The 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions:

Communication

Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics

An excerpt from the full technical study conducted for the American Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Recommended Citation: Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko, *The 2012–13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions* (College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014; sponsored by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences).

Communication

In this section, we will provide an overview of Communication departments. Table COM1 provides data on number of departments and faculty members.

Table COM1: Faculty Members by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments	Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members
Primarily Undergraduate	204	7.6	1,550
Comprehensive	367	17.5	6,440
Primarily Research	195	27.2	5,310
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments	Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members
Bachelor's	468	10.4	4,870
Master's	212	28.0	5,940
Doctorate	86	29.0	2,490
TOTAL	766	17.4	13,300

Table COM2 presents faculty members by tenure status. There are almost as many neither tenured nor tenure-track, part-time faculty members in Communication departments as there tenured faculty members.

Table COM2: Faculty Members by Tenure Status, Fall 2012

Carnegie	-		Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track,	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track,
Classification	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Full-Time	Part-Time
Primarily Undergraduate	480	300	210	560
Comprehensive	2,110	990	1,130	2,210
Primarily Research	2,000	710	930	1,670
Highest Degree Offered	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Bachelor's	1,680	930	740	1,520
Master's	1,780	710	1,170	2,280
Doctorate	1,130	360	360	640
TOTAL	4,590	2,000	2,270	4,440

Table COM3 presents faculty members by employment status and gender. About two-thirds of the faculty members a full-time and just over half are women.

Table COM3: Faculty Members by Employment Status and Gender, Fall 2012

Carnegie	,	J		
Classification	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Primarily Undergraduate	980	570	800	750
Comprehensive	4,170	2,270	3,040	3,400
Primarily Research	3,550	1,760	2,690	2,620
Highest Degree Offered	Full-Time	Part-Time	Men	Women
Bachelor's	3,270	1,600	2,470	2,400
Master's	3,620	2,320	2,780	3,160
Doctorate	1,810	680	1,280	1,210
TOTAL	8,700	4,600	6,530	6,770

Not every department housed in an institution classified as Primarily Research using the Carnegie classifications offers a doctorate, or even a master's. Table COM4 details the highest degree offered by Communication departments housed at various institutions.

Table COM4: Number of Departments by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012

8		Hig	Highest Degree Offered				
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate	TOTAL		
e :ion	Primarily Undergraduate	191	13	0	204		
Carnegie Classification	Comprehensive	250	117	0	367		
Clas	Primarily Research	27	82	86	195		
	TOTAL	468	212	86	766		

Table COM5 summarizes responses to the question of how many bachelor's degrees were awarded in Communication during the 2011-12 academic year. Departments at Primarily Research institutions accounted for almost one-half of the bachelor's degrees awarded.

Table COM5: Bachelor's Degrees completed in Communication in the 2011-12 Academic Year

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments	Average Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded
Primarily Undergraduate	204	24.9	5,070
Comprehensive	367	68.6	25,160
Primarily Research	195	151.7	29,580
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments	Average Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded
Bachelor's	468	39.1	18,310
Master's	212	121.1	25,670
Doctorate	86	184.1	15,830
TOTAL	766	78.1	59,810

Table COM6 presents data on the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in Communication. If the number of students receiving bachelor's degrees is to remain fairly constant, then one would expect the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major to be at least twice as large as the number of bachelor's degree recipients. This is the case in Communication.

Table COM6: Number of Juniors and Seniors with Declared Major in Communication as of the Beginning of the Fall 2012 Term

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments	Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major
Primarily Undergraduate	204	51.0	10,410
Comprehensive	367	152.2	55,840
Primarily Research	195	353.5	68,940
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments	Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major
Bachelor's	468	91.7	42,920
Master's	212	240.9	51,070
Doctorate	86	479.1	41,200
TOTAL	766	176.5	135,190

These data are detailed in Table COM7 provides data on the number of students in each department completing a minor in Communication. During the 2011 – 2012 academic year, Communication departments awarded, on average, about 78 bachelor's degrees per department and had about 29 students per department earn a minor in the field.

Table COM7: Number of Students Completing a Minor in Communication

during the 2011-12 Academic Year

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments	Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor
Primarily Undergraduate	204	11.6	2,360
Comprehensive	367	16.7	6,120
Primarily Research	195	68.9	13,430
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments	Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor
Bachelor's	468	13.7	6,405
Master's	212	28.2	5,980
Doctorate	86	110.8	9,525
TOTAL	766	28.6	21,910

As shown in Table COM8, there were almost 14,000 graduate students enrolled in programs in Communication departments during the Fall 2012 term. Over half of these students were in departments that awarded a doctorate. There were 130 students enrolled in graduate programs in departments that offer only a bachelor's degree. It is likely that these students are in departments that had a graduate program at one time, and the department no longer awards graduate degrees. These departments have been allowed to retain currently enrolled graduate students.

