

**Refereed Convention Paper Productivity in the Magazine Division of AEJMC
(1999-2008): Analysis of Benchmarks and Impact of Gender**

George W. Musambira
University of Central Florida
georgem@mail.ucf.edu

Abstract

All refereed convention papers sponsored by the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) in the period 1999-2008 were content analyzed. Benchmarks for both institutional and individual magazine research productivity were established within the framework of the Carnegie Classification System. A gender gap regarding both top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity was determined. While female authors dominated top paper productivity, male authors commanded regular paper productivity. A strong correlation between institutional top paper productivity and institutional regular paper productivity was identified though a weak link between individual top paper productivity and individual regular paper productivity was also found. Implications of these findings were discussed.

Introduction

A common ritual in academia is participation in annual conventions by scholars and practitioners. These meetings range from state through regional, national, to international. While many activities take place at these meetings, the presentation and discussion of competitively selected papers is one of the major communication activities in which participants engage. This study used refereed convention papers that were sponsored by the AEJMC Magazine Division to identify benchmarks for evaluating the productivity of academic institutions and individual scholars.

The study also examined how author gender impacts top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity to assess progress made by the Magazine Division towards gender parity in refereed paper productivity. Further, the study investigated the correlation between top paper productivity and regular paper productivity. Determination of a strong correlation between these two variables could lead to using top paper productivity as a proxy for all refereed paper productivity.

Analysis of scholarship in the Magazine Division is important because this division has been a pacesetter in the AEJMC organization regarding issues such as prolificacy of female scholars (Adams & Bodle, 1995). Thus focusing on this division provides a window into the more progressive side of the AEJMC organization.

The goals of this study were accomplished in four ways. First, research on convention papers as a measure of research productivity in communication studies, journalism and mass communication, and magazine scholarship in particular was reviewed. Second, methods used in the present study were described. Third, results from the study were presented. Fourth, results and areas of future research were discussed.

Literature Review

Before reviewing the extant scholarship on the convention paper as a unit of productivity, it will be examined in the context of communication studies and journalism and mass communication research. At a general level, some research in communication studies has implications for examining the convention paper as a unit of productivity in magazine scholarship.

Convention Papers as Unit of Research Productivity in Communication Studies

Research productivity as a line of scholarship in communication studies continues to grow (Bunz, 2005) and has emphasized units of productivity including articles, books, book chapters, and citations (Hickson, Hill, & Bodon, 1999). Little research in communication studies has focused on the convention paper as a unit of productivity. Some of this research (e.g., Hickson, Hill, & Fulmer, 1987) has recognized the importance of top convention papers and notes that these papers “might allow judgments of both [research productivity] quality and quantity” (p. 29). Adding to this rationale for emphasizing top convention papers as a measure of research productivity, other research (e.g., Musambira, 2000) posited that an award-winning top convention paper is likely to be valued more than a regular competitive or contributed paper in tenure and promotion decisions, and “schools are also likely to use such top convention papers won by their faculty and students for purposes of publicity and recruiting” (p. 284).

This research argues that since top convention papers are selected through a blind review process, they tend to be a more objective measure of an academic program’s or individual scholar’s productivity than a reputational study based on self-report questionnaires or peer ratings. One researcher (Musambira, 2000) then used top convention papers of both the International Communication Association (ICA) and National Communication Association (NCA) to analyze U.S. doctoral institutions’ research productivity from 1994 to 1998.

Other researchers (Emmert & Rollman, 1997; Rosenfeld, Stacks, & Hickson, 1990) argued that despite the relatively less important role convention papers play in influencing tenure and promotion decisions, these papers still matter. In fact, Rosenfeld et al. emphasized that “convention papers are not unimportant, they are simply less important than articles” (p. 179). Another way convention papers matter, according to these authors, is that they are linked to publication of research articles at a rate of two convention papers per one research article published by an individual. According to Hickson (2006), a refereed conference paper is usually a harbinger of a journal article. Moreover, the fact that both individuals and institutions invest considerable resources

(i.e., financial, expertise, time, and effort) into the preparation and presentation of convention papers makes it imperative to investigate the attendant productivity benchmarks.

