

# CT&P

JUNE 2004

---

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

---

## What's In a Name?

---

By Sally J. McMillan

The Communication Technology and Policy Division made a giant leap forward in technology this year. The division initiated an online submission and review process under the guidance of research chair Sriram Kalyanaraman. Elsewhere in this newsletter, Sri provides an overview of the program that has emerged from the process.

One thing that became clear with the electronic submission process is that technology does NOT scare people away from CT&P. We had a record number of submissions – more than 100 as contrasted with the “usual” 65 papers.

We are excelling at technology, but what about policy? In the fall issue of this newsletter, I reported on an e-mail “conversation” that I had with past-heads of the division. That conversation involved two “policy” issues. First, what kinds of policies or guidelines should we have that guide division activities and second should the word “policy” continue to be part of the division name. Let me explore those issues a bit more and remind you of the earlier “conversation” that appeared in the newsletter last fall.

This year’s paper competition highlights the need for clearer guidelines about what the division does. It seems quite likely that some authors may have selected the CT&P division for submission sim-

ply because the electronic process was easier and helped to facilitate procrastination. But did they have a clear idea of what kind of papers are most appropriate for CT&P?

Former division head Shyam Sundar provided the following summary of the mission of CT&P: “we have made sure that technology is the focal object of interest, and not treated simply as an area of study that is secondary to larger concerns in journalism and mass communication.” Jane Singer echoed that sentiment when she wrote: “we have never adequately expressed the division’s ‘mission’ or scope, and so we have become a catch-all category...unfortunately, too often for research papers that are too poorly executed or conceptualized to fit anywhere else.”

This leads to the second policy issue. Should we keep the word “policy” in our name? Let me recap some “discussion” of this issue. Former division head Bruce Henderson said this was a good question and worth further study. Singer was in favor of dropping the “and policy” part of the name and Sundar made a strong argument for keeping (and perhaps even expanding) the policy part of the division’s title.

Singer’s argument for dropping the word “policy” centered on the need for focus. “I have always thought that including ‘policy’ as part of our name only further muddies the

already-murky understanding of what we are, both within the division and outside it.”

Sundar noted that there are many thriving programs in telecommunications, with a predominantly policy focus. “I agree that we may be privileging policy, but ours is the closest match for the telecomm scholars.... Some may argue that telecomm policy is not really the same as other technology research. In that case, we have two options--to give it up and let it veer toward another division (or, God forbid, form its own!), or to accommodate it as a distinct component of our division (we could even call our division Communication Technology and Telecommunications Policy--CT&TP--for example).”

Last fall, I asked for your feedback on the possibility of a name change. The silence was thundering. Perhaps it’s just too much work to respond to a newsletter article. But I hope you’ve been thinking about the idea. I’d like for us to seriously consider this issue at our members’ meeting in Toronto this year.

So plan to come to the conference, come to the member’s meeting, and help the division fine-tune its focus and answer the burning question posed in the title of this article: what’s in a name? More specifically, what’s the best name for our division? See you in Toronto!

---

# Blogging in the Classroom

By: Mindy McAdams

At the 2004 AEJMC convention in Toronto, CT&P will co-sponsor a mini-plenary on blogging (Friday, August 6, 1:30 p.m.).

Most people who spend a lot of time online have heard of “blogging,” or the practice of keeping up a Weblog. For those who have missed out on hearing about this phenomenon, a Weblog is essentially an online diary, usually updated using some automated software that you can access free of charge. While many blogs are excruciatingly tedious, and you may not be able to imagine anyone reading them for more than two seconds, there are also a number of Weblogs that have become required reading for loyal audiences.

One of our graduate students required regular blogging in a reporting course she taught last fall, and faculty at other schools have also used class blogs or individual blogs successfully. This article is intended to let you know where you can go online to start a blog, or to learn more about them.

