Fall 10-15-2011

Student Perceptions of Public Relations and Journalism: A Pilot Study of Attitude Shifts Through Curriculum Innovation

Bernard R. McCoy
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, bmccoy2@unl.edu

Jerry Renaud
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, jrenaud1@unl.edu

Adam Wagler
University of Nebraska at Lincoln, adamwagler@unl.edu

Amy Struthers
University of Nebraska - Lincoln, astruthers2@unl.edu

John Baker
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Student Perceptions of Public Relations and Journalism:

A Pilot Study of Attitude Shifts through Curriculum Innovation

Bernard McCoy
Associate Professor
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jerry Renaud
Professor
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Adam Wagler
Lecturer
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Amy Struthers
Associate Professor
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

John Baker
Graduate Assistant
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Abstract

Journalism and public relations have had a long and often contentious relationship. It is rare when journalists and advertising/PR specialists work well together in the real world. It is equally rare when advertising, public relations and journalism students work together as part of their classroom education. This mixed methods pilot study explored the perceptions journalism and public relations majors had about each other's professions. The experimental group was comprised of 40 journalism and public relations majors who worked together covering a national event in an experimental college class. The control group included 68 students who participated in a more traditional college class required of all journalism and public relations majors. A survey was completed by both groups. Results indicated that students who participated in the experimental class differed in their perceptions of public relations and journalism practitioners compared with students who participated in the control class.

Student Perceptions of Public Relations and Journalism:
A Pilot Study of Attitude Shifts through Curriculum Innovation

Journalism and public relations have had a long and often contentious relationship. Much of that disharmony comes from the major difference in how the two groups serve their constituencies. Journalists write stories to inform a general audience. Public Relations practitioners provide information to particular audiences on behalf of their clients. Both groups use similar techniques, but their responsibilities, objectives, and the way they frame information can be quite different. In describing the journalism/PR relationship, Falconi (2007) noted "Simply put, there is mutual dependence, but also mutual caution and that doesn't lead to a trusting atmosphere."

On the higher education side, journalism and public relations/advertising studies have also traditionally remained separate. Joe Foote, dean of the college of journalism at the University of Oklahoma, notes that journalism was the "lead dog" for years in college mass communications programs (personal communication, March 10, 2011). After World War II, when public relations and advertising came into the picture, Foote said, most American mass communications programs were already entrenched in their leadership and objectives. This resulted in a diminished presence for PR and advertising.

Bovet (1992) claimed most journalism schools tolerate public relations because PR students have become "cash cows" for the schools in which they study. Cline (1982) argued that some negative attitudes journalism faculty had regarding public relations came from the educational process, more specifically, undergraduate textbooks that journalists read. Rosenberg (1998) noted the University of Maryland's College of Journalism decision to phase out its advertising program and do away with public relations in a budget-cutting move. "A

journalist's mission is to tell the truth," College of Journalism Dean Reese Cleghorn told the *New York Times.* "It's not to sell something, it's not to sell people on something- it's to find out and disseminate the truth in a responsible manner," he said.

Shaw and White (2004) found that, recently, journalism educators displayed more agreement with positive statements about public relations than past literature or anecdotal evidence would suggest. They concluded: "It is important to identify and address why misperceptions exist, and to look for ways to build on agreement."

Research by Supa & Zoch (2009) suggest integrated experiences in higher education be explored for journalism and advertising/PR students to gain a better understanding of each other's disciplines. It may instill a greater respect and awareness in students of the two professions. In the work world, a greater degree of awareness and respect between journalists and PR practitioners may also provide opportunities for greater trust in their professional relationships.

The purpose of this pilot study is to examine the relationships between the two professions in a higher education setting by comparing journalism and advertising/PR students who took part in an integrated classroom with student counterparts who did not have a similar collaborative experience. The researchers explored student attitudes toward the journalism and advertising/PR professions in an effort to evaluate the impact of collaborative learning experiences.

Literature Review

Perceptional differences and working relationships between journalists and PR/Advertising professionals date back decades (Supa & Zoch, 2009; DeLorme &Fedler, 2003; Kopenhaver, 1984). Grunig (2007) reviewed 150 research studies, published over the last four

decades, in which journalists described an antagonistic yet conflicted stance towards public relations.