Convention Papers and Research Productivity in Journalism and Mass Communication

The scarcity of research emphasizing the top convention paper is even more acute in journalism and mass communication research productivity scholarship. The top convention paper study mentioned above (Musambira, 2000) focused mainly on areas of speech communication and included only two specialties directly related to journalism and mass communication (i.e., public relations and mass communication).

Adams and Bodle (1995) and Applegate and Bodle (2005) are perhaps the only scholars who have systematically examined refereed convention papers across the various divisions, interest groups, and commissions of AEJMC. However, these scholars limited their analysis to the productivity of female authors across the various units of AEJMC. According to Adams and Bodle (1995), between 1987 and 1993 female authors garnered refereed convention paper productivity at a rate (41%) higher than their numeric representation in AEJMC (24%-28%). Ten years later, Applegate and Bodle (2005) found that between 1994 and 2003 women continued this trend of producing an amount of refereed convention research (42.9%) that exceeded their percentage of AEJMC membership (40%). These researchers posited that though refereed convention scholarship rates for women had not yet reached the 50% target set in 1989 by AEJMC, women managed to register a higher convention paper productivity per capita than men.

Despite these important findings, the foregoing research did not take into account the distinction between top convention papers and regular refereed papers. Such a distinction is important because it would present a more complete picture of female convention paper productivity as it compares with male convention paper productivity. At present, it is not clear whether the strong showing by female convention authors identified above applies to both top convention papers and regular refereed papers in a similar way.

Convention Papers and Scholarly Productivity in Magazine Research

With the exception of Adams and Bodle (1995) and Applegate and Bodle (2005) mentioned above, there has been limited focus on convention paper productivity in the journalism and mass communication specialty of magazine scholarship. According to Adams and Bodle (1995), between 1987 and 1993 female convention paper productivity in the magazine division (62.6%) was consistent with the general trend in AEJMC of exceeding both female membership in AEJMC (24%-28%) and female membership in the division itself (rate not specified by the authors).

Notably, Applegate and Bodle reported that the Magazine Division registered the highest rate of refereed convention paper productivity by women compared with all other divisions and the third highest increase in female refereed paper authors (10.14%) between the two periods they studied (1994-1998 and 1999-2003). Moreover, Applegate

and Bodle posited that the Magazine Division was fourth out of 15 divisions in having the highest level of gender inclusivity (defined as the percentage of female convention paper authorship in the division over the percentage of female membership in the division).

These findings led Adams and Bodle to conclude that compared with any other division in the AEJMC organization, female convention authors showed the highest level of interest and success in the Magazine Division. In fact, female authorship in this division had already exceeded the 50% target implied in a 1989 AEJMC resolution focusing on increased diversity in the organizational membership. Despite the value of the above research in tracking female convention paper productivity in the Magazine Division, failure to distinguish between top convention paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity has left four important gaps.

The first gap in the research involves lack of clarity as to whether the above findings regarding female convention productivity apply to both top convention papers and regular refereed papers. It is possible that women outperform men per capita when all refereed papers are counted, but this may not be the case when top convention papers and regular refereed papers are considered in isolation. Therefore, the first research question of this study is:

RQ1: What is the impact of author gender on convention paper productivity, when top papers and regular refereed papers that were sponsored by the AEJMC Magazine Division in the period 1999 to 2008 are isolated?

Lack of empirically established benchmarks for individual and institutional convention paper productivity is the second research gap. Such benchmarks could be used to gauge the performance of an institution or individual among peers. One tool for categorizing individual scholars or the institutions they represent is the latest Basic Carnegie Classification system (2005 version) because, unlike previous versions, it controls for differences among colleges and universities in the U.S. based on highest degree offered and a multiplicity of funding sources (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007). In fact, Morton and Beard (2005) used an older version of this classification system to investigate benchmarks of research productivity among faculty peers in AEJMC accredited institutions, although they did not specifically focus on convention paper productivity. The 2005 Carnegie Classification system used in this study is described further in the methods section. However, failure by previous researchers to investigate benchmarks of convention paper productivity in the advertising division using the Carnegie Classification prompted the second and third research questions:

RQ2: To what extent does the Carnegie Classification system account for patterns of AEJMC refereed paper productivity in the Magazine Division in the period 1999 to 2008?

