

Training for Diversity in Journalism:
Tracking the Columbia Summer Program Graduates, 1968 – 1974

A thesis
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Communication
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in Professional Communication

by
Mary Alice Basconi

May 2006

Dr. John M. King, Chair

Dr. Jack Mooney

Dr. Ardis Nelson

Keywords: Minorities, diversity, retention, journalism training, journalism history,
journalism education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is dedicated to Ed Basconi, for immeasurable kindness and patience, and to my parents, Alicia Serafica Woodhams and Richard L. Woodhams, for showing the way.

Special appreciation goes to Dr. John M. King for chairing the thesis committee, for believing in this endeavor, and for guidance through the mechanics of SPSS. Dr. Jack Mooney provided the spark for this project by challenging students to tell stories that make up journalism history. He and Dr. Ardis Nelson offered insight during the research and enlisted me in the bilingual newspaper project at ETSU. The School of Graduate Studies was generous in providing guidance and travel assistance, and Kelly Hensley at the Sherrod Library was helpful in locating research materials. Personal thanks also are due to Dr. Charles Roberts, Dr. Norma Wilson, Dr. Murvin H. Perry, Dr. Cecilia McIntosh, Dr. Andrea Clements, Dr. Rosalind Gann, and Janine Richardson.

Several persons clarified information and guided me to the records: Ruth Friendly of the Fred Friendly Seminars, who provided access to her husband's papers; Alexandra Bernet of the Columbia University Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Anthony Malony of the Ford Foundation, Dr. Everett C. Parker of Fordham University, and Dr. David Weaver of Indiana University. I also am indebted to the faculty and staff of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism Summer Program, who were so gracious in sharing recollections.

To the 110 Summer Program graduates who took part in the survey: Thank you for remembering so much, for caring enough to participate, and for words that teach lessons in journalism.

Copyright 2006 by Mary Alice Basconi
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Training for Diversity in Journalism:
Tracking the Columbia Summer Program Graduates, 1968 – 1974

by

Mary Alice Basconi

Columbia University's Summer Program, created by Fred Friendly, was the first enduring effort to prepare non-whites for jobs in the news media. It operated from 1968 to 1974 at the Graduate School of Journalism, training 223 journalists for print and broadcast jobs. Three decades after the closing of this elite program, 110 graduates responded to a telephone survey on attitudes toward first employers, careers, and their experiences at Columbia. Results from this exploratory study show respondents spent an average 17.6 years in news media after the Summer Program, and 30.9 percent of respondents spent thirty years or more in journalism. Nearly 42 percent of respondents said they were promoted in their first jobs, and 29.1 percent became managers or supervisors in mainstream media news. Those who left news media cited reasons that seem to contradict results of earlier retention studies on people of color. Graduates rated the training highly.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
ABSTRACT	4
LIST OF TABLES	11
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	13
Statement of the Problem	13
Definition of Terms	15
2. THE ‘WELCOME MAT’	17
The Summer of 1967	17
The Kerner Commission	20
The Mainstream-Media Newsroom	22
Fred Friendly and the Ford Foundation	25
A Broadcast Pioneer	27
The FCC and License Renewals	30
Television Access	34
3. THE SUMMER PROGRAM	38
Laying the Groundwork	38
The Summer of 1968	42

Chapter	Page
Diversity, Jobs, and Print	45
The Middle Years	49
Finances	49
The Partners	51
A Threat to Survival	52
The Broadcast Class of 1971	53
Two Advocates	55
Black Leadership	56
Visiting Editors	57
A Survival Course	58
The Michele Clark Fellowship Program	59
The Second Track The Second Track.....	62
Ambassadors for Journalism	65
4. LITERATURE REVIEW	73
Introduction	73
What Research Said About Ethnicity	73
The Makings of a Journalist	75
On the Job	78
Covering Stories	80
First Job Longevity	82

Chapter	Page
Journalism Careers	83
Staying in Journalism or Switching Careers	85
Advancement Opportunity and Career Longevity	88
Survey of the Summer Program	89
Conclusions and Research Agenda	89
5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS	91
Introduction	91
Research Questions	92
Hypotheses	93
Exploratory Research Questions	93
Exploratory Question 1	94
Exploratory Question 2	94
Exploratory Question 3	95
Exploratory Question 4	95
Exploratory Question 5	95
Exploratory Question 6	96
Exploratory Question 7	96
Exploratory Question 8	97
6. METHOD	98
Survey of Summer Program Graduates	98