Voros and Alvarez (1981) compared the relationship between public relations practitioners and journalists with the game of baseball: "On the field of play, there's an adversary relationship that must be understood. The 'hardball' nature of both endeavors is evident from time to time, and both are governed by rules – written and unwritten – and tradition…Calls of 'foul' and 'fair' are subjective, and knowing how to win and lose gracefully means a lot to the reputation of the 'team'" (Voros and Alvarez, 1981, p. 41.)

Grunig and Hunt (1984) described the early 20th century practice of large corporations and government agencies hiring journalists as PR practitioners. These organizations realized they needed experienced journalists more than press agents to counter the attacks of muckraking journalists.

After World War I, PR became a more formalized profession. Discourse between journalists and PR practitioners became increasingly antagonistic. DeLorme and Fedler (2003) noted that many newspapers waged a campaign against so-called "space grabbers" because journalists feared publicists "efforts to obtain free publicity" would reduce the newspapers' advertising revenue (DeLorme and Fedler, 2003, p. 100.) Other studies show this "mistrust" of information continues to be prevalent on both sides. Kopenhaver, (1985) drew from a 1984 study that found the news values of PR practitioners and journalists were similar, but that journalists viewed public relations practitioners as obstructionists who sought to gain publicity. Sallot (1990) argued that because journalists do not value public relations practitioners' perceptions of what can be considered news, they do not in turn assign the practitioners much credibility.

Cameron, Sallot, and Curtin (1997) conclude that there is much room for improvement in media relations practices. They suggest more research and employing diverse methods would greatly enrich the practice of media relations and the body of knowledge surrounding public relations.

Supa and Zoch (2009) noted little change in the relationship between public relations practitioners and journalists over the past 23 years. The authors said it was perhaps the most surprising conclusion of their study given the advances in education and technology. "In an era when people are more closely connected through technological innovation, it seems as though the relationship between public relations practitioners and journalists has remained static. This is, and will remain a problem for both groups until they each make the effort to better understand the other's role."

Tilley and Hollings (2008) reported on the results of a qualitative survey that asked New Zealand journalists their thoughts on public relations. Positive survey comments generally "focused on utility, seeing public relations as a crucial, perhaps even misunderstood, function in society, assisting journalists with story ideas, access to interviewees, background facts, and statistics." The survey's negative comments were centered more on morality views: "In the most judgmental of the negative comments, PR was simply considered wholly wrong, with invective such as "evil," "loathsome," "pernicious," and "peopled by sell-out scum" common forms of response in this category." The authors concluded that while their findings were nothing new, what was interesting is this long-held stance endures while many other aspects of the media landscape are changing.

Despite the trust issues they frequently have with each other, several studies indicate journalists and PR specialists have always depended on each other. Gibson (1987) noted that the

founding fathers of public relations were journalism graduates. Monck (2007) notes that when researchers analyzed a day's output at *The New York Times* in 1926, they found 147 out of 255 stories came from public relations releases. The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism conducted a study (2010) that examined 53 news outlets in Baltimore, Md. It found 83 percent of the "news" stories studied simply repeated or repackaged previously published information, including official press releases. In March 2010, the Australian news analysis and commentary web site *Crikey* and the Australian Centre for Independent Journalism found nearly 55 percent of stories analyzed were driven by some form of public relations.

Job reductions and altered work flow for journalists over the past 20 years may have increased their reliance on PR practitioners for the content they produce. Williams and Franklin (2007) examined reporting staff reductions at two United Kingdom newspapers. They found that journalists who kept their newspaper jobs increasingly relied on rewritten press releases issued by local governments, public and private sector lobbying organizations, or press agencies for stories they produced.

Delung (2008) wrote that the symbiosis between the two professions increases daily. "The time to research and do in-depth, enterprising reporting unfortunately isn't granted to many journalists anymore," wrote Delung. "So, reporters turn to PR practitioners for story pitches, news releases, packaged quotes and quick answers to their questions."

The dichotomy of the two professions continues to bewilder researchers. As the journalism and PR professions evolve there is recognition by both sides that a better understanding needs to exist so these groups can work more efficiently together. Supa & Zoch (2009) said education is one potential solution to discrepancies in the relationship. "This would

need to start in higher education, where students from both public relations and journalism should be required to learn about and experience the other field**."**

Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this mixed methods pilot study was to explore the attitudes journalism and public relations majors have about each other's professions. The study sought to compare journalism and public relations students who participated in an intensive, immersive college class, in which all worked together to cover an event, to journalism/PR students who participated in a traditional required course for all majors.

