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Southern Agricultural Communications Undergraduate Programs: A Survey

Abstract
Student enrollment in agricultural communications undergraduate programs continues to increase throughout the southern region. This research reports on a survey of the nine agricultural communications programs in the 13-state southern region. The survey reviewed programmatic areas being taught, the number of students enrolled at each of the institutions, the faculty allocated to the effort, and faculty opinions about the future directions of their programs, especially in terms of enrollment and support for the program. Findings include that all programs depend on a small number of faculty to teach courses; and many of those faculty seem frustrated with a low level of support, recognition and respect. Two-thirds of respondents believed that a national accreditation program would be beneficial to their programs.
Implications

While this study did advance skills training literature by demonstrating the impact of a skills training session, there is substantial work to be done in terms of understanding what specific factors are most effective in increasing interaction in a distance education classroom. The skills training sessions delivered to students at CU and the remote site were found to be effective in increasing overall student satisfaction with the course (Kelsey, 2000), but not the level of interaction between students and instructors. Further research should focus on skills training attributes to determine the relationship between the level and quality of interaction in a distance education course.

Key constructs that surfaced in this study for explaining the relationship between interaction and CA students were vicarious interaction (Fulford & Zhang, 1993; Zhang & Fulford, 1994) and anticipated interaction (Yarkin-Lenin, 1983). For both CA and non-CA students, direct participation in the question and answer session and the discussion board was not necessary for learning, nor was it as satisfying as watching and listening to others participate.

When students report that learning vicariously and through anticipated interactions satisfied them, then educators must ponder who will ask questions during the question and answer session as well as post questions on the discussion board. This study has demonstrated that CA students will not participate orally in the learning environment regardless of interventions. Future research on interaction and skills training should focus on the factors that motivate and stimulate non-CA students (85% of the population) to openly participate in the learning environment.

Discussion and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to determine the impact of communication apprehension on students who participate in distance education courses and, second, to determine the impact of a skills training session on interaction within a distance education course. The results of this study confirmed that CA is a trait-based personality characteristic that inhibits individuals from speaking to others in a variety of contexts (Allen & Bourhis, 1996; Bourhis & Allen, 1992). CA
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The first agricultural communications programs were developed primarily to help disseminate information discovered and created at the experiment stations of land-grant universities (Duley, Jensen & O’Brien, 1984). Iowa State College was the first to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Journalism in 1920. By 1928, there was a total of seven colleges offering courses in agricultural journalism. During the 1960s, agricultural journalism programs had another era of significant growth (Duley et al., 1984). By 1975, most programs defined themselves as "agricultural communications" rather than "agricultural journalism" (Evans, 1975). As of 1991, there were more than 30 agricultural communications programs at colleges and universities across the United States (Doerfert & Cepica, 1991).

Several studies have been conducted within the past decade pertaining to undergraduate agricultural communications programs at U.S. universities. Reisner (1990) found that 26 institutions nationwide taught agricultural communications classes and that the curriculum at these institutions varied widely. Sprecker and Rudd (1998) found that practitioners emphasized a need for students to build firm communication skills in an array of areas, particularly the ability to write. Bailey-Evans (1994) suggested a model curriculum be developed that new or developing agricultural communications programs could use as a guide to meet the needs of the industry and future professionals. She recommended that this model be based on disciplines and competencies identified in her research, which surveyed leaders in agricultural communications (Bailey-Evans, 1994). Terry, Vaughn, Vernon, Lockaby, Bailey-Evans, and Rehrman (1994) recommended that future research identify a core curriculum as the basis of agricultural communications degree programs.

Reisner’s (1990) study examined undergraduate program structure and curricular requirements in agricultural communications programs and found that the programs’ most predominant characteristic was variety. Specifically, Reisner (1990) stated that agricultural communications curricula were lacking because "agricultural communication students are not required to take courses specifically designed to teach cross-cultural global perspectives, agricultural systems analysis, values and ethics in agriculture, public policy, or leadership" (p. 15). Terry et al. (1994) noted that it would be impossible to complete each instructional objective contained in the research in a students’ awareness of the importance of asking questions and engaging the lecturer in meaningful dialogue; however, the students reported that they remained consistent with previously established behaviors during this course.