Chapter	Page
Research Design	100
Threats to Validity and Limitations	102
7. RESULTS	104
Introduction	104
Respondents	105
Ethnicity and Geography	106
Education	107
Reporting Experience	109
First Jobs	110
Perceptions of First Jobs	113
Autonomy	114
Satisfaction.....	116
Parity.....	118
Respect for Summer Program.....	119
Career Experiences	122
Mainstream Media: Job Titles	123
Organizing.....	126
The Ethnic Press	129
Evaluating the Summer Program	130

Chapter	Page
Hypotheses and Exploratory Questions	136
Hypothesis 1	136
Hypothesis 2	139
Exploratory Question 1	142
Exploratory Question 2	144
Exploratory Question 3	146
Exploratory Question 4	147
Exploratory Question 5	148
Exploratory Question 6	149
Exploratory Question 7	150
Exploratory Question 8	153
8. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE STUDY.....	165
Introduction	165
Survey of Major Findings	166
Future Study.....	172
APPENDICES	174
Appendix A: Summer Program Survey Questionnaire	174
Appendix B: Cover Letter and Release.....	179
Appendix C: First Employers after Summer Program	181

Chapter	Page
Appendix D: Highest Titled Position in Mainstream Media News	182
Appendix E: Last Mainstream Media Employers of Graduates	183
Appendix F: Later Work after Leaving Mainstream Media News	184
Appendix G: Highest Position in Media, Outside News	185
NOTES	186
BIBLIOGRAPHY	220
VITA	229

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Broadcast and Print Students	106
2. Respondents by Gender	106
3. Respondents by Class Year	106
4. Social Groups	107
5. Education Before Summer Program	108
6. Studied Journalism in College/Reporting Experience	108
7. Reporting Experience/Matched or Sent	109
8. Reporting Experience, Mainstream and Ethnic Press	110
9. Class/Years in First Jobs after Summer Program	112
10. First Job Duties by Media Sector	113
11. Freedom to Initiate Stories	116
12. First-Job Satisfaction	118
13. Parity in Assignments	119
14. Respect for Summer Program	122
15. Years in Mainstream News Media	123
16. Social Group/Management or Supervisory Position, Mainstream News	124
17. Print or Broadcast/Last Job Held in Ethnic Media	130
18. Prepared for First Job.....	131
19. Prepared for Journalism Career	131

Table	Page
20. Matched or Sent/Job Placement Rating	132
21. News-Gathering Experience Rating	132
22. 20 years+ in Mainstream Media/Quality of Instruction Rating	134
23. Matched or Sent/Would Repeat Experience	135
24. Matched or Sent/First Job Departure Reasons.....	139
25. Career Departure Reasons	142
26. Matched or Sent/Satisfied with First Job (Tables A and B)	143
27. Sponsorship Categories/Satisfied with First Job	144
28. Matched or Sent/Time in First Jobs	146
29. Matched or Sent/20 years+ in Mainstream Media	147
30. Matched, Reporting Experience/20 years+ in Mainstream Media	148
31. Matched Graduates and Reporting Experience/Supervisory Jobs	148
32. 20 years+ in Mainstream Media/Journalism Education	150
33. Gender/First Job Development Opportunities	151
34. Gender/Management or Supervisory Post, Mainstream News	152
35. Gender/20 years+ in Mainstream Media	153

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Twenty aspiring journalists arrived at Columbia University in July 1968 to begin a whirlwind training program for jobs in the news business. Seventeen were black and three were Hispanic; eighteen were men and two were women. As the first of 223 people of color trained for the craft through what would be called the Summer Program, they represented the first sustained effort to diversify professional ranks of an industry that, generally speaking, had resisted integration. Within seven years, the program “trained and placed in jobs more multi-hued young professionals than the combined forces of the nation’s regular journalism education programs,” Columbia faculty member Phyl Garland observed in 1974.¹

What became of the Summer Program graduates? Aside from individual success stories, little has been reported beyond the fact that some assumed leading roles in the news industry while others pursued careers elsewhere.² This exploratory quantitative analysis takes the first long-range look at where they landed – both in and out of the business. It is based on telephone interviews conducted with 52 percent of the available population, after the deaths of twelve graduates were taken into account.

Most studies that explored reasons for leaving journalism have focused on people still working in news media and their intent to change careers. The few that reported actual departures

told little about the number of years invested in the industry. A study addressing why Summer Program graduates left the news media not only fills a gap in the literature on retention but also provides a means to assess a program that broke new ground for journalism training.