You may be asking “Why would I want to?” It depends on your teaching goals, of course, but if you’ve been wanting to engage students in some kind of online writing project, requiring

them to post entries to a blog at regular intervals might be the answer. You can provide guidelines to discourage students from indulging too much in navel-gazing or unfocused rambling. Kaye Trammell, who incorporated a blogging project into her University of Florida journalism course, provided these instructions:

“The topic of the Weblog can be about any facet of journalism (such as J.D. Lasica’s *New Media Musings* Weblog) or used to report on a particular topic throughout the class (such as animal rights, politics, etc.). What should a student blog about? Blog about articles that relate to the ‘beat’ covered in the Weblog, upcoming legislation, important issues or advances in the field. Remember to include links to other resources, and always credit sources if links were found on another Weblog. Weblog posts should be interesting, discuss current trends, contain hyperlinks and be written appropriately for the medium” (<http://projects.jou.ufl.edu/ktrammell/projects.htm>).

There you have it. Students could be required to post once a week, for example. Require them to follow AP style, dock them for spelling and grammatical errors, and maintain the same standards for accuracy that you would in any other media writing class. Include some

criteria for linking, such as one new link per blog post, to get them accustomed to sourcing their information. Insist that no images be used without permission from the copyright holder.

In addition, you can require students to read and comment on one another’s blogs throughout the semester.

The difference between a blog and a discussion forum is really one of formatting. The typical forum (or message board) is ordered by topic; within each topic, you’ll find posts by many authors in reverse date order. The typical blog is ordered by date, with the most recent post at the top. The posts may or may not be searchable by topic. Some blogs allow readers to comment on posts, while others do not.

Rebecca Blood, author of *The Weblog Handbook* (Perseus, 2002), wrote this informative article in April 2004: “A Few Thoughts on Journalism and What Can Weblogs Do About It” ([http://www.rebeccablood.net/essays/what\\_is\\_journalism.html](http://www.rebeccablood.net/essays/what_is_journalism.html)).

Continued from page 2

Here are a few well-known journalism blogs you might look at for ideas:

**The Daily Dish**/Andrew Sullivan

<http://www.andrewsullivan.com/>

**eJournal**/Dan Gillmor

<http://weblog.siliconvalley.com/column/dangillmor/>

**New Media Musings**/J.D. Lasica

<http://www.newmediamusings.com/>

**PressThink**/Jay Rosen

<http://journalism.nyu.edu/pubzone/weblogs/pressthink/>

**Romenesko**/Jim Romenesko

<http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=45>

**The Weblog**/Guardian Unlimited

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/weblog>

Here are a few Web sites where you and your students can start up a blog instantly, for free, using no software other than your Web browser:

**Blogger**

<http://www.blogger.com/>

Free and easy to use. Instructions are on the site.

**LiveJournal**

<http://www.livejournal.com/>

Free for the basic blog, or \$25 a year for extra features.

**Movable Type**

<http://www.movabletype.org/>

Free online publishing system. (This is not for everybody.) If you understand Web site production and Web server technology, you can build a group Weblog or a whole online newspaper with this software.

**TextAmerica**

<http://www.textamerica.com/>

Free Moblogs (short for *mobile* Weblogs). Post photos from your cell phone.

**TypePad**

<http://www.typepad.com/>

Not free, but you get some great options for a small monthly fee.

And just in case you feel like looking for a particular type of blog:

**Blogarama**

<http://www.blogarama.com/>

A directory of blogs, by subject matter.

**Blogdex**

<http://www.blogdex.net/>

Generates a list of “fastest spreading ideas” based on an automated survey of all Weblogs in its database. Addictive and fascinating.

**Note: The links in this article can be clicked on this Web page:**  
<http://www.macloo.com/ctpteaching/articles/2004may.htm>



## EXCITING CTP REFEREED RESEARCH SESSIONS AT AEJ 2004

By: Sriram "Sri" Kalyanaraman

Greetings! The program for the Toronto conference has been finalized and, as usual, thanks to the diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches, we have a robust program in place. As you all know, we went with an online submission and review system for this year's paper competition. I am pleased to report that it was a tremendous success. Submissions to our division increased manifold—from the normal average of around 65 papers to 100 papers this year. Without exception, submitters expressed their gratitude for the ease and convenience of electronic submission. Once all submissions were in, they were converted into pdf files after all identifying information was removed, and each paper was assigned for blind review to three referees. We had a wonderful response from volunteers who agreed to review for the division—thus we had a total of 96 referees assist with the review process. This healthy figure also ensured that no referee had to review more than 4 papers, with a majority (app. 65%)

reviewing either 2 or 3 papers. My sincere thanks to all reviewers for their valuable service, particularly for conforming to the return deadlines in the busy month of April. A large majority of the reviewers also provided detailed qualitative comments and suggestions, which, I am sure, will be beneficial to authors.