Research Question: Will the pairing of public relations and journalism students in cross-disciplinary collaborative classes that involve working side-by-side to cover real world events change students' perceptions of each other's professions?

Methodology

In the summer of 2010, faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln developed a multi-media curriculum for a class built around reporting and promotion for the 2010 Special Olympics USA National Games. The class involved an almost equal mix of public relations and journalism students. Students created more than 300 video reports and 3,000 photographs for a Special Olympics Summer Games website that covered 13 sports event venues. The website drew more than 34,000 visits from all 50 U.S. states and 106 countries. Students used social media such as Twitter, Facebook and Foursquare to reach their domestic and international audience. These activities were prepared with the goal of having journalism and PR students and faculty work together to gain an appreciation of each other's skill sets and to facilitate a collaborative experience.

Provoked by the course development, a literature review into mutual perceptions of journalists and public relations practitioners revealed a potential education gap for future media professionals. This launched a research agenda focused on studying the effects of this mixed class on student attitudes about the professions.

A mixed methods research design was used for this study. In using this design, the strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative methods are brought together, providing a richer understanding of the issues in a research project. This study utilized a qualitative approach initially, to help frame the second, quantitative phase.

Qualitative comments by students were gathered by the researchers on the last day of the class through videotaped interviews. The interview, developed by the researchers, asked students a list of questions to which they were asked to respond on camera. These interviews were analyzed to identify themes and to help shape the quantitative phase that followed.

Quantitative data was gathered through a survey. An 11-statement instrument using a five point Likert scale to measure responses for each statement was developed. The survey drew on previous studies that explored the journalist/public relations practitioner relationship in the workplace (Kopenhaver et al., 1984). Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to administration of the survey. An informed consent form was attached as the cover page of each survey.

The sample included two groups. The experimental group was made up of journalism and PR students who participated in the collaborative class, who were 19 years of age or older, and who chose to complete the survey (n = 40). This group was recruited through email and personal contact during fall 2010, several weeks after the collaborative class ended.

The control group was made up of a convenience sample of journalism and PR students at the same institution and in the same degree program. Control group students had not participated in the experimental class and were enrolled in a traditional media law class required of all majors in the college (n = 68). This group was recruited during class time, with students given the option to complete the survey or not.

Surveys were kept anonymous by removing the cover page and the informed consent form, and filing this separately from the survey. Surveys from members of the experimental group were identified with an "SO" in the corner of the survey in order to compile data for the two samples independently.

Data was entered into SPSS software and results examined for statistically significant differences between control and experimental group responses via Pearson's chi-square tests. Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center consultant Michael Zweifel and Michigan State University researcher Dr. Charles Atkin reviewed quantitative survey responses. University of Nebraska-Lincoln researcher Dr. John Creswell advised on the use of qualitative findings in this pilot study.

Findings

Qualitative Themes

Qualitative student comments were gathered on the last day of the experimental group's class. An analysis of the recorded interviews indicated three themes:

1. Changed perceptions - Students mentioned that working together was unique and helped change their perceptions of the other's profession. "Everyone at the same time, trying to get these stories out," commented one journalism student, "was a considered effort from both sides."

2. Improved understanding of each other's professions - Many PR and journalism students said they learned quite a bit about the responsibilities and roles of each other's professions. "It's a greater knowledge for us that benefits us when we get jobs in the future because we've seen advertising and PR do stuff," said one journalism student. An advertising student added, "It taught me a lot, not just with journalism and advertising, but also with everything that goes behind the scenes."
3. Respect for the other profession - Many PR and journalism students said they gained respect for each other's professions. "I didn't know before that there were so many aspects in journalism and it really did take about 50 of us to get everything covered," commented one advertising/PR student. "It was like a real world experience," noted a journalism student, who added, "We all kind of like got tossed into it together. So we had a good bonding experience."

Quantitative Data

The instrument used to collect quantitative data included 11 statements that respondents ranked on a five point Likert scale. The following results were obtained for each question.

Statement 1: Public relations practitioners and journalists should work hand-in-hand to inform the public.

The majority of respondents agreed with the premise of the survey question, but a larger percentage of experimental group respondent (Control group = 67.6%, Experimental group = 85%.) agreed with the question's premise. There was a similar difference in group responses for "Disagree" (Control group = 20.6%, Experimental group = 5%.)