Table COM8: Number of Graduate Students in Communication during Fall 2012 Term

Carnegie Classification	Number of Departments	Average Number of Graduate Students (per department that offers graduate degree)	Total Number of Graduate Students
Primarily Undergraduate	204	49.2	640
Comprehensive	367	37.4	4,380
Primarily Research	195	52.0	8,730
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Departments	Average Number of Graduate Students	Total Number of Graduate Students
Bachelor's*	468	0.3	130
Bachelor's* Master's	468 212	0.3 30.0	130 6,370

Overall, about 70% of the students enrolled in undergraduate introductory Communication courses are taught by a full-time faculty member, and 6% are taught by graduate students. These data are presented in Table COM9. The differences indicated by the asterisk (*) in the table means that the proportion of students taught by that rank faculty member in that type of department differs significantly from the other comparable types of department (either by Carnegie Classification, by highest degree offered, or by form of control). A student in a department housed in a Primarily Undergraduate institution (by Carnegie Classification) is more likely to be taught by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. The same is also true for a student in a department housed in a private institution.

It must again be noted that statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table COM9: Instructor of Record for Undergraduate Introductory Courses in Communication, Fall 2012 Term

		% of students	s taught by	
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non- Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
	By Carneg	ie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate	54%*	25%	19%	1%*
Comprehensive	43%	23%*	32%*	2%*
Primarily Research	40%	28%	18%	14%
	By Highest	Degree Offered		
Bachelor's	47%	25%	27%*	1%*
Master's	40%	28%*	24%*	8%*
Doctorate	45%	21%	13%	21%
	By Forr	n of Control		
Public	42%	26%	21%	10%
Private	47%*	24%	26%*	2%*
All Institutions	45%*	25%*	24%	6%

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table COM10 presents results for the instructor of record for all other (non-introductory) classes in Communication. Students in departments housed in Primarily Undergraduate institutions (Carnegie classification) are more likely to be taught by full-time faculty members than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. There is little difference by form of control.

Finally, Table COM11 summarizes the results for the instructor of record in graduate courses. There is very little difference for graduate courses. At private institutions, students are less likely to be taught by full-time faculty members and more likely to be taught by part-time faculty members.

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Table COM10: Instructor of Record for All Other Undergraduate (Non-Introductory) Courses in Communication. Fall 2012 Term

		% of students	s taught by	
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non- Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
	By Carneg	ie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate	66%*	21%	13%*	0%*
Comprehensive	59%	21%	20%*	0%*
Primarily Research	55%	23%	16%	6%
	By Highest	Degree Offered		
Bachelor's	62%	21%	16%*	1%*
Master's	57%	23%	19%*	1%*
Doctorate	57%	21%	12%	10%
	By Forr	n of Control		
Public	59%	22%	15%	4%
Private	61%	21%	17%	1%*
All Institutions	60%*	21%*	16%*	2%

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table COM11: Instructor of Record for All Graduate Courses in Communication. Fall 2012 Term

		% of students	s taught by	
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non- Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
	By Carneg	ie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate	81%	12%	7%	0%
Comprehensive	85%	9%	6%	0%
Primarily Research	85%	10%	6%	0%
	By Highest	Degree Offered		
Bachelor's	81%	13%*	5%	0%
Master's	83%	12%*	5%	0%
Doctorate	86%	7%	7%	0%
	By Forr	n of Control		
Public	87%	9%	5%	0%
Private	80%*	12%	8%*	0%
All Institutions	84%	10%	6%	0%

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table COM12 presents the results for the assessment of undergraduate student learning in Communication departments. Learning outcomes assessment is an aggregate assessment which attempts to measure the effectiveness of a program or institution by examining the competence of a given cohort of students. We did not ask about the assessment of individual students; we asked respondents to tell us whether or not they assessed undergraduate student learning.

^{*} indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level.

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Table COM12: Assessment of Overall Undergraduate Student Learning in Communication as of the Fall 2012 Term

		Carr	egie Classification	Form of	Control	
	All	Primarily		Primarily		
	Institutions	Undergraduate	Comprehensive	Research	Public	Private
No						
Departmental	6%	10%	0%	13%	6%	6%
Assessment						
Departmental						
Assessment	90%	88%	98%	77%	91%	89%
for All Majors						
Departmental						
Assessment						
for Majors in	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%
Honors						
Program Only						
Departmental						
Assessment						
for Some	8%	5%	8%	13%	5%	11%
Other Group						
of Students						

Note: The sum of the four rows in any column may exceed 100% because respondents could select multiple choices.