RQ3: What are the means, medians, and modes for convention paper productivity of institutions and individual scholars in the AEJMC Magazine Division based on refereed AEJMC papers?

Third, given that convention paper research on magazines takes place in a context that also includes non U.S. academic, and non academic actors, it is not clear how much these actors contribute to refereed convention paper productivity. This led to the fourth research question:

RQ4: How much do non-academic institutions and non-U.S. academic institutions contribute to refereed AEJMC convention paper productivity in the AEJMC Magazine Division?

The fourth gap in the research is the lack of knowledge as to whether top convention paper productivity is linked to regular refereed paper productivity. Establishing that such a link exists is important because it can demonstrate the extent to which top convention paper productivity can be used as a proxy for measuring convention paper productivity as a whole. In order to investigate the existence of a link between the two types of convention paper productivity, a fifth research question was posited as:

RQ5: To what extent is top convention paper productivity linked to regular refereed paper productivity in the AEJMC Magazine Division in the period 1999 to 2008?

Methodology

Emulating a procedure used in previous research on top convention paper productivity (Musambira, 2000), the researcher and one other trained coder used annual AEJMC convention programs to independently isolate all top and regular refereed papers that were sponsored singly or jointly by the magazine division from 1999 to 2008. The coders then independently identified authors by name, institutional affiliations, and gender; and subsequently checked each other's work as a quality check.

A total of 24 U.S. colleges and universities had authors of a top paper compared with a total of 50 that had authors of a regular refereed paper. Due to 18 of these institutions having combined a top paper and a regular paper to their credit, 56 U.S. colleges and universities altogether had an author with a refereed paper in the Magazine Division. Only one non-U.S. university or college had an author of a top convention paper compared with five that had authors of a regular refereed paper. Non-academic institutions did not have a top paper but two such institutions had an author of a regular refereed paper. A total of 46 individuals authored a top paper compared with a total of 120 individuals credited with authoring a regular refereed paper. Because 11 of these individuals combined having a top paper and a regular refereed paper, 155 individuals altogether had a refereed paper in the Magazine Division.

Because the AEJMC organization does not publicize member personal data including gender (Applegate & Bodle, 2005), coders relied on name identification initially to determine author gender, and if it was not enough authors were Googled for photo identification or gendered pronouns in reference to them or their work. Alternatively, printed convention programs were scoured for photo identification. If this was still not sufficient, coders used the EBSCO research database for gendered pronouns used in reference to authors. In some cases, other Internet resources such as *ratemyprofessor.com* were used to track down relevant gender pronouns used to refer to a focal individual. As a result of this process, the gender of all the 44 individuals who authored top papers and gender of 117 (97.5%) individuals out of a total of 120 who submitted regular refereed papers was indentified. Therefore, only a small portion (1.67; 1.7%) of the total regular refereed paper productivity remained unaccounted for.

The coders also employed the Basic Carnegie Classification System (Carnegie Classification from now on) to categorize institutions represented by authors. For purposes of this study, only two of the six tiers of the Carnegie Classification were adopted because they were represented in the data unlike the excluded two tiers. Each tier is based on highest degree offered, and comprises different categories. The first tier includes doctorate-granting institutions which are sorted in terms of their level of research activity: research universities with a very high research activity level (RU/VH) which are by inference the most dominant in this tier; research universities with a high research activity level (RU/H) which by inference are next in dominance in this tier; and research doctoral universities (RDU) which are by inference the least dominant in this tier. The second tier involves master's colleges and universities which are divided into three categories based on number of masters degrees granted: Large (L) which by inference is the most dominant category in this tier; Medium (M) which by inference is next in dominance in this tier; and Small (S) which by inference is the least dominant in this tier.

In this study, a top paper was construed as one marked "top" in the convention program regardless of the ranking (e.g., top three or top four paper). The AEJMC Magazine Division grants separate top paper awards for faculty and students. A fractional system was used to determine credit due to each author or institutional affiliation by dividing 1 into the number authors as previous researchers (e.g., Applegate & Bodle, 2005).

Results

Like much of the previous research on convention paper productivity (e.g., Adams & Applegate, 2005; Adams & Bodle, 1995), this study content analyzed the population of refereed papers included in its time frame, which made statistical tests unnecessary. Instead simple frequencies or percentages and correlations without tests of statistical significance were computed to determine the results presented below.