Statement 2: There is no content difference between a news release by a public relations practitioner and an original news story by a journalist.

There was little difference in how the two groups answered this question. The majority of respondents disagreed with the premise of the survey question (Control group = 82.4%, Experimental group = 80%.) Responses for "Undecided" (Control group = 13.2%, Experimental group = 15%) and "Agree" (Control group = 4.4%, Experimental group = 5%) were also similar.

Statement 3: Public relations practitioners use unfair and inaccurate information in trying to get a story in the media.

The experimental group disagreed with this statement more strongly than the control group. The majority of respondents in both groups disagreed with the premise of the survey statement (Control group = 58.8%, Experimental group = 77.59%.) Responses for "Agree" (Control group = 17.6%, Experimental group = 7.5%) were also similar.

Statement 4: Journalists use unfair or inaccurate information in trying to get a story in the media.

The majority of respondents disagreed with the premise of the survey question (Control group = 76.5%, Experimental group = 87.5%.)

Statement 5: The public has respect for the public relations profession.

There is a statistically significant (Chi-square value = .029) split between control and experimental respondents with the premise of this statement. Responses for "Undecided" (Control group = 27.9%, Experimental group = 52.5 %) reflect a large percentage difference between the two respondent groups. More respondents in the control group (Control group = 45.6%, Experimental group = 35%) indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with the premise of the question than those in the experimental group. More respondents in the

control group (Control group = 26.5%, Experimental group = 12.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the premise of the question than the experimental group.

Statement 6: The public has respect for the journalism profession.

There is a statistically significant (Chi-square value = .043) difference between the control and experimental responses for the premise of this statement. Responses for "Undecided" (Control group = 23.5%, Experimental group = 45 %) reflect a large difference between the two respondent groups. More respondents in the control group (Control group = 50%, Experimental group = 42.5%) indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with the premise of the question than those in the experimental group. More respondents in the control group (Control group = 26.5%, Experimental group = 12.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the premise of the question than the experimental group.

Statement 7: Journalism faculty value the work of public relations practitioners

The majority of respondents agreed with the premise of the survey question (Control group = 58.8%, Experimental group = 72.5 %.) We note that a higher percentage of the experimental respondents agreed with the premise of the question, and that twice the percentage of control respondents are undecided on this statement (Control group = 30.9%, Experimental group = 15%) than their experimental counterparts.

Statement 8: Public relations faculty value the work of journalists.

The majority of respondents agreed with the premise of the survey question (Control group = 64.7%, Experimental group = 82.5%.) We note that a higher percentage of the experimental respondents agreed with the premise of the question, and that twice the percentage of control respondents are undecided on this statement (Control group = 30.9%, Experimental group = 15%) than their experimental counterparts.

Statement 9: Journalists and public relations practitioners share common values in deciding what makes a story or event newsworthy.

There is a statistically significant (Chi-square value = .005) split between control and experimental respondents with the premise of this statement. More than two-thirds of respondents in the experimental group agreed with the above statement compared to just over forty percent of the control group (Control group = 42.6%, Experimental group = 67.5%.) Likewise, a greater percentage in the control group disagreed with the statement's premise compared to the experimental group (Control group = 42.6%, Experimental group = 12.5%.)

Statement 10: Trust is the most important factor when journalists and public relations practitioners are working together.

There is a no statistically significant difference between control and experiment respondents for this statement (Control group = 75%, Experimental group = 90%.) Responses for "Undecided" (Control group = 2.5%, Experimental group = 14.7%) reflect a large percentage difference between the two respondent groups. Disagreement is almost identical (Control group = 10.3%, Experimental group = 7.5%.)

Statement 11: Journalists and public relations practitioners are professions that are equal in status.

There is a statistically significant split between the two respondent groups for the premise of this statement (Chi-square value = .001.) The percentage of students in the two response groups who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement was vastly different (Control group = 19.1%, Experimental group = 42.5%.) This was also the case for the percentage of respondents in the two groups who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (Control = 57.4%, Experimental group = 22.5%.)

Quantitative Data: Statistically Significant Results

The results of questions 5, 6, 9 and 11 reveal a statistically significant difference between the responses of the experimental group of journalism and public relations students versus the control group of journalism and public relations students.

Discussion

Survey results confirmed interview themes indicating attitudinal differences between the advertising/PR and journalism students who worked together in the experimental group compared to students in the control group. Experimental group responses as a whole (Statements 1,3,4,7,8,9,10,11) reflected greater respect, more agreement on common values, and shared status for journalism and public relations practitioners than the control group responses.