Previous research suggested the possibility that lack of opportunities for advancement in journalism prompted people of color to leave the field. This study examined the degree to which this applied to Summer Program graduates. Focusing on first-job experiences, the study addressed working conditions and perceptions of satisfaction. Of particular interest were responses of graduates who were completely new to journalism: those with no reporting experience who were matched with their first employers. Finally, graduates' assessments of the program provided data of use to journalism educators and managers. Participants' recollections of the program's strengths and weaknesses identified areas that may warrant attention in the classroom. Data on career longevity demonstrated the value of employee training programs, and individual comments illustrated perceptions of problems in the workplace.

In 1978 people of color accounted for 3.95 percent of the journalistic workforce in the newspaper industry and 17 percent of the U.S. population, according to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.³ That year ASNE announced that by 2000 it would achieve newsroom parity, bringing the representation of non-white journalists to the same levels found in the general population.⁴ While ASNE has since restated its goal to reach parity by 2025, recent data suggest the newsroom equality gap is actually widening. The organization reported that between 2003 and 2004 the number of non-whites in newspaper journalism increased by half of a percentage

point, to 13.42 percent, at a time when the 2004 non-white makeup of the U.S. population was estimated at 31.7 percent.⁵ A 2005 report by the Knight Foundation found that “among the 200 largest newspapers, 73 percent employ fewer non-whites, as a share of the newsroom jobs, than they did in some earlier year from 1990 to 2004.”⁶

Journalism educator Lori Edmo has challenged historians to examine what caused the industry to delay the quest for parity.⁷ Bonnie Brennen has advocated the use of stories from news media workers to “help us understand the position of labor in media institutions.”⁸ This research attempts to address both challenges in the context of the political, social, and professional climate of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Definition of Terms

1. The Summer Program. Creators of the project under study first named it the Summer Program in Broadcast Journalism for Members of Minority Groups. When print journalism was added a year later, the name became the Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups. School records from 1970 refer to the Summer Program to Train Members of Minority Groups for Careers in Broadcast and Print Journalism, although the original title returned in 1971 after the print program failed to secure funding. The 1973 and 1974 programs operated as the Michele Clark Fellowship Program for Minority Journalists, honoring a prominent 1970 graduate who died in a plane crash. For consistency this report uses the project’s informal title, “the Summer Program,” under which it was known both at Columbia and in later years at the

University of California, Berkeley.⁹ The Berkeley participants were not included in this study.

2. People of color. As much as possible, people “of color” will serve in this study to address black, Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American students served by the Summer Program. Some scholars argue that the umbrella term “minority” misleads when it applies to a social group with majority status in a given community.¹⁰
3. Non-whites. Groups served by the Summer Program – black, Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American – which, as noted above, may or may not hold minority status in communities. While this term is not accepted by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget for presentation of data on race and ethnicity,¹¹ it is used for the sake of clarity in this research.
4. Blacks. This term will be used as much as possible for the social group often termed African American, as several of the Summer Program participants were of Caribbean descent.
5. Career journalists. In this study, twenty years or more in mainstream news media will characterize a career journalist.

CHAPTER 2

THE ‘WELCOME MAT’

The Summer of 1967

Conflict and change defined the 1960s in a racially divided nation and its even more racially divided mass media. The decade saw progress – the 1964 and 1965 Civil and Voting Rights Acts and the social milestones of the “Great Society”¹ – as well as problems, both in Vietnam and at home. When white journalists sustained injuries in covering the 1965 Watts rebellion in Los Angeles, editors pressed blacks into service as reporters.² University of Maryland journalism educator Alice Bonner called Watts “the turning point in making the passive tokenism of press integration into an urgent cause.”³

But change would not come quickly. Two years later, as racial tensions erupted in urban disturbances across the country, most mainstream media continued to sidestep the newsroom integration issue. A survey that drew responses from 300 managing editors showed 230 African-Americans employed by newspapers represented by the Associated Press Managing Editors Association – 147 of them in non-clerical jobs.⁴ After that summer’s rioting brought frequent news images of burning buildings and militant activists, editors in 1967 professed to seek diversity for their staffs. “The welcome mat,” proclaimed an article in *Editor & Publisher*, “is out for Negroes in the city rooms of American newspapers.”⁵