In response to research question one, which investigated the impact of gender on AEJMC Magazine Division convention paper productivity, the results are presented at both the micro and macro levels. The micro level involved comparing the convention paper productivity of a given gender with the numeric representation of authors of that gender. The more a gender's paper productivity surpasses its numeric representation, the greater the gender's impact per capita on paper productivity.

Table 1 shows that at this level, indeed, a gender gap exists regarding both top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity. While top paper productivity for females was high (25.42; 65.18%) and in excess of their numeric representation (N=28; 60.87%) among authors of top convention papers, top paper productivity for males was much lower (13.58; 34.82%) well below their numeric representation (N=18; 39.13%) among top convention paper authors. However, in terms of regular refereed paper productivity the gender gap exists in reverse form. Specifically, female regular paper productivity (49; 51.95%) lagged behind female numeric representation (N= 67; 57.26%) in contrast to male regular paper productivity (45.33; 48.05%), which surpassed male numeric representation (N= 50; 42.74%).

| Gender | Top Paper Productivity | Regular Paper Productivity |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Male | 25.42 (65.18%) N = 28.00 (60.87%) | 49.00 (51.95%) N = 67.00 (57.26%) |
| Female | 13.58 (34.82%) N = 18.00 (39.13%) | 45.33 (48.05%) N = 50.00 (42.74%) |
| Total | 39.00 (100%) N = 46.00 (100%) | 94.33 (100%) N = 117 (100%) |
| Unknown gender | 00.0 N=0 | 01.67 N=3 |

When the productivity in the periods 1999 to 2003 and 2004 to 2008 was compared, the gender gap pattern did not seem to change. For top papers, female productivity stood high (12.25; 61.25%) and above female numeric representation (N= 14; 58.33%) in 1999-2003 compared with male productivity (7.75; 38.75%), which was below male numeric representation (N= 10; 41.67%). In the 2004 to 2008 period, female top paper productivity increased (13.17; 67.61%) and remained above female numeric representation (N= 17; 66.67%) unlike male productivity (5.83; 32.39%) that decreased and remained below male numeric representation (N= 8; 33.33%).

For regular refereed papers, female productivity (27.50; 48.5%) in 1999 to 2003 lagged behind female numeric representation (N= 36; 54.55%) in contrast to male productivity (28.17; 49.71%), which soared above male numeric representation (N= 30; 45%). In the period 2004 to 2008, the same pattern persisted: female regular paper

productivity (21.50; 55.6%) stood below female numeric representation (N= 33; 58.93%) unlike male productivity (17.17; 44.4%), which surpassed male numeric representation (N= 23; 41%).

The macro level involved examining convention paper productivity of a given gender over gender representation in the AEJMC Magazine Division. With regard to top convention productivity, women performed in an amount (25.42; 65.28%) that exceeded their numeric representation (50.76% as reported by Stephens, 2003) in the division in contrast to men who performed at a level (13.58; 34.82%) below their numeric representation in the division (49.24% according to Stephens). Regarding regular refereed conventional papers, female performance (49; 51.85%) exceeded female numeric membership in the division (50.76% as reported by Stephens), but not as much as male performance (45.33; 48.05%), which soared above male numeric membership (42.24% as reported by Stephens) by a larger margin.

In response to research question two which investigated how much the Carnegie Classification can explain patterns of AEJMC refereed paper productivity in the magazine division, Tables 2 presents results regarding institutional top convention paper productivity. Surprisingly, the RU/H category of universities (15; 39.47%) generated a higher amount of top convention paper productivity than RU/VH universities (14.50; 38.16%), which would be expected be dominant in scholarly productivity. RU/H universities not only grossed more top convention paper productivity than any other category of universities, they also outperformed them per capita (i.e., RU/H universities had the highest positive percentage difference between productivity and numeric representation).

| Classification | Top Paper Productivity | Median | Median | Mode |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| RU/VH | 14.50 (38.16%) N = 12.00 (50.00%) | 01.21 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| RU/H | 15.00 (39.47%) N = 05.00 (20.83%) | 03.00 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| DRU | 02.00 (05.26%) N = 02.00 (08.30%) | 01.00 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| L | 02.50 (06.58%) N = 02.00 (08.30%) | 01.25 | 01.25 | 02.00 & 00.50 |
| M | 04.00 (10.53%) N = 03.00 (12.50%) | 01.33 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| Total | 38.00 (100%) N = 24.00 (100%) | | | |

As expected, RU/VH universities (41; 46.07%) grossed more regular paper productivity than any other category of universities. However, RU/H universities (28.17; 31.65% productivity and N=13; 26% numeric representation) still unexpectedly outperformed RU/VH universities (41; 46.07% productivity and N=23; 46% numeric representation) per capita.