Interestingly, "Undecided" responses in statement 5 (Control group = 27.9%, Experimental group = 52.5%), and statement 6 (Control group = 23.5%, Experimental group = 45 %.), reveal nearly a 2-to-1 ratio of "Undecided" responses between the experimental group versus the control group on the public's respect for the journalism and PR professions. In these two statements there was actually a greater "Agree" response by the control group for the public's respect for the journalism and PR professions than the experimental group, as seen in responses to statements 5 and 6. . This may be the result of the experimental group's opportunity to think about and consider the roles of the two professions in the public sphere; the class allowed extensive practice of the professions, including interaction with the public, as well as much conversation between the journalism and PR students.

Researchers believe more collaborative classes, like the experimental group students participated in, may improve trust, respect, understanding and working relationships between public relations and journalism practitioners.

Researchers also believe it would more effective to create questions using a co-orientation methodology. This more robust measurement would do two things: On an intrapersonal level it would gauge what students think in their own mind about an issue; on an interpersonal level it would measure what students believe other students think about the same issue.

Researchers believe three other factors bear further study because they may redefine the journalism/PR relationship:

First, job reductions over the past 20 years have dramatically altered work flow for journalists and increased their reliance on PR practitioners for the content they produce. The Pew Research Center (2011) found that U.S. newspapers alone lost close to a third of its editorial ranks in the previous decade, and 11,000 in just three years.

Second, anyone with an Internet connection can create and globally distribute his or her own messages. Smith (2008) notes the emerging role that individuals play in message creation and placement, adding "Any further discussion on the interplay of PR and journalism should dedicate considerable attention to consumer-generated media and its role in redefining information management and dissemination."

Third, consolidation and convergence have changed the journalism/PR job ratio and thus the relationship between the two professions. The U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010) estimates that employment of news analysts, reporters, and correspondents will decline 6 percent between 2008 and 2018. Conversely, public relations jobs will grow an estimated 24 percent. In 2008, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated there were four PR practitioners for every journalist. By 2018, the Bureau estimates the PR/journalism ratio will be 5.25 to 1. College level programs in these two disciplines have the opportunity and perhaps even

the obligation to help their students, future practitioners, understand and appreciate each other. Intensive, immersive work together in classes affords time to interact and reflect on each profession.

Based on the survey findings, researchers believe future research should focus on attitudinal shifts involving three survey areas of statistical significance: respect, common values and status within the PR and journalism relationship. Researchers hope to create larger quantitative and qualitative samples by surveying students who participate in new courses that give PR and journalism students similar experiences as the pilot study's experimental group. Researchers would conduct pre and post tests to better measure for attitudinal shifts in experimental class participants versus students in traditional classes. Researchers might survey other institutions to see what their experiences have been teaching collaborative courses involving journalism and PR majors or involving resource reallocations that may better fit the representative interests of PR and journalism students.

References

Australian Centre for Independent Journalism & *Crikey* (2010). Over half your news is spin. http://www.crikey.com.au/2010/03/15/over-half-your-news-is-spin. Retrieved January 11, 2011.

Bovet, S. L. (1992). Educators need to communicate better on and off campus. *Public Relations Journal*, 48(September), 14-17.

Cameron, G.T., Sallot, L.M., & Curtin, P.A. (1997). Public relations and the production of news. *Communication Yearbook, 20*, 111-155. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cline, C. (1982). The image of public relations in mass communications texts. *Public Relations Review*, 58(8), 63-78.

DeLorme, D.E., & Fedler, F. (2003). Journalists' hostility toward public relations: A historical analysis. *Public Relations Review, 29*(2), 99-124.

DeLung, J. (2008) Journalism vs. Public Relations Writing, Ethics, *Relatively Journalizing* http://joshuadelung.blogspot.com/2008/07/journalism-vs-public-relations-writing.html. Retrieved October 10, 2010.

Falconi, T. (2007) Anne Gregory on relationships between public relations and journalism, *PR Conversations.* http://www.prconversations.com/index.php/2007/06/anne-gregory-on-relationships-between-public-relations-and-journalism. Retrieved, February 3, 2011. (blog)

Gibson., D. C. (1987). Public relations education in a time of change. *Public Relations Quarterly, 32(3),* 25-3 1.