All authors were notified of the status of their papers on May 2. Because of the availability of online reviews, the reviews were also attached to the notification mails. Based on the reviews, we were able to accept 55 papers for presentation at the conference. These papers have been scheduled in 8 refereed research sessions. The CTP refereed research sessions kick off with the Jung-Sook Lee competition for top student papers at 11.45 am on Wednesday, August 4. Also, on Wednesday, August 4, we have a session titled *Computer, Heal Thyself and Others: Health and Safety in Online Environments* at 5.00 pm. On Thursday, August 5, we have two refereed sessions. The first one is titled *Enhancing Engagement: The Internet and Public*

*Sphere* and is scheduled for 8.15 am. The same afternoon, we have the *Scholar-to-Scholar* poster session at 1.30 pm. The majority of CTP papers will be presented in a *special poster* session on Friday, August 6. This session is co-sponsored with the Communication Theory and Methodology and Mass Communication and Society divisions and is scheduled at 3.15 pm. On the final day of the conference (Saturday, August 7), we have three refereed sessions. The first of these is titled *I Read the News Today: New Directions in Online Journalism Research* and is scheduled at 8.15 am. The second session is at 11.45 am and is titled *Privacy and Regulatory Issues in Cyberspace*. The refereed sessions conclude with a joint research session on technology and gender sponsored by the Commission on the Status of Women at 3.15 pm. This session will feature two papers each from CSW and CTP.

I thank all authors for submitting their scholarship to the CTP division and congratu-

Continued from page 4

late authors of accepted papers. I would also like to extend my congratulations to authors of the top faculty and student papers. All award winners will be recognized at the CTP members' meeting, so I request you to make a note of that in your schedule. The winners of the top-4 papers in the open competition are:

1. *Character-Based Group Identification and Referent Informational Influence in Computer-Mediated Communication* by Eun-Ju Lee, UC-Davis

2. *Staged News and the Online Audience: Participatory Journalism's Criteria for "Misleading" Representations by Government Perception Managers at Times of Social, Political and Economic Stress* by Larry Pryor & Stephen O'Leary, University of Southern California

3. *Relationship between Disclosure Dimensions and Physical and Psychological Health in an Online Breast Cancer Support Group* by Janice Liebhart, Suzanne Pincree, Robert Hawkins, Fiona McTavish, & David Gustafson, University of Wisconsin-Madison

4. *Exploring the Dynamics of Webcasting Adoption* by Carolyn Lin, Cleveland State University

The winners of the top-3 papers in the Jung-Sook Lee competition for student papers are:

1. *The Dynamics of the 3G Wireless Standards Competition in China and Its Implications for Telecommunications Policy* by Chun Liu & Feng Wu, Penn State University

2. *Experiencing interactive Advertising Beyond Rich Media: Impacts of Ad Type and Presence on Brand Effectiveness in 3D Gaming Immersive Virtual Environments* by Dan Grigorevici & Corina Constantin, Penn State University

3. *Internet Technology and Long-Arm Jurisdiction: Are New Standards Required?* by Robert Magee, UNC-Chapel Hill

The entire CTP program will be available on the CTP Website at <http://aejmc.net/ctp/>.

Once again, my sincere thanks to all volunteers who agreed to serve as reviewers, moderators, and discussants for our division. In addition, Mindy McAdams and Sally

McMillan offered valuable feedback during the course of setting up the system. Finally, a big "thank you" to Dr. Thomas Preuss, who created the ConfMaster online management system that we used for the paper competition. In addition to his technical expertise, Thomas was available 24X7 and ensured that the entire submission and review process went off smoothly without any glitches. I certainly hope we continue our association with ConfMaster in the future. As AEJ's "tech" division, our success augurs well for the future of not only CTP, but also a few other divisions that have now contacted me about going with a similar online system for AEJ 2005.

I look forward to seeing you all at the CTP sessions in Toronto. In the meantime, please spread the word to your friends and colleagues and request them to attend the members' meeting in Toronto.



