically (by relocation or through retirement). Also, many of the top-rated scholars (e.g., Ting-Toomey, Richmond, Cheney, Levine, T. Sellnow) spent a number of years teaching at doctoral programs before the current institutional affiliation. Essentially, the comparison to other faculty that spent

entire careers at Master's level or undergraduate programs may create a bias in favor of particular career paths.

The issue of citations becomes subject to arguments about the manipulation of citation counts to achieve status. A number of online or electronic journals that are considered "open" journals have been accused of requiring articles to provide a number of citations to the material in the journal. The goal of the requirement becomes the focus on increasing the number of citations (both for the power ranking of the journal as well as individual citations). The accusation is similar to that made about the use of "bots" on *Twitter* or *Facebook* to increase the number of "likes" and reposting to make the material considered "trending." The issue is that the impact of such efforts creates an artificial inflation of the importance of the material compared to other articles and publications that do not have such efforts at inflation.

Google Scholar receives criticisms of inclusion and citation limitations. The service does not include all books or some web-based materials. The problem remains of understanding how and what material is included becomes a central issue. Also, the retrieval process varies based on what key word combinations are used when searching for a scholar. In some cases, the person's name had to be combined with the various institutional affiliations to provide complete information.

The use of citations may favor particular areas of the discipline over areas. For example, rhetorical scholars publish fewer works (more weighted in terms of books) that use a reduced number of citations. The impact of areas of the discipline that are simply smaller, means fewer opportunities to gain citations. Areas of the discipline that are much more interdisciplinary (like health communication) have other areas of the academy likely to use the material. Health communication often publishes in journals that are jointly sponsored by other larger organizations (American Psychological Association) and therefore have simply more opportunity to create larger numbers of citations. A small area, like public address, may have much fewer scholars involved using practices less likely to generate larger numbers of citations. The result becomes a focus on employing a method of evaluation that may create a bias in favor of particular areas of scholarship. The solution for this may be the designation by area of scholars or the affiliation of departments by area of concentration.

Other critiques of the use of publication metrics exist including concerns about gender inequity (Blair, Brown, & Baxter, 1994) as well as issues with regard to misuse or creating pressures that are dysfunctional to other institutional goals (Erickson, Fleuriet, & Hosman, 1993, 1996). The problem becomes the reliance on numbers may obscure the necessary narrative required to understand and interpret the information (Huxman & Allen, 2004). The focus on creating a sense of objective measurement may introduce other biases that do not serve other institutional goals.

Despite the limitations of overall institutional assessment, the data provide some ability to evaluate individual faculty relative to the expectations vis-à-vis similar kinds of institutions. Rather than making comparisons of faculty achievement to doctoral programs, this paper generates a more relevant comparison for Master's level programs and the research agenda and outcomes of faculty. The nature of administrative or competitive comparisons is such that the claims of excellence require some element of evidence, preferably objective and quantifiable comparisons using some metric. This paper provides a more relevant institutional comparison by creating a system that provides more similarity in function than a comparison to doctoral program faculty.

References

Allen, M. (1996). Research productivity and positive teaching evaluations: Examining the relationship using meta-analysis. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 7*, 77-97.

Allen, M., Berkowitz, S., Hunt, S., & Louden, A. (1999). A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. *Communication Education, 48,* 18-30. doi.org/10.1080/03634529909379149

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Burrell, N., Cole, A. W., Cramer, E., Dilbeck, K., England, N., Hawkins, J. M., Maier, M., Mullane, R., Omachinski, K., Omori, K., DeCloedt-Pincon, D., Victor, A., Willes, K. L., & Zmyslinski, A. N. (2013). Comparing communication doctoral programs, alumni, and faculty: The use of Google Scholar. *Journal of the Association of Communication Administration, 32*, 55-68.

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Burrell, N., Mukarram, A., Blight, M. G., Gross, C. M., Lambertz, M., & Anderson, C. J. E. (2015). Examining undergraduate communication degree programs: Mission statements, assessment plans, and assessment evaluations. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, *34*, 57-74.

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Mabry, E., Emmers-Sommer, T., Titsworth, S., Burrell, N., Mattrey, M., Crowell, T., Bakkar, A., Hamilton, A., Robertson, T., Scholl, J., & Wells, S. (2002). Comparing student satisfaction of distance education to traditional classrooms in higher education: A meta-analysis. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *16*, 83-97. doi.org/10.1207/S15389286AJDE1602_3

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Tenzek, K. E., & Bauman, I. (2014). Reducing homophobia: A meta-analytic summary of technique effectiveness. In N. Burrell, M. Allen, B. Gayle, & R. Preiss (Eds.), *Managing interpersonal conflict: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 271-283). New York: Routledge.