Grunig, J.E, & Hunt, T (1984). *Managing Public Relations.* New York, NY: Holt: Rinehart Winston

Grunig, J. (2007). Journalism and public relations in the United States. In Merkel, B., Russ-Mohl, S., & Zavaritt, G. (Eds.), *A complicated, antagonistic and symbiotic affair: Journalism, public relations and their struggle for public attention* (pp. 101-114). Lugano, Switzerland: European Journalism Observatory.

Kopenhaver, L.L. (1985). Aligning values of practitioners and journalists. *Public Relations Review, 11,* 34-42.

Kopenhaver, L.L., Martinson, D.L., & Ryan, M. (1984). How public relations practitioners and editors in Florida view each other. *Journalism Quarterly, 61,* 860-865, 884.

Monck, A. (2007) PR vs. Journalism. *Adrian Monck; A blog about news.* http://adrianmonck.com/2007/03/pr-vs-journalism. Retrieved, January 15, 2011. (blog)

Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism (2010) *How News Happens; A study of the news ecosystem of one American city.* http://www.journalism.org/analysis_report/how_news_happens. Retrieved, November 22, 2010.

Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism (2011) *The State of the News Media 2011, Key Findings.* http://stateofthemedia.org. Retrieved, March 21, 2011.

Rosenberg, M. (1998) Media: Finding a Home for Public Relations, *The New York Times. Business Day.* Nov. 9, 1998.

Sallot, L. M. (1990). Public relations and mass media: How professionals in the fields in Miami and New York view public relations effects on mass media, themselves, and each other. *Paper presented at Association for Educators in Journalism & Mass Communication,* Minneapolis, MN, August.

Shaw, T., & White, C. (2004). Public Relations and journalism educators' perceptions of media relations. *Public Relations Review. 30,* 493-502.

Shin, J. & Cameron, G. (2005) Different Sides of the Same Coin: Mixed Views of Public Relations Practitioners and Journalists for Strategic Conflict Management. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. *82*(2), 318-338.

Smith, B. (2008) Review: A Complicated, Antagonistic, Symbiotic Affair: Journalism, Public Relations and Their Struggle for Public Attention. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Winter*.

Supa, D. & Zoch, L. (2009), Maximizing Media Relations Through a Better Understanding of the Public Relations-Journalist Relationship: A Quantitative Analysis of Changes Over the Past 23 years. *Public Relations Journal, 3*(4).

Tilley, E & Hollings, J. (2008). Power and Place: Still stuck in "A love-hate relationship": Understanding journalists' enduring and impassioned duality towards public relations. *Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference*, Wellington, New Zealand, July.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010-11) Occupational Outlook Handbook. *U.S. Department of Labor*. http://www.bls.gov/oco. Retrieved January 15, 2011.

Voros, G.J., & Alvarez, P.H. (1981). *What Happens in public relations*. New York, NY: Amacom.

Williams, A. & Franklin, B. (2007) Turning Around the Tanker: Implementing Trinity Mirror's Online Strategy. *The School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies*, Cardiff University, 16.

November 2010
CoJMC Survey

Directions: **Please circle the response below each statement that reflects your opinion.**

(Example: ***Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree*****)**

1. **Public relations practitioners and journalists should work hand-in-hand to inform the public.**

   Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

2. **There is no content difference between a news release by a public relations practitioner and an original news story by a journalist.**

   Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

3. **Public relations practitioners use unfair or inaccurate information in trying to get a story in the media.**

   Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

4. **Journalists use unfair or inaccurate information in reporting stories to the public.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

5. **The public has respect for the public relations profession.**

   Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

   (Over please)

6. **The public has respect for the journalism profession.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

7. **Journalism faculty value the work of public relations practitioners.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

8. **Public relations faculty value the work of journalists.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

9. **Journalists and public relations practitioners share common values in deciding what makes a story or even newsworthy.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

10. **Trust is the most important factor when journalists and public relations practitioners are working together.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

11. **Journalists and public relations are professions that are equal in status.**

Strongly Agree----Agree----Undecided----Disagree----Strongly Disagree

1. Public Relations practitioners and journalists should work hand in hand to inform the public.

Crosstab

			Public Relations practitioners and journalists should work hand in hand to inform the public			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	34	4	2	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	85.0%	10.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	control class	Count	46	8	14	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	67.6%	11.8%	20.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	80	12	16	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	74.1%	11.1%	14.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.225[a]	2	.073
Likelihood Ratio	5.947	2	.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.035	1	.025
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.44.