Research question three examined the means, medians, and modes for productivity of institutions and individual scholars in the AEJMC magazine division based on AEJMC refereed papers. Table 2 indicates the means, medians, and modes of top paper institutional productivity in the different Carnegie categories. Table 3 provides a list of all U.S. universities and colleges whose faculty or students had top convention papers in the Magazine Division in the period 1999 to 2008. The table is organized in terms of the Carnegie classifications relevant to this study.

| <i>Table 3</i> | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Institutional Top Convention Paper Productivity by Carnegie Classification</i> | | |
| Carnegie Classification | Top Paper Productivity | Rank |
| RU/VH Schools | | |
| Florida State | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| North Carolina-C.H. | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| Northwestern | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| Missouri-Columbia | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| Kansas | 01.00 | 05.00 |
| Arizona State | 01.00 | 05.00 |
| Texas-Austin | 01.00 | 05.00 |
| Minnesota | 01.00 | 05.00 |
| Louisiana State | 00.50 | 09.00 |
| Illinois-Urbana | 00.50 | 09.00 |
| Tennessee | 00.50 | 09.00 |
| RU/H Schools | | |
| Ohio-Athens | 09.00 | 01.00 |
| Temple | 03.00 | 02.00 |
| Brigham Young | 01.00 | 03.00 |
| Marquette | 01.00 | 03.00 |
| Oregon | 01.00 | 03.00 |
| DRU Schools | | |
| Ball State | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| Pepperdine | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| L Schools | | |
| Middle Tenn. State | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| Marist College | 00.50 | 02.00 |
| M Schools | | |

| | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|
| Trinity-San Antonio | 02.00 | 01.00 |
| Otterbein | 01.00 | 02.00 |
| Scranton | 01.00 | 02.00 |

Table 4 identifies the means, medians, and modes for individual top paper productivity also organized in terms of relevant Carnegie classifications.

| Table 4 Individual Top Convention Paper Productivity 1999-2008 by Carnegie Classification | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Classification | Top Paper Productivity | Median | Median | Mode |
| RU/VH | 14.50 (%) N = 23.00 (%) | 00.63 | 00.50 | 01.00 |
| RU/H | 15.00 (%) N = 13.00 (%) | 01.15 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| DRU | 02.00 (%) N = 02.00 (%) | 01.00 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| L | 02.50 () N = 06.00 (%) | 00.42 | 00.25 | 00.25 |
| M | 04.00 (10.53%) N = 03.00 (12.50%) | 01.00 | 01.00 | 01.00 |
| Total | 38.00 (100%) N = 48.00 (100%) | | | |

Table 5 lists 26 individuals who had at least one full point worth of top convention paper productivity in the period 1999 to 2008, as measured by this study.

| Table 5 Highest Ranking 26 Individuals in Top Convention Paper Productivity | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Author | Top Paper Productivity | Rank |

| | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|
| Kelly, Jean | 03.00 | 01.00 |
| Kitch, Carolyn | 03.00 | 01.00 |
| Marcellus, Jane | 02.00 | 03.00 |
| Bifano, Matthew | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Coyle, Erin | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Duke, Lisa | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Haygood, Daniel | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Kressin, Lindsey | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Marsh, Charles | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Mound, Josh | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Nio, Josephine | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Price, Joan | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Reavey, Matthew | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Rice, Alison | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Rodgers, Ronald | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Rudloff, Amanda | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Russ, Marianne | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Schwalbe, Carol | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Siff, Stephen | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Sivek, Susan Currie | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Sumner, David | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Thomsen, Steven | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Thornton, Jonathan | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Waters, Ken | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Webb, Sheila | 01.00 | 04.00 |
| Wu, Huaiting | 01.00 | 04.00 |