Meanwhile, President Lyndon B. Johnson had a U.S. Supreme Court vacancy to fill. As Johnson aide Joseph Califano Jr. recounted, the president in June nominated Thurgood Marshall,

the former NAACP lawyer who had successfully argued the landmark school desegregation case *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* before the high court in 1954. Weeks after Marshall's appointment new rioting broke out, first in Newark, then in Detroit, following rumors that blacks had been beaten by police. In Newark, Johnson did not intervene with federal aid. But Detroit erupted in violence just as Newark's troubles subsided, and that situation proved politically problematic for the president. New Jersey Gov. Richard Hughes, a Democrat and Johnson ally, relied on state funds to handle the riots. Republican Gov. George Romney of Michigan, with whom Johnson had little rapport, had suggested federal troops be summoned to quell the intensifying Detroit disturbance.⁶

After exhausting other appeals, the president signed a statement drafted by adviser Abe Fortas that would allow federal troops to restore order. This was justified by the argument that Michigan could not resolve the matter without federal aid. Appearing on television, Johnson used Romney's name fourteen times in relating the governor's inability to regain control.⁷ In response, Romney criticized the way troops were sent to Detroit and blamed the riots on national, rather than local, conditions.⁸ The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under J. Edgar Hoover, had also raised the possibility that Communists and other "subversives" might be exploiting the violence.⁹

The 1967 disturbances caught Johnson at a turbulent time. He was waging war in Vietnam, pushing social programs for his Great Society, winning congressional appropriations for the cities, and worrying about how the violence would affect whites – particularly those in Congress.¹⁰ With riots under way in Detroit, and with his adviser Califano trying to dissuade

him, Johnson on July 27 decided to create the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders,¹¹ otherwise known as the Kerner Commission. In a nationwide television address to announce the plan, Johnson said:

The only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack – mounted at every level – upon the conditions that breed despair and violence. All of us know what those conditions are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease, not enough jobs. We should attack these conditions – not because we are frightened by conflict, but because we are fired by conscience. We should attack them because there is simply no way to achieve a decent and orderly society in America. . .¹²

According to Califano, the president hoped the commission would help whites understand the plight of inner-city residents while showing blacks how Johnson was working on their behalf. Johnson also hoped to pre-empt a congressional riot investigation that might implicate his administration.¹³ Johnson’s critics pointed out his omission of militants from the bipartisan panel.¹⁴ Yet, as Tom Wicker of the *New York Times* noted:

A commission made up of militants, or even influenced by them, could not conceivably have spoken with a voice so effective, so sure to be heard in white, moderate, responsible America. And the importance of this report is that it makes plain that white, moderate, responsible America is where the trouble lies.¹⁵

Johnson, who had the vision of exploring racial strife in America, privately expressed disappointment in the report. By calling for huge increases in federal spending and by claiming that America’s black and white societies were “separate and unequal,” the Kerner Report seemed to disregard Johnson Administration efforts.¹⁶ Later the president conceded that Kerner had made “many good recommendations,” although he did not agree with all of them.¹⁷ According to

Califano, the president thought it “overdramatized” in blaming white racism for the turmoil in the cities, ignored Johnson’s positive contributions, and overlooked how Congress had blocked the White House from doing more.¹⁸ The remainder of Johnson’s presidency included two other violent events: the 1968 assassinations of civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4 and of Democratic presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy on June 5.

The Kerner Commission

Johnson’s Kerner Commission, so named after its chairman, Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner, issued calls to reform on many levels, among them local government, police, the courts, and the media. A million-dollar undertaking, the research employed field surveys, interviews, content analysis, and hearings.¹⁹ What it said about the roots of racial unrest would have far-reaching implications for the American press.

Kerner was not the first to critique the media’s inability to serve diverse communities. The Commission on Freedom of the Press, or Hutchins Commission, in 1947 noted that the media’s failure to accurately portray social groups could “pervert judgment” of audiences; thus, the media were obligated to project a “representative picture of the constituent groups in the society.”²⁰ In January 1968 the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission challenged the news media to hire more people of color.²¹ The Kerner Commission would agree, but was more concerned with the media’s “failure to communicate.”²²

They have not communicated to the majority of their audience – which is white – a sense of the degradation, misery and hopelessness of living in the ghetto. They have not communicated to whites a feeling for the difficulties and frustrations of being a Negro in the United States. They have not shown understanding or appreciation of – and thus have not communicated – a sense of Negro culture, thought or history. Equally important, most newspaper articles and most television programming ignore the fact that an appreciable

part of their audience is black. The world that television and newspapers offer to their black audience is almost totally white, in both appearance and attitude.²³