The "assessment" referenced is an aggregate assessment based on examining the results from a given cohort of students in an attempt to examine the effectiveness of a program.

For Communication, 71% of the department view publications as either essential or very important in tenure decisions; a similar proportion of all of the departments in the study view publications this way. The importance of teaching is about the same in Communication departments as it is in all other disciplines combined, and service is deemed slightly less important. The views of Communication departments on the importance of public humanities are also similar to that for all disciplines combined. Details for Communication departments are shown in Table COM13.

Table COM13: Considerations in Tenure Decisions in Communication, Fall 2012

2012			Vom		Manainally	
	4		Very		Marginally	
	CC*	Essential	Important	Important	Important	Unimportant
Publications (research, scholarship, and creative work)	All	46%	25%	16%	12%	1%
	PUG	18%	18%	34%	24%	5%
	Comp	44%	36%	10%	10%	0%
	PRes	80%	10%	6%	4%	0%
Teaching	All	84%	10%	6%	0%	0%
	PUG	92%	5%	3%	0%	0%
	Comp	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%
	PRes	49%	29%	22%	0%	0%
Service to the department or institution	All	41%	29%	26%	4%	0%
	PUG	42%	34%	21%	3%	0%
	Comp	54%	33%	13%	0%	0%
	PRes	16%	16%	55%	12%	2%
Public humanities (making the humanities and/or humanities scholarship accessible to the general public)	All	2%	9%	32%	37%	19%
	PUG	0%	11%	34%	39%	16%
	Comp	3%	10%	36%	33%	18%
	PRes	4%	6%	22%	43%	25%

^{*}CC – Carnegie classification and PUG – Primarily Undergraduate, Comp – Comprehensive, & PRes – Primarily Research

Table COM14: Faculty Tenure Decisions and New Hires

	Number*	Relative to
Tenured Faculty Members as of Fall 2012	4,590	35% of total faculty members
Tenure-Track Faculty Members (not yet tenured) as of Fall 2012	2,000	15% of total faculty members
Tenure-Track Faculty Members Granted Tenure per Year (Two- Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12	165 per year	8% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members
Faculty Members Denied Tenure or Leaving Prior to Tenure Decision per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12	55 per year	3% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members
Tenured, Tenure-Track and Permanent Faculty Members Hired for 2012-13	700	8% of full-time faculty members

Table COM14 provides data on faculty tenure decisions and new hires in Communication departments.

About six Communication departments in seven (or the institutions in which they are housed) provide support for research for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members; this is comparable to all disciplines combined. It appears that the proportion of full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members in Communication departments receiving research support is also comparable to all disciplines combined. About one part-time faculty member in six receives this support; this could be lower than for all disciplines combined. The data are presented in Table COM15.

Table COM15: Availability of Institutional or Departmental Support for Research, Fall 2012

	% of Institutions or	
	Departments Providing Support	
For Full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty members	86%	
For full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members	67%	
For part-time faculty members	17%	

When looking at all disciplines, about one department in three (33%) offers a fully online course, and about one in five (19%) offers a hybrid course. Communication departments appear to be more likely to offer either type of course. At the departments where these courses are offered, it appears that there are more fully online or hybrid courses offered than for all the disciplines combined. The details are shown in Table COM16.

Table COM16: Communication Departments Offering Online Courses by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control, 2011-12 Academic Year

	Departments Offering Fully Online Courses	Average Number of Fully Online Courses Offered	Departments Offering Hybrid Courses	Average Number of Hybrid Courses Offered
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	21%	7.5	21%	6.0
Comprehensive	55%	13.4	32%	4.9
Primarily Research	45%	8.9	24%	6.4
By Form of Control				
Public	66%	5.8	43%	5.9
Private	25%	22.9	14%	4.4
All Institutions	43%	15.4	27%	5.1

Communication departments could be more likely than all disciplines combined to offer a seminar focusing on digital methods for research and teaching. The proportion of Communication departments with formal guidelines for evaluating digital publications for tenure and promotion is comparable to that for all disciplines combined. These results are summarized in Table COM17.

Table COM17: Engagement with Digital Humanities by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control as of Fall 2012

	Offered Seminar Focusing on Digital Methods for Research and Teaching	Have Formal Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Publications for Tenure and Promotion		
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	16%	8%		
Comprehensive	33%	6%		
Primarily Research	27%	16%		
By Form of Control				
Public	23%	13%		
Private	31%	7%		
All Institutions	27%	9%		