Allen, M., Mabry, E., Mattrey, M., Bourhis, J., Titsworth, S., & Burrell, N. (2004). Evaluating the effectiveness of distance learning: A Comparison using meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, *54*, 402-420. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02636.x

Allen, M., Maier, M., & Grimes, D. (2012). Evaluating doctoral programs in communication on the basis of citations. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, *22*(1-2). 13pp

Allen, M., Omori, K., Burrell, N., Mabry, E., & Timmerman, E. (2013). Satisfaction with distance education. In M.G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of Distance Education 3rd ed.* (pp. 143-154). New York: Routledge.

Allen, M., & Preiss, R. (1990). Using meta-analysis to evaluate curriculum: An examination of selected college textbooks. *Communication Education*, *39,* 103-116. doi.org/10.1080/03634529009378793

Allen, M., Trejo, M., Bartanen, M., Schroeder, A., & Ulrich, T. (2004). Diversity in United States forensics: A report on research conducted for the American Forensic Association. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *40*, 173-184.

Barnett, G. A., Danowski, J. A., Feeley, T. H., & Stalker, J. (2010). Measuring quality in communication doctoral education using network analysis of faculty-hiring patterns. *Journal of Communication*, *60,* 388-411. doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01487.x

Barnett, G. A., & Feeley, T. H. (2011). Comparing the NRC and the faculty hiring network methods of ranking doctoral programs in communication. *Communication Education*, *60,* 362-370. doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2011.558202

Beatty, M. J., Feeley, T. H., & Dodd, M. D. (2012). Journal impact factor or intellectual influence? A content analysis of citation use in *Communication Monographs* and *Human Communication Research* (2007-2009). Public Relations Review, 38, 174-176. doi.org.ezproxy.lib.uwm.edu/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.08.005

Blair, C., Brown, J. R., & Baxter, L. A. (1994). Disciplining the feminine. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *80*, 383-409. doi.org/10.1080/00335639409384084

Bolkan, S., Griffin, D. J., Holmgren, J. L., & Hickson, M. (2012). Prolific scholarship in communication studies: Five years in review. *Communication Education*, *61,* 380-394. doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.699080

Bradford, L., Cooper, E., Allen, M., Stanley, J., & Grimes, D. (2006). Race and the classroom: Interaction and image. In B. Gayle, R. Preiss, N. Burrell, & M. Allen, M. (Eds.), *Classroom communication and instructional processes: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 169-184). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cooper, E., & Allen, M. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of the impact of student race on classroom interaction. *Communication Research Reports*, *15*, 151-161. doi.org/10.1080/08824099809362109

Edwards, R., Watson, K., & Barker, L. (1988a). A rating of doctoral programs in selected areas of speech communication: 1987-1988. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, *66*, 23-36.

Edwards, R., Watson, K., & Barker, L. (1988b). Highly regarded doctoral programs in selected areas of communication: 1987. *Communication Education*, *37*, 263-269. doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378727

Erickson, K. V., Fleuriet, C. A., & Hosman, L. A. (1993). Prolific publishing: Professional and administrative concerns. *Southern Communication Journal*, *58*, 328-338. doi.org/10.1080/10417949309372915

Erickson, K. V., Fleuriet, C. A., & Hosman, L. A. (1996). Scholars and pub-junkies: Perspectives on academic publishing. *Southern Communication Journal*, *61*, 271-276. doi.org/10.1080/10417949609373022

Funkhouser, E. (1989). Problems with the use of citation indexes in communication research. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, *69*, 79-83.

Gayle, B., Preiss, R., Burrell, N, & Allen, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Classroom communication and instructional processes: Advances through meta-analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hickson, M. III., Bodon, J., & Turner, J. (2004). Research productivity in communication: An analysis, 1915-2001. *Communication Quarterly*, *52*, 323-333. doi.org/10.1080/01463370409370203

Hickson, M. III., Stacks, D. W., & Amsbary, J. H. (1989). An analysis of prolific scholarship in speech communication, 1915-1985: Toward a yardstick for measuring research productivity. *Communication Education*, *38*, 230-236. doi.org/10.1080/03634528909378759

Hickson, M. III., Stacks, D. W., & Amsbary, J. H. (1992). Active prolific female scholars in communication: An analysis of research productivity, II. *Communication Quarterly*, *40*, 350-356. doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369851

Hickson, M. III., Stacks, D. W., & Amsbary, J. H. (1993). Active prolific scholars in communication studies: Analysis of research productivity, II. *Communication Education*, *42*, 224-233. doi.org/10.1080/03634529309378930