The Kerner panel found the journalism profession “shockingly” backward in hiring, promoting, and training blacks, reporting that they held fewer than 5 percent of news and editorial jobs nationwide. Moreover, Kerner said blacks accounted for less than 1 percent of all editors and supervisors. Most worked in the ethnic press, where they had little impact on white media consumers. The report warned that tokenism – “the hiring of one Negro reporter, or even two or three – is no longer enough.”²⁴ The panel saw balance in media accounts of the riots, while calling overall news coverage an “exaggeration of both mood and event.”²⁵

Following his testimony before the Kerner Commission and other fact-finding groups, the deputy managing editor of the *Washington Post*, Ben Gilbert, recounted the line of questioning for fellow members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Did the media cover race stories with police reporters? Did they choose sources carefully or just quote the loudest or most sensational? “How many of you,” he wrote, “have editors and reporters who are Negroes to help you make these [news] judgments?” Kerner, along with a panel from the Washington news media and a joint committee from the American Jewish Committee and American Civil Liberties Union, had stopped short of calling for regulation. Yet, all found the media, in Gilbert’s words, guilty of “doing a lousy job.” Gilbert professed shock at hearing references to the “white” press. He asked editors if they really served as a branch of the power structure, passing along news on blacks only when it involved trouble.²⁶

The Kerner Commission did not set out to uncover failings of the press, and only one of the report's seventeen chapters addressed mass media.²⁷ And as Carolyn Martindale has noted, mainstream news media deserve credit for advancing the civil rights movement, since coverage of racial violence in the 1960s "shocked the nation into a realization of the oppression and hostility endured by blacks in the South."²⁸ Over time, Kerner would inspire waves of media self-defense, which tarnished what was considered a golden age of journalism.²⁹ But ultimately, the Kerner findings would do much more. They generated public debate about a problem rarely reported by journalists themselves: the press's inability to integrate the newsroom.

The Mainstream-Media Newsroom

As violent disturbances fueled news stories in cities across the nation, philosophical differences arose among journalists over the merits and methods of covering activists. The same ASNE *Bulletin* in which Gilbert challenged his colleagues to do better contained an essay by *Dallas Times Herald* editor and co-publisher Felix McKnight, a former ASNE president. McKnight acknowledged the news value of the legitimate civil rights struggle but warned against "an overbalanced desire to present a minority cause" and giving voice to the "errant bum".³⁰

I wince when I think of the mileage [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee Chairman] Stokely Carmichael has received from the news media. This dangerous man – and we damn well know he is dangerous, and usually three cuts below minimum news-acceptance standards – is permitted to mouth his way from one street insurrection to another under the protective cloak of a free press and free speech.³¹

As they wrestled with such issues, managers answered hiring surveys from both professional organizations and academia. The results of these indicate Kerner's estimate of non-white hiring had been generous. Kerner's claim that 5 percent of news people were black corresponded with an 11 percent black representation in the population, according to the 1970 Census.³² In 1968 *Columbia Journalism Review* and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith sponsored a mail survey of 889 news media executives.³³ With a 43.6 percent response rate, the survey showed blacks held 4.2 percent of jobs in the industry.³⁴ The *New York Times* participated in the survey but said it did not keep statistics by race. The *Washington Post* reported the largest percentage of black workers – 388 of 1,850.³⁵

While the data revealed neglect in industry hiring, they neither targeted journalists nor separated print from broadcast employees. Temple University journalism educator Edward Traves' 1969 study underscored how far diversity, at least in print media, fell below Kerner Commission estimates. Collecting responses from 196 of the country's 958 dailies with circulations of over 10,000, Traves found 2 percent black representation in newsrooms.³⁶

A retrospective look at the status of newsrooms in 1968 indicated about four hundred non-white journalists at daily papers, but did not disclose their percentage of the total.³⁷ A 1971 Newspaper Guild study, based on responses from seventy-five of the union's units, suggested non-whites accounted for 2.4 percent of editorial workers.³⁸ Although the reports captured data from urban and non-urban areas, they did not reflect the newsroom climate of the cities, where

the disturbances occurred. The 1970 U.S. Census reported that half of the nation's 22.3 million blacks lived in fifty cities and found one-third concentrated in fifteen cities.³⁹

Other factors characterized the news media's racial divide. A look at Washington bureau staffing, an industry guidebook, and ASNE membership revealed examples of institutional resistance to integration. Until 1969, a leading reference guide for the newspaper business, *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook*, segregated black newspapers – or rather, their managers, circulation figures, and advertising contact information – from others in their states and cities under the heading “Negro