## Busted Another One

By David R. Thompson, Ph.D.

It's like my own version of reality television. I'm one of the men and women of intellectual law enforcement sworn to serve and to protect the reputations of myself and my college, the well-being of my students, and the integrity of the professions in which my students will be employed.

Another semester has ended, and I've busted another student. The crime? Violation of academic integrity by means of Internet piracy. This form of plagiarism is known as "cut and paste writing" – using Web sites as sources, according the Headwaters Writing Center at Loras College.

We all know that plagiarism can be broadly defined, from Internet piracy to failure to use proper attribution, to fabrication. We all know the general rule: If it's not yours, don't present it as your own work.

This semester, my student knew that. In fact, every student I have busted for plagiarism in the last three years has known the rule. But three years ago, Loras College became a wireless laptop campus. The same technology that put a world of information at our fingertips also made it easier than ever to commit Internet piracy.

Of course, the same technology that makes it easy for students to fulfill the length requirement for an assigned paper also makes it easy for me to catch them. Some students don't seem to realize that, though. Or perhaps they realize it, but they hope I won't notice or that I won't check if I do notice.

Loras College subscribes to a service provided by Turnitin ([www.turnitin.com](http://www.turnitin.com)). If a professor suspects a paper has been spliced together from Internet sources, he or she can send the entire paper to Turnitin. Within 24 hours, the professor has an answer.

I could use Turnitin. Students submit their assignments to me electronically, as email attachments. That saves them pages on their printing accounts, and I have a date and time stamp to confirm whether or not the work was completed on deadline. I could easily forward suspect papers to be checked for copied or unattributed material.

I've never used Turnitin or any other plagiarism detection service, though. I don't need private investigators. Remember, I'm an intellectual law enforcement professional trained to sniff out wrongdoers.

It's not hard, really. Once I have collected a few informal writing assignments early in the semester and a short essay or two, I have

a pretty good idea who might use words like "ubiquitous" or "ebullient" in their formal writing.

British spelling is usually a giveaway, unless, of course, the student is British or learned British English as a second language. Most often, "colour" catches my eye and sends me to the Web to do an "Advanced Search" on Google or Yahoo! to look for exact phrase matches.

When I reach for my figurative handcuffs, I feel an odd mixture of pity for the student and a "hoo-yeah!" sense of satisfaction that I beat that student at his or her own game (about half of the Internet pirates I've busted have been male).

I wonder what I could have done to prevent this transgression. These students have had writing courses that should have taught them proper methods for conducting research, taking notes, and writing a paper. My syllabus includes a statement that defines academic integrity and spells out the consequences for crossing the line. My deadlines are reasonable; students have plenty of time to complete the assignment.

Again, I turn to the Writing Center at Loras and learn: "The single most common reason students plagiarize is because they have waited until the last minute to research and write a paper." Okay, that's not my fault.

Continued from page 6

I think every instructor has a favorite method for dealing with plagiarists, so I'll spare you from reading the details of my method. But I will tell you it involves both a way for the student to save face and a way for me to take the matter to the next level should this student plagiarize again. (If you'd like to know more, please send an email. Or, we can take this discussion to the CTP listserv.)

So when did Jack Kelley, Jayson Blair and others who have been busted for some form of plagiarism learn they could get away with it? If they had been my students, would I have had the chance to say "hoo-yeah!"? If so, would they have learned a hard lesson in school – that place where mistakes happen, corrective action is taken, and futures are shaped – never to make those mistakes in their professional careers?

In his article "Making it by making it up: The only path to glory?" ([www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=52&aid=62837](http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=52&aid=62837), March 23, 2004), Chip Scanlan writes, "In the age we live in, the odds of fabrication and plagiarism going undetected are getting slimmer."

The same goes for our students. It's too easy to get caught these days. But students still take that chance. Is it because they think they can get away with

it? Or is it something more? Are we doing our part as educators to demonstrate professionalism and to expect it from our students?

In his article "What needs to be done? Questions about leadership" ([www.poynter.org/content/content\\_view.asp?id=36488](http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=36488), June 5, 2003), Gregory Favre asks, "What needs to be done to create a culture where expectations and goals and values are articulated and made clear through coaching?"