Hickson, M. III., Stacks, D. W., & Bodon, J. (1999). The status of research productivity in communication, 1915- 1995. *Communication Monographs*, *66*, 178-197. doi.org/10.1080/03637759909376471

Hickson, M. III., Turner, J., & Bodon J. (2003). Research productivity in communication: An analysis, 1996-2001. *Communication Research Reports*, *20*, 308-319. doi.org/10.1080/08824090309388830

Huxman, S., & Allen, M. (2004). Scientists and storytellers: The imperative pairing of qualitative and quantitative approaches in communication research. In S. Iorio (Ed.), *Qualitative research in journalism: Taking it to the streets* (pp. 175-192). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrance Erlbaum.

Levine, T. (2010). Rankings and trends in citation patterns of communication journals. *Communication Education*, *59*, 41-51.

McBath, J. H. (1979). Methods of assessing graduate programs in speech communication. *Communication Education*, *28*, 359-363. http://doi.org/10.1080/03634527909378379

National Research Council. (2012). *A Data-based Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs In the United States (2011).* Retrieved from www.nap.edu/rdp October 28, 2012.

Novak, J., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, *24*, 149-157. doi:10.1080/08824090701304881

Preiss, R., & Allen, M. (2006). Meta-analysis, classroom communication, and instructional processes. In B. Gayle, R. Preiss, N. Burrell, & M. Allen, M. (Eds.), *Classroom communication and instructional processes: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 3-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stephen, T. D. (2008). Measuring the reputation and productivity of communication programs. *Communication Education*, *57*, 297-311. doi: org/10.1080/03634520801905600

Stephen, T. D. (2009). Clustering research activity in communication doctoral programs: Relationship of publication productivity and department size to disciplinary reputation and prestige. *Journal of Communication*, *59*, 768-787. doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01457.x

Stephen, T. & Geel, R. (2007). Normative publication productivity of communication scholars at selected career milestones. *Human Communication Research*, *33*(1), 103-118. : 103–118. doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00291.x

U. S. News. (2016, September, 12). Best colleges 2017: About the rankings/methodology. Retrieved on March 27, 2017, from: https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/rankings-methodologies

Watson, K. W., Edwards, R. & Barker, L. L. (1989). A rating of doctoral programs in selected areas of mass communication: 1987–1988. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 67: 20–36.

Table 1

Institutional Level Data

INSTITUTION	# FACULTY	Total Citations	Average per faculty Citations	Average Citations per faculty per post PHD year
1. Alabama-Birmingham	11	21,949**(1)**	1995**(1)**	69.16**(3)**
2. CSU-Fullerton	14	17,091**(2)**	1221**(6)**	42.25**(11)**
3. Colorado-Colorado Springs	8	14,804**(3)**	1851**(2)**	58.39**(6)**
4. Cleveland State	9	14,325**(4)**	1592**(3)**	50.07**(9)**
5. CSU-Long Beach	26	14,158**(5)**	545**(16)**	27.48**(18)**
6. Boston University	9	13,102**(6)**	1456**(4)**	54.14**(7)**
7. San Diego State	11	12,811**(7)**	1165**(8)**	72.99**(2)**
8. Delaware	9	11,864**(8)**	1318**(5)**	67.32**(4)**
9. Northeastern	10	11,800**(9)**	1180**(7)**	80.74**(1)**
10. Texas-El Paso	12	11,499**(10)**	958**(9)**	39.80**(12)**
11. Rhode Island	12	9,348**(11)**	779**(12)**	30.78**(15)**
12. Louisville	17	8,881**(12)**	522**(17)**	18.37
13. Texas Christian	11	7,735**(13)**	703**(13)**	50.68**(8)**
14. Western Michigan	12	7,130**(14)**	594**(15)**	30.55**(16)**
15. Houston	13	6,746**(15)**	519**(18)**	32.61**(13)**
16. Central Florida	10	6,303**(16)**	630**(14)**	28.30**(17)**
17. Texas State-San Marcos	12	5,269**(17)**	439**(20)**	30.91**(14)**
18. Illinois State	17	5,266**(18)**	310	22.64
19. CUNY-Baruch	14	5,064**(19)**	361	16.39
20. Ithaca College (NY)	5	4,643**(20)**	929**(10)**	61.39**(5)**
21. Arkansas-Fayetteville	11	4,007	364	15.27
22. College of Charleston	14	3,768	269	20.19
23. CSU-Northridge	15	3,658	244	17.06
24. Virginia Tech	11	3,630	330	18.15
25. Akron	11	3,327	302	9.79
26. North Carolina-Charlotte	14	3,281	234	19.69
27. San Francisco State	15	3,256	217	10.79
28. Hartford	4	3,247	812**(11)**	21.03
29. Northern Iowa	18	3,189	177	13.22
30. St Louis	7	3,159	451**(19)**	46.34**(10)**
31. Wake Forest	10	3,118	312	14.93
32. Colorado State	12	3,118	260	27.11**(20)**
33. Montana	8	3,092	387	16.84
34. DePaul	16	2,840	178	11.63
35. Texas-San Antonio	15	2,775	185	14.23
36. North Carolina-Greensboro	11	2,677	243	13.69