In response to research question four investigating the amount of refereed paper productivity generated by non-academic institutions and non-U.S. academic institutions, it was found that non-U.S. academic institutions had little impact on paper productivity. However, they are relatively more influential than non-academic institutions. Non-U.S. academic institutions accounted for a small amount of both the top paper productivity (1; 2.6%; N= 1; 4%) and regular refereed paper productivity and (6; 6.3%; N= 5; 9.1%), all below their numeric representation. Southern Taiwan University was the only non-U.S. school to register top paper productivity while Nanyang Technological University in Singapore dominated the refereed regular paper productivity among non-U.S. schools. Non-academic institutions made no contribution at all to the top paper productivity and only a small amount of regular refereed paper productivity (1; 1.0%) that was below their numeric representation (N= 2; 3.5%).

Research question five examined the relationship between top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity based on AEJMC convention papers. Only those institutions and individuals that had both top paper productivity and regular refereed productivity were used in the correlation tests. Eliminating institutions and individuals that did not have both types of productivity prevented artificial inflation of differences

between the variables (Cherwitz & Daly, 1981). Results showed a strong correlation between institutional top paper productivity and institutional refereed regular paper productivity ($r = 0.83$). This correlation is even stronger ($r = 0.99$) within the RU/H category of schools but relatively milder ($r = 0.57$) within the RU/VH category of schools. Correlations for other Carnegie categories are not reported because the categories were minimally represented. It is notable that Ohio University at Athens not only ranked first in both types of productivity but it did so dominantly. Also, the University of Missouri ranked second in regular refereed paper productivity and third in top paper productivity. Further, the University of North Carolina was ranked third in both types of productivity. However, results showed existence of a relatively weak link between individual top convention paper productivity and individual regular refereed paper productivity ($r = 0.27$).

Discussion

Gender Gap in Convention Paper Productivity

Previous research by Applegate and Bodle (2005) was useful in noting female dominance per capita in the AEJMC magazine division's refereed convention papers. The results of this study extend Applegate and Bodle's research by demonstrating that this gender gap is more complex than what these researchers found. According to the results of this study, females dominate top convention paper authorship but males command regular refereed paper authorship. This split in dominance by the genders can be viewed as a mark of progress toward the AEJMC organization's search for gender diversity implied in its 1989 resolution alluded to earlier. As Adams and Bodle (1995) stated, the AEJMC Magazine Division has a "pace-setting acceptance [and success] of scholarship by women that "could act as a model for other divisions or specialties of Journalism and Mass Communication." One explanation for the dominance by women in the Magazine Division's top paper productivity is that they are responding to the pressure to excel. As a group, males do not feel the pressure to overcome historical marginalization in scholarly research like women and ethnic minorities do.

Carnegie Classification's Account of Convention Paper Productivity

The results of this study supported some aspects of the Carnegie Classification System but contradicted others. In support of the classification system, doctoral institutions as a group (RU/VH, RU/H, and RDU) accounted for the majority of both top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity in the Magazine Division. This is not surprising because the Carnegie Classification System posits doctoral tier of institutions as inclined toward research activities more than any of the other four tiers.

However, the results contradicted the expectations of convention paper productivity within the tier of doctoral institutions. Although RU/H institutions would be expected to rank second behind RU/VH universities in convention paper productivity, the order was reversed in the results of this study. RU/H schools outperformed RU/VH schools at both gross and per capita levels, and also at the per capita level in terms of refereed regular papers. The reason for this anomaly may be akin to Beard and Morton's

(2005) explanation, which was mentioned earlier. Despite having fewer resources at their disposal (e.g., research time or funding), faculty in RU/H institutions may be responding to pressure from their administrators to conduct research that enables home schools to acquire RU/VH status. While Beard and Morton employed an older version of the Carnegie Classification, they also found that one unlikely category of doctoral institutions (RII) out performed the more likely one (RI) in terms of research productivity.

Convention Paper Productivity Benchmarks

This study identified the means, medians, and modes of convention paper productivity as benchmarks that can be used by faculty, administrators, and students to evaluate institutions and individuals. The identification of such benchmarks within the context of the Carnegie Classification System controls for significant institutional differences (e.g., amount of financial resources available to an institution). Thus, comparisons of individual and institutions using these benchmarks can be more accurate.