The four CA students who participated in the training session and interviews at both CU and the remote site reported that they did benefit from the training session in the same way that non-CA students did. They enjoyed learning about the technological aspects of the classroom and reported that knowledge of the capabilities and limitations of the technology eased their anxieties surrounding participation in the course. However, participating in the training session did not change their desire to interact with others.

The training session provided to the CU students and one remote site at the beginning of the semester was valuable in terms of increasing student satisfaction with the course, although it did not change their perceptions regarding the amount of interactions that they engaged in over the semester. Initially, student perceptions of anticipated interactions as a result of the training sessions were high at both CU and the remote site. As the semester progressed, the students who participated in the skills training session settled into a routine and their reported actual interaction was not affected by the training session, especially among the four CA students. The following quotes serve to illustrate this point:

Interviewer: Did material covered in the workshop increase your desire to interact with the instructors or other students?

Student 38: No, I don’t think anything could increase my desire to interact (CA).

Student 27: No, only because I don’t like asking questions (CA).

Student 81: I don’t think it really made that much of a difference one way or the other.

Student 9: I remember thinking that because of the workshop, I was going to interact more in the class; but I never actually did. I did remember thinking that after hearing all that, I should interact more and communicate more in the class, but I haven’t.
The skills training session delivered to the remote site students was more effective in terms of changing their attitudes and reducing their anxiety than the session delivered to the CU students. Sixty-four percent of remote site students reported having anxiety about being seen on camera and about speaking to others through the ICV system. Thirty-six percent of the remote site students reported that the session helped them to overcome their anxiety about being seen on camera, and 73% percent of the remote site students reported that the session helped them to overcome their anxiety about speaking to others through the ICV system. Twenty-seven percent of remote site students said they had changed the way they felt about interacting in class as a result of the skills training, 18% predicted they would change the way they interacted in class, 64% were neutral, and 9% disagreed with the statement.

**Interview Results**

Nine of the 22 students who participated in the CU skills training session were interviewed at the end of the semester regarding the impact of the skills training session. Of the nine, three students experienced the CA trait. All of the remote site students who participated in the skills training were interviewed and one experienced the CA trait.

None of the students who participated in the study had taken a distance education course in the past; thus the format and delivery of the course was new to them. Students who participated in the interviews reported that the overall impact of the training session was to expose them to the technology and to reduce anxiety surrounding its use. As a result of the skills training session, students were ready to focus on the content of the course and not the technology that surrounded them. The ICV system that sat in the classroom was demystified, thus creating a seamless transition between speaker and student.

However, all participants who took the skills training session were asked during the interviews if the material covered in the training session increased their desire to interact with instructors and other students. In terms of increased interaction, interviewees reported that the training session had a marginally positive effect on non-CA students and no effect on CA students. The skills training session did serve to heighten all typical four-year bachelor's degree program. Therefore, they argue that agricultural communications curricula should be flexible with opportunities for students to specialize in specific areas of agriculture and communications in their upper division course work.

Because of this variability in programs, agricultural communications faculty may be facing some of the same academic issues shared by colleagues in other nascent fields, such as women's studies, popular culture, film studies or, closer to home, natural resources conservation management. What is the current status of this emerging field, especially since it is almost exclusively housed in long-established colleges of agriculture? How is it faring in terms of support (funding, space, personnel)? Finally, what directions are these programs taking?

The purposes of this study were to examine current undergraduate agricultural communications programs in the southern United States and to identify their baseline characteristics. Specific objectives were:

1. to compile a list of colleges/universities with agricultural communications programs,

2. to identify their current major programmatic areas as perceived by agricultural communications faculty, and

3. to identify future trends for agricultural communications undergraduate programs as perceived by agricultural communications faculty.

**Methods**

This research surveyed all undergraduate agricultural communications programs in the 13-state southern region, which included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. A 43-question survey was sent via electronic mail to the primary advisers for chapters of Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) as well as to land-grant agricultural communications professionals who teach agricultural communications courses or had expressed interest to the National ACT faculty adviser in starting an agricultural communications program at their universities. A total of 14 surveys (Texas had two programs) was distributed. Nine programs provided information about
their programs; five other states responded that they had no current program. The surveys were returned to the researchers via E-mail, and responses were tabulated.