2. There is no content difference between a news release by a public relations practitioner and an original news story by a journalist.

Crosstab

			There is no content difference between a news release by a public relations practitioner and an original news story by a journalist.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	2	6	32	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	5.0%	15.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	control class	Count	3	9	56	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	4.4%	13.2%	82.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	15	88	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	4.6%	13.9%	81.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.092[a]	2	.955
Likelihood Ratio	.092	2	.955
Linear-by-Linear Association	.080	1	.778
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.85.

3. Public relations practitioners use unfair or inaccurate information in trying to get a story in the media.

Crosstab

			Public relations practitioners use unfair or inaccurate information in trying to get a story in the media.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	3	6	31	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	7.5%	15.0%	77.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	12	16	40	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	17.6%	23.5%	58.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	15	22	71	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	13.9%	20.4%	65.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.103[a]	2	.129
Likelihood Ratio	4.300	2	.116
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.930	1	.047
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.56.

4. Journalists use unfair or inaccurate information in reporting stories to the public.

Crosstab

			Journalists use unfair or inaccurate information in reporting stories to the public.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	2	3	35	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	5.0%	7.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	6	10	52	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	8.8%	14.7%	76.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	8	13	87	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	7.4%	12.0%	80.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.964[a]	2	.375
Likelihood Ratio	2.070	2	.355
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.598	1	.206
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.96.

5. The public has respect for the public relations profession.

Crosstab

			The public has respect for the public relations profession.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	14	21	5	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	35.0%	52.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	31	19	18	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	45.6%	27.9%	26.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	45	40	23	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	41.7%	37.0%	21.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.087[a]	2	.029
Likelihood Ratio	7.141	2	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	.049	1	.826
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.52.

6. The public has respect for the journalism.

Crosstab

			The public has respect for the journalism profession.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	17	18	5	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	42.5%	45.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	34	16	18	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	50.0%	23.5%	26.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	51	34	23	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	47.2%	31.5%	21.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.296[a]	2	.043
Likelihood Ratio	6.351	2	.042
Linear-by-Linear Association	.169	1	.681
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.52.

7. Journalism faculty value the work of public relations practitioners.

Crosstab

			Journalism faculty value the work of public relations practitioners.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	29	6	5	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	72.5%	15.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	40	21	7	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	58.8%	30.9%	10.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	69	27	12	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	63.9%	25.0%	11.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.389[a]	2	.184
Likelihood Ratio	3.579	2	.167
Linear-by-Linear Association	.696	1	.404
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.44.

8. Public relations faculty value the work of journalists.

Crosstab

			Public relations faculty value the work of journalists.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	33	6	1	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	82.5%	15.0%	2.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	44	21	3	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	64.7%	30.9%	4.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	77	27	4	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	71.3%	25.0%	3.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.908[a]	2	.142
Likelihood Ratio	4.106	2	.128
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.306	1	.069
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.48.

9. Journalists and public relations practitioners share common values in deciding what makes a story or event newsworthy.

Crosstab

			Journalists and public relations practitioners share common values in deciding what makes a story or event newsworthy.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	27	8	5	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	67.5%	20.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	29	10	29	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	42.6%	14.7%	42.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	56	18	34	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	51.9%	16.7%	31.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.694[a]	2	.005
Likelihood Ratio	11.690	2	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.532	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.67.

10. Trust is the most important factor when journalists and public relations practitioners are working together.

Crosstab

			Trust is the most important factor when journalists and public relations practitioners are working together.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	36	1	3	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	90.0%	2.5%	7.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	51	10	7	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	75.0%	14.7%	10.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	87	11	10	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	80.6%	10.2%	9.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.600[a]	2	.100
Likelihood Ratio	5.449	2	.066
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.027	1	.155
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.70.

11. Journalists and public relations are professions that are equal in status.

Crosstab

			Journalists and public relations are professions that are equal in status.			
			Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Which class was surveyed	Special Olympics	Count	17	14	9	40
		% within Which class was surveyed	42.5%	35.0%	22.5%	100.0%
	control class	Count	13	16	39	68
		% within Which class was surveyed	19.1%	23.5%	57.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	30	30	48	108
		% within Which class was surveyed	27.8%	27.8%	44.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.033[a]	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	13.540	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.185	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	108		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.11.