Link Between Top Paper Productivity and Regular Refereed Paper Productivity

The finding of a strong correlation between top paper productivity and regular refereed paper productivity at the institutional level is significant because it provides an empirical basis for using institutional top paper productivity as a proxy for all institutional refereed paper productivity. This can save time and effort because top papers constitute only small fraction of all refereed papers (30.0%). However, the finding of a weak correlation between individual top paper productivity and individual regular refereed paper productivity is a reminder that what may apply at the macro level (i.e. institutional productivity) may not always operate the same way at the micro level (individual productivity). Therefore, individual top convention paper productivity cannot be reliably used as a proxy when there is a need for evaluating individual productivity as a whole.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study has examined diversity in refereed convention paper productivity in terms of gender, future research needs to investigate diversity in terms of other variables such as race and ethnicity. Granted, an author's gender may be easier to access through name identification as well as gender pronouns. However, due to the importance of tracking research productivity in terms that extend beyond gender methods of data collection that capture variables such as race and ethnicity will need to be devised. Self report surveys of refereed convention paper authors could be administered in order to tap into this information.

Another area that warrants further inquiry is the extent to which the Carnegie Classification used in this study actually matches the nature academic magazine programs with which convention paper authors are affiliated. The Carnegie Classification System focuses on an institution rather than an academic program or department. As a result, an institution may be identified as a research university with doctoral programs and yet the magazine department in that particular university does not offer doctoral

studies. A study that compares productivity of magazine programs in a given Carnegie classification based on highest degree offered is needed to see if it makes a difference.

Conclusion

Despite the above limitations, this study has extended previous research on convention paper productivity in meaningful ways as already discussed. Although convention papers do not carry as much weight as publications as a measure of research productivity, the fact that they engage considerable individual and institutional resources makes it imperative to identify benchmarks to use in evaluating authors and their home institution. Given the contemporary concerns about diversity in the academy, it was also important to examine how gender impacts both top and regular convention paper productivity. Hopefully, students, faculty, administrators, and AEJMC officers can use the findings to fulfill their wide-ranging responsibilities and interests regarding scholarly productivity.

References

- Adams, E., & Bodle, J. (1995). Research presented at conventions: How well are women doing. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 50, 14-22.
- Applegate, E., & Bodle, J. (2005). Scholarship rates of women within AEJMC divisions, interest groups, and commissions (1994-2003). *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 50, 150-189.
- Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication. (2008). AEJMC divisions. Retrieved November 3, 2008, from http://aejmc.org/_about/divisions/index.php
- Bunz, U. (2005). Publish or perish: A limited author analysis of ICA and NCA journals. *Journal of Communication*, 55, 703-720.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2007). *Basic classification description*. Retrieved November 3, 2008, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791>
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1981). Filtering the field's knowledge: Affiliations and backgrounds of editorial board members in speech communication. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin*, 37, 49-56.
- Emmert, P., & Rollman, S. (1997). A national survey of tenure and promotion standards in communication departments. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 26, 10-23

- Hickson, M. (2006). Raising question # 4: Why bother attending conferences? *Communication Education, 55*, 464-468.
- Hickson, M., Hill, S., & Fulmer, H. (1987). The presentation of convention papers as an indicator of the quantity of faculty productivity," *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 60*, 29-32.
- Hickson, M., Stacks, D., & Bodon, J. (1995). The status of research productivity in communication: 1915-1995. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 178-197.
- Musambira, G. (2000). Top convention paper productivity in the U.S.: Analysis of national communication association (NCA) and international communication association (ICA) awards 1994-1998. *Communication Education, 49*, 284-296.
- Morton, L., & Beard, F. (2005). Faculty productivity and Carnegie institutional characteristics within AEJMC programs. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator, 60*, 176-189
- Rosenfeld, L., Stacks, D., & Hickson, M. (1990). Perceptions of professional associations II: Role and impact of professional outlets on faculty development. *Communication Education, 39*, 171-180
- Stephens, L. (2003). Diversity profile report of the AEJMC standing committee on professional freedom and responsibility. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 58*, 49-63.