Findings

All of the nine respondents indicated that their programs were affiliated with colleges of agriculture. Even though several had names somewhat different from that, all colleges mentioned had “agriculture” in the title. Similarly, all the degree programs were called either “agricultural communications” or “agricultural journalism.”

Where Programs Are Housed

Regarding the department that houses their program, the predominant response (4) was that it is part of another academic department; two each were either aligned with an affiliated program or unit or were in a stand-alone program; and one was part of an agricultural communications service unit. Seven affiliated in some manner with an academic unit were part of an agricultural education or Extension education department. One program was simply part of the college of agriculture. (This last one appears to be a topical major offered by the college, in that no agricultural communications courses are taught.)

Enrollment/Graduation Trends

The number of students majoring in agricultural communications varied widely at the nine institutions, from 9 students to 115 students. The mean number was 32 students per department.

Eight of the nine respondents indicated that their enrollment had increased during the past five years, with one indicating that enrollment remained steady. (A newly established department had no graduates to report.) Further, six respondents indicated that their enrollment would grow in the next five years; three indicated that they anticipated that enrollment would remain steady. No respondent believed their program’s enrollment was likely to decrease.

Respondents were asked how many students graduated from their agricultural communications programs in the previous year (1998-1999). The range from nine respondents was fairly substantial with from “none graduated from a newly
Five of the seven CA students reported that being in a distance-learning course that required students to present themselves on camera for asking questions inhibited them from doing so. The CA students adopted a voyeuristic posture in the course by preferring to watch and listen to others interact:

Interviewer: Do you ask questions during the live broadcast?

Student 38: No! No way! First of all I don’t want my face on the huge screen, and I don’t ask questions. I don’t ask questions (in classes) that aren’t distance learning either. I’m just not comfortable with that.

CA students reported that they were as interested and motivated by the course content as non-CA students; however they expressed no desire to actively participate in the interactive features of the course (student photo gallery, post-lecture question and answer session, discussion board, and E-mail). They expressed a need to get in and get out of the learning environment as quickly and efficiently as possible without undue interaction with others. CA students enjoyed being present in the classroom, but clearly they did not want to participate orally. They were dissatisfied if there were no questions asked during the question and answer session but would not ask questions themselves. They wanted to be part of the learning environment but not co-creators of it:

Interviewer: What learning resources have you used for this class?

Student 2: I’ve been on the web. I’ve looked at the discussion board. I did put a question up there because I didn’t want to say it in class. I haven’t responded to anything (on the discussion board) though.

Peers and site facilitators at all six sites reported during the interviews that CA students were invisible to them. In fact one student interviewed did not remember that a CA classmate was in the class with her when there were only five students in her section. When questioned about her peer, she began to remember her, but she could not remember her name. Both students attended class regularly. When asking a site facilitator about his cohort, he remarked that he did not think that any of his students were CA. After continued probing on the topic, he recalled a student who did not say much. The student’s pres-
established program” to “40 students.” The mean was 11.5, with most programs falling within the 8 to 12 range.

Respondents also were asked to provide the number of agricultural communications graduates from last year, who were now employed within the field. Of the total of 92 students graduated from the eight established agricultural communications programs, 41 are employed in agricultural communications work; 19 had accepted jobs in some other aspect of agriculture. Slightly less, 16, had applied to or been accepted into graduate school. And 14 of the 92 found employment outside both agriculture and communications. (Although respondents said they graduated 92 students, they could account for only 90.)

**Programs’ Foci**

Respondents were asked to characterize their program’s preparation of students in these three areas: program focuses primarily on teaching professional skills; program primarily teaches broad-based critical thinking skills; and the program provides an equal combination of both professional and critical thinking skills. The nine respondents fell nearly equally into the professional skills category (5) and into the both "professional skills" and "critical thinking skills" category (4).