Favre's question is directed to newsroom management, but I think the question should be addressed to educators, as well. If we see ourselves as leaders in the sense that students look to us for direction, then we must establish such a culture. We may need to be more deliberate about establishing expectations and goals and articulating values. If we do that, maybe we can be coach more often than cop.

In the meantime, I feel like I've done my part to keep another Jack or Jayson from hitting the streets. "Oh, no" and "hoo-yeah!" I've busted another one.

David Thompson may be reached at [david.thompson@loras.edu](mailto:david.thompson@loras.edu)



## 'Best of Web' Winners

The Winners of the 2004 AEJMC 'Best of the Web' Design Competition, co-sponsored by the Visual Communication and Communication Technology & Policy Divisions have been announced. This year's competition generated 50 qualified entries with four sites earning first-place designations.

Below is a listing of this year's winners. These award-winning sites may be viewed online at: <http://www.jou.ufl.edu/aejmcweb/>. First-place recipients will be presenting their sites during this summer's AEJMC Convention in Toronto.

Department or School:

First Place: Edgar Huang, University of South Florida St. Petersburg, "Department of Journalism and Media Studies"

Second Place: Jeff Rutenebeck, Judianne Triglia, Brian Comerford, Amy-Beth McNeely, & Alyssa Pumphrey, University of Denver, "Digital Media Studies Program"

Teaching:

First Place: Thomas McHardy, James Madison University, "Interactive Tutorial on High-Definition Television (HDTV)"

Second Place: M Joseph Hinshaw & Steven D. Anderson, James

## C T & P Officers 2003 - 04

Continued from page 5

Madison University, "Video Exposure Control Tutorial"

Journalism:

First Place: Andrew DeVigal, San Francisco State University, "Xpress Online"

Second Place: John Kaplan, Kevin Allen & Craig Lee, University of Florida, "Florida FlyIns"

Third Place: Kim Grinfeder and Bruce Garrison, University of Miami, "Our National Parks"

Creative:

First Place: Monica Postelnicu, University of Florida, "The Shtetl Economic History Project"

Honorable Mentions:

Prabu David, Ohio State University & Frank Biocca, Michigan State University, "Media Interface and Network Design Labs (M.I.N.D. Lab)"; Thomas Bivins, University of Oregon, "History of the School of Journalism and Communication"; Prabu David, Ohio State University, "JCOM 101: History of Communication"; Christof Demont-Heinrich & Lynn Schofield Clark, University of Colorado at Boulder, "Media, Culture & Meaning"; Mary McGuire, Chris Waddell & Roger Martin, Carleton University, "Capitol News Online".

### DIVISION HEAD

Sally J. McMillan  
 Dep. of Advertising  
 College of Communications  
 University of Tennessee  
 Knoxville TN 37996-0332  
 Tel: 865-974-5097  
 Email: sjmcmill@utk.edu

### VICE-HEAD PROGRAM CHAIR

David R. Thompson  
 Loras College  
 Dept of Communication Arts  
 LC Mail Box 198  
 Dubuque, IA 52004  
 Tel: 563-588-7940 Fax: 563-588-7339  
 E-mail: dt276118@loras.edu

### NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Vandana Pednekar-Megal  
 Grand Valley State University  
 School of Communication  
 Allendale MI 49401-9403  
 Tel: 616-895-3337  
 E-mail: vandana@magal.com

### RESEARCH COMMITTEE CHAIR

#### PAPER COMPETITION CHAIR

Sri Kalyanaraman  
 University of North Carolina  
 School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
 CB # 3365  
 Chapel Hill NC 27599  
 Tel: 919-842-5858  
 E-mail: sri@unc.edu

### PF & R COMMITTEE CHAIR

Peter Morello  
 University of Missouri-Kansas City  
 202 Haag Hall  
 Kansas City MO 64110  
 Tel: 816-235-2532  
 E-mail: morellop@umkc.edu

### TEACHING STANDARDS COMMITTEE CHAIR

Mindy McAdams  
 University of Florida  
 Dept of Journalism  
 PO Box 118400  
 Gainesville FL 32611-8400  
 352-392-8456  
 mmcadams@jou.ufl.edu