37. Baylor	11	2,491	227	9.15
38. West Chester	14	2,264	162	7.50
39. Nevada-Las Vegas	8	2,224	278	14.29
40. Oakland (MI)	17	2,154	127	10.40
41. Missouri State	11	2,151	196	9.48
42. Michigan Technological	7	2,112	301	13.80
43. University of Pacific	5	2,018	404	23.19
44. Emerson	10	2,003	200	9.59
45. Western Illinois	9	2,002	222	22.50
46. CSU-Los Angeles	9	1,980	220	8.10
47. Florida Atlantic	10	1,772	177	6.58
48. Northern Colorado	8	1,691	211	10.47
49. James Madison	20	1,689	84	6.20
50. East Carolina	9	1,678	186	13.56
51. Tennessee-Knoxville	7	1,601	229	20.56
52. Farleigh Dickinson	7	1,439	206	11.60
53. CSU-San Bernadino	8	1,431	179	8.36
54. Western Kentucky	10	1,361	136	12.87
55. Marquette	4	1,343	335	12.57
56. Ball State	10	1,321	232	6.73
57. Florida International	11	1,320	120	18.69
58. Old Dominion	6	1,302	217	11.64
59. CSU-Chico	8	1,268	159	14.79
60. Wyoming	6	1,183	197	27.36**(19)**
61. SUNY-Brockport	7	1,104	158	8.60
62. Indiana State	9	1,073	119	5.51
63. Louisiana-Lafayette	7	1,070	153	9.71
64. Fordham	4	1,045	261	20.41
65. Eastern Washington	6	991	165	6.86
66. CSU-Sacramento	18	883	49	10.79
67. Arkansas-Little Rock	6	870	145	7.92
68. Boise State	9	865	96	10.46
69. Valdosta	9	850	94	3.89
70. Kansas State	6	808	135	24.89
71. Kennesaw	3	800	267	9.94
72. Northern Kentucky	12	732	61	6.29
73. Drexel (PA)	3	723	241	10.57
74. Wisconsin-Whitewater	12	720	60	6.55
75. Pepperdine	11	680	62	5.51
76. Southern Illinois-Edwardsville	5	669	134	13.99
77. Texas-Grande Valley	11	666	61	4.43
78. Rochester Institue of Technology	5	665	113	9.19
79. Auburn	6	654	109	8.90
80. Northern Arizona	7	555	79	4.01
81. Fairfield	7	513	73	6.70
82. Texas A&M-Corpus Cristi	10	498	50	24.28

83. Villanova	6	479	80	4.18
84. Indiana/Purdue-Fort Wayne	5	438	88	4.26
85. Grand Valley State	7	434	62	3.74
86. Bethel	7	428	64	3.33
87. University of Portland	6	413	69	4.19
88. Liberty	8	404	51	3.12
89. West Florida	4	399	100	5.41
90. Central Connecticut	4	368	92	4.31
91. Kean	4	344	86	5.68
92. Murray State	6	343	57	2.79
93. Governors State	3	324	108	17.36
94. Gonzaga	5	321	64	3.81
95. West Texas A&M	7	313	45	2.69
96. Southern Utah	2	297	149	11.44
97. Idaho State	3	288	96	3.50
98. Cal State University-East Bay	7	276	39	5.35
99. SouthEast Louisiana	7	275	39	2.55
100. Texas-Arlington	3	246	82	8.14
101. Marist	4	244	61	6.85
102. South Dakota State	5	201	40	5.39
103. Abilene Christian	8	188	24	0.91
104. Queens	5	185	37	3.42
105. Austin Peay	7	173	25	1.86
106. South Dakota	5	168	34	5.94
107. Alaska-Fairbanks	4	157	39	13.80
108. Radford	7	156	22	2.17
109. Spring Arbor	2	153	77	3.48
110. Eastern Michigan	8	146	18	1.14
111. Louisiana-Monroe	6	120	20	0.80
112. Illinois-Springfield	3	110	37	1.98
113. National University	4	109	29	2.44
114. Wisconsin-Stevens Point	6	106	18	4.05
115. Lynn	2	103	52	1.84
116. Arkansas State	4	86	22	3.09
117. Drury	4	84	21	1.13
118. Eastern Illinois	12	84	7	0.98
119. Purdue-Calumet	2	76	38	1.72
120. CUNY-Brooklyn	2	74	37	2.20
121. Eastern New Mexico	3	67	22	1.18
122. Fort Hayes	7	63	9	1.01
123. Regis	3	60	20	3.67
124. Stephen A. Austin	4	57	14	1.70
125. Bellermine	3	51	17	4.28
126. Louisiana Technological	3	49	16	2.04
127. Texas Southern	1	39	39	1.11
128. Hofstra	5	30	6	1.46