When asked how many agricultural courses are taught within each program, responses from the nine respondents ranged from none to ten, with the mean just under five. In response to the companion question "How many different instructors teach these courses?" a narrower range of responses (from one to four) was indicated, with the predominant response as two. The mean was just under two.

**The Faculty**

The survey asked how many full-time equivalent faculty (FTE) members teach in the agricultural communications program (Table 1). Responses ranged from 0.5 faculty members to 2.6. Faculty-to-student ratios (for programs with faculty members assigned to teaching) ranged widely from 1:10 to 1:77, for eight respondents with faculty teaching courses.

Thirteen faculty members were listed as teaching agricultural communications. Of those, two are full professors, with
The impact of communication apprehension on distance education students was assessed in two ways. Participants filled out a Likert-type survey developed for this study immediately after the session. Students were also queried during the face-to-face interviews as to the overall impact of the skills training session at the end of the semester.

### Findings

#### Impact of Communication Apprehension on Distance Education Students

Seven students self-identified as having the CA trait using the PRCA-24 and the WTC scale (9.5% of the population). The students who scored high for CA on the PRCA-24 and low on the WTC ($r = -0.630$) behaved and responded in ways that were consistent with the literature for CA individuals (McCroskey, 1977).

During face-to-face interviews, the CA students reported that being communication apprehensive was a barrier to interactions, not only in this course but also in all their courses. On no occasion was being CA considered a benefit in the classroom. All seven students had an acute awareness of their CA trait and the negative role that it played in their learning endeavors throughout their lives in terms of speaking inside and outside of class with instructors and peers. Direct quotations of the seven CA student interviews are included to support these findings:

- **Interviewer:** As far as communication apprehension is concerned, is this getting in the way of your learning?

- **Student 71:** In a lot of lecture classes I will have a question about a part of it and I could ask it right then and get it cleared up, but instead I don’t. That is a big problem.

- **Student 2:** Yeah it’s a barrier in my learning but I have found other ways to deal with it so I don’t treat this class any different than any other class.

CA students had developed coping mechanisms for getting their academic needs met without having to interact personally with other students or instructors. In order to avoid oral communication with peers and instructors, the CA students consulted textbooks, utilized the library, and searched the Internet to find answers to their questions.

### Quality of Preparation

Respondents were asked how well their programs prepare graduates in three areas: applied professional skills, critical thinking skills, and graduate or professional school. All nine programs provided data and the “applied professional skills” area received the highest ranking, with six schools indicating they prepared students "very well" and two more indicating they prepared students "well." Six respondents reported their

### Table 1 Undergraduate Agricultural Communications Programs and the Number of Full-time Equivalent Faculty Members Assigned in 1999.

| University                      | Faculty (FTEs) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Auburn                          | 0              |
| Clemson University              | *              |
| Louisiana State University      | *              |
| Mississippi State University    | *              |
| North Carolina State University | 1              |
| Oklahoma State University       | .75            |
| Texas A & M                     | 1              |
| Texas Tech                      | 1.5            |
| University of Arkansas          | 1              |
| University of Florida           | 2.6            |
| University of Georgia           | .5             |
| University of Kentucky          | .5             |
| University of Tennessee         | *              |
| Virginia Polytechnical Institute| *              |

*denotes no active undergraduate agricultural communications program.
Methods

This case study was guided by two research questions.

RQ 1: What was the impact of communication apprehension on distance education students who experience the trait, and

RQ 2: What was the impact of a skills training session on interaction in a distance education course?

Data were collected using Likert-type surveys, interviews, and participant observations at all six sites (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1984). Site facilitators were interviewed for methodological triangulation concerning the CA trait among their students and the interaction variable. Interviews were audiotaped, transcribed, and coded following Miles and Huberman’s (1994) suggestions for qualitative data analysis. Videotaped recordings of all lectures were analyzed for quantity of interactions among participants.

To determine the presence of communication apprehension among the population, two survey questionnaires were administered to students at all six sites during the first two weeks of the course. The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24), which consisted of 24 Likert-type questions, was selected because it was the most widely used measure of CA and because its reliability and content validity were well established (alpha reliability = 0.97) (McCroskey, 1978; McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney, & Plax, 1985).

The Willingness to Communicate scale (WTC) was also administered to students at all six sites as a multiple-method technique for determining students’ willingness to communicate (the antithesis of CA). The WTC scale is a 20-item, probability-estimate scale with an estimated reliability of 0.92 (McCroskey, 1992).

The skills training session was offered face-to-face by the researcher at two of the six participating campuses. After the pre-enrollment period was over, students at Cornell University were randomly separated into two groups where one-half of these students were invited to participate in the skills training session. Nine out of ten students at the chosen remote site attended the skills training session.

The impact of the skills training session on student interac-
benefit their programs. They believe that accreditation would do the following: "provide leverage with the administration" in garnering much-needed support; "bolster the image" of agricultural communications in relation to journalism and communications programs on campus; "improve the identity" of ag communications within the college; and "provide respect and esteem" to the field through the establishment of standards.

**Challenges to Programs**

Issues cited in open-ended questions at the end of the survey—What are the biggest challenges facing your program? What are the challenges facing ag communications programs nationally? and where do you see your program five years from now?—were interesting. All nine respondents provided comments such as "lack of understanding about what ag communications is," "the image problem," and "poor attitudes of journalism faculty and students toward ag communications" which could be addressed by national accreditation. Challenges that programs face individually—administration turf battles, understaffing, student recruitment, wearing too many hats as faculty members—might also be ameliorated by national standards in such areas as appropriate funding levels for curriculum and professional development and faculty:student ratios, for example.

Because a majority of agricultural communications programs in the southern states see themselves as increasing in size over the next five years, faculty find themselves challenged by all of the issues related to that growth. From simple concerns—such as identifying good textbooks and making contacts for internships and job placement—to complex issues—such as increased funding for technology and maintaining critical thinking skills—agricultural communications faculty face perhaps their most challenging decade since the inception of the field.

**Conclusions and Discussion**

This study found that the undergraduate agricultural communications programs throughout the southern United States are growing and are expected to continue to grow for at least the next five years. This seemingly rapid growth may be responsible for the wide-ranging number of faculty to student ratios, from 1:10 to 1:77. The rapid growth also may be responsible for the small number of faculty members involved

Hopf and Ayres (1992) recommended that students should be supported in learning cognitive, affective, and technological skills necessary for interacting with others through communication technologies. As few universities have provided skills training to distance students, there is a lack of empirical data regarding the effectiveness of such efforts.

**Context of the Case**

This study was situated within an animal genetics course offered by Cornell University (CU) to five remote sites in the Northeast during fall semester, 1998. The course was designed to expose students to the animal genetics industry by means of presenting current research being conducted in the field. Eleven guest speakers from across the United States and Canada presented the seminars as guest speakers. The speakers were flown to CU and presented the seminar live to the CU cohort. The other five remote sites received the lecture via ICV technology. Each of the five remote sites employed a local site facilitator (all of whom were animal science professors) who served as instructor of record. The site facilitators were primarily responsible for managing communications between sites.

Seventy-three students (14 men and 59 women) participated in the study. The average age of the group was 21.7 years, and the average number of years in college was 3.6. None of the students had participated in a distance education course prior to this one, thus their experience with the technology was new.

The students had the opportunity to participate in five types of interaction essential for optimal learning (Moore, 1989; Hillman, Willis, & Gunawardena, 1994). They were: (a) face-to-face interactions between students and site facilitators at each campus, (b) ten minutes at the end of each lecture for a live question and answer session, (c) E-mail, (d) a discussion board, and (e) luncheons with guest speakers (provided at the CU only). All the students who participated in this study also had access to an extensive Internet web site.

The researcher presented a skills training session to the CU site and one remote site early in the semester. The focus of the skills training session was to teach students and instructors how to interact more effectively within a distance education course (see Appendix for outline of skills training session). The other four remote sites did not receive any training.
to interact overtly with peers and instructors. These learners experience a trait-based condition known as communication apprehension (CA) (McCroskey, 1982). There is a strong negative correlation between CA and learning outcomes in the traditional classroom at all grade levels (Aitken & Neer, 1992; Allen & Bourhis, 1996; Bourhis & Allen, 1992); however, the research surrounding CA in the distance education context is limited.