129. University of Dubuque	2	22	11	2.20
130. Suffolk	3	22	7	0.27
131. Spaulding	1	14	14	1.17
132. SUNY-Potsdam	5	8	2	0.12
133. Lasell	1	4	4	0.50
134. Iona	3	3	1	0.21

Table 2

Data on Individual Faculty

Faculty Member	Citations	Institution
1. Ting-Toomey	13,363	CSU-Fullerton
2. Richmond	10,028	Alabama-Birmingham
3. Cheney	9,430	Colorado-Colorado Springs
4. Neuendorf	9,628	Cleveland State
5. Spitzberg	9,214	San Diego State
6. Katz	9,185	Boston University
7. Nisbet	6,345	Northeastern
8. Singhal	5,352	Texas-El Paso
9. Cunningham	5,158	Louisville
10. Caplan	4,548	Delaware
11. Levine	4,408	Alabama-Birmingham
12. Kearney	3,833	CSU-Long Beach
13. T. Sellnow	3,699	Central Florida
14. Nakayama	3,688	Northeastern
15. Hobbs	3,596	Rhode Island
16. Plax	3,567	CSU-Long Beach
17. Chen	3,447	Rhode Island
18. Wu	2,709	Boston University
19. Schrodt	2,677	Texas Christian
20. Planalp	2,530	Colorado-Colorado Springs
21. Peterson	2,520	Texas-El Paso
22. Rancer	2,477	Akron
23. Goodman	2,472	CUNY-Baruch
24. Orbe	2,398	Western Michigan
25. Ellis	2,293	Hartford
26. Jowett	2,274	Houston
27. Park	2,274	Alabama-Birmingham
28. C. Simonds	2,019	Illinois State
29. Ferguson	2,001	College of Charleston
30. Ruggiero	1,953	Texas-El Paso
31. Ryan	1,852	Houston
32. McCornack	1,848	Alabama-Birmingham
33. Allen	1,842	Arkansas-Fayetteville
34. Beach	1,812	San Diego State
35. Abelman	1,612	Cleveland State
36. Leichty	1,743	Louisville
37. Teven	1,726	CSU-Fullerton
38. Courtright	1,721	Delaware
39. Shockley-Zalabak	1,685	Colorado-Colorado Springs

40. Emmers-Sommer	1,665	Nevada-Las Vegas
41. Medhurst	1,606	Baylor
42. Witt	1,579	Texas Christian
43. Beebe	1,537	Texas State-San Marcos
44. Jones	1,483	CSU-Northridge
45. Cargile	1,327	CSU-Long Beach
46. Houser	1,324	Texas State-San Marcos
47. Tedesco	1,277	Virginia Technological
48. Ledbetter	1,278	Texas Christian
49. Dong	1,218	University of the Pacific
50. Yep	1,213	San Francisco State
51. Ma	1,126	CSU-Long Beach
52. Bourhis	1,116	Missouri State
53. Ray	1,105	Cleveland State
54. Sillars	1,085	Montana
55. Apker	1,085	Western Michigan
56. Hinsley	1,079	St. Louis
57. Slack	1,071	Michigan Technological
58. Ivory	1,073	Virginia Technological
59. Mundorf	1,019	Rhode Island
60. Yang	1,010	Texas-El Paso
61. Fejes	1,009	Florida Atlantic
62. Morrison	1,000	Alabama-Birmingham

Footnotes

[1]Some M.A. degrees are no longer offered (UW-Superior, Ithaca College) despite listing at the National Communication Association. The data collection occurred during the months of January to May 2016 using web pages and changes in faculty and degree availability are not reflected after that date. Retirements, relocation, or program changes may result in inclusion or omission of departments/faculty after that date.