Distance education brings with it unique circumstances that limit both the assets and liabilities of interpersonal interaction. Distance students can learn alone in correspondence-type courses or within groups, using interactive compressed video (ICV) technology. ICV technology permits synchronous two-way audio and video transmission, allowing distance educators to incorporate fully interactive design techniques into the teaching and learning environment. Using ICV technology, distance education courses can resemble traditional campus-based courses.

Researchers (Bauer & Rezabek, 1992; Boverie, Murrell, Lowe, Zittle, Zittle, & Gunawardena, 1997; Sholdt, Zhang & Fulford, 1995; West & Pearson, 1994) have hypothesized that fully interactive classrooms will lead to an increase in learning outcomes in terms of quantity and quality of questions asked and answered. As interactive technology is infused in the traditional classroom environment, students’ skills in using the technology must be upgraded for effective communication to occur (Hillman, Willis & Gunawardena, 1994).

Distance educators have recommended communication skills training for distance education students in order to provide them with necessary communication tools for success in technology-rich learning environments as participating in technology-laden classrooms can be intimidating for students and serve to inhibit interaction (Davie, 1989; Gibson, 1998; Hillman, Willis, & Gunawardena, 1994; Nahl, 1993). In one study, the process of going on-camera inhibited 33% of the students in an ICV classroom (Nahl, 1993). Students’ concerns diminished by one-half toward the end of the semester due to a natural desensitization toward the technology. Nevertheless, students who participated in the study spent the majority of their learning time in a state of anxiety related to using the technology.

in teaching in the various surveyed programs. (The mean number of faculty who taught at the programs was just under two per program, with many having only one faculty member involved in teaching.) Without a doubt, all programs depend on a small number of faculty members to coordinate, administer and teach the agricultural communications programs surveyed.

It might be asked how robust an agricultural communications program really can be if only one or two faculty members coordinate, administer and teach a program. It was apparent that many of the faculty members involved in teaching also had other responsibilities, too. The question we might ask from these responses is how well can faculty members teach courses when the demands for teaching are high, but the FTE’s allocated for teaching are so low, especially in programs with a large number of students?

The survey indicated a strong level of faculty frustration associated with the perceived low status of their programs as well as actual low levels of support (funding, space, personnel), recognition, and respect. All but one of the program respondents indicated that their program was in the bottom half in terms of support, relative to other programs in their institution. And fully one half of those responding to the question said that their program was in the bottom quarter in terms of support, relative to other programs at their institution. That only one program of all of those surveyed considers itself to be in the top half of programs at its institution, relative to other programs, is very telling. The need for accreditation (discussed below), the need for support of all kinds, and the "lack of understanding about what agricultural communications is as a field" (cited as a national challenge), are all related to the perceived low standing of agricultural communications programs in colleges of agriculture.

The low level of perceived support may be due in some measure to the rapid growth many of the programs are experiencing. If so, then, it may be that institutional support will catch up to their growth over time. The fact that two-thirds of respondents believed that a national accreditation program would help their program may be a response to their perceived low status of programs, coupled with high demands on the faculty.

A national accreditation process could be somewhat prob-
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Abstract

The importance of providing students with skills necessary for success in distance education classrooms is uncontested; however, few universities have done so. This case study sought to answer two questions: (a) What was the impact of communication apprehension (CA) on distance education students who experience the trait; and (b) What was the impact of a skills training session on interaction in a distance education course? Findings indicate that communication apprehensive students could not be motivated to interact regardless of interventions; however, non-CA students did benefit from the skills training session. An outline for a recommended skills training session based on recommendations from the literature and this study is included along with implications for educational practice.

Interpersonal interaction in the learning context has been touted as the Holy Grail of effective education. Scholars (Bandura, 1977; Dewey, 1938; Holmberg, 1983) have demonstrated the importance of interaction theoretically and empirically in that learning is positively correlated to interaction. Nevertheless, there are a number of learners who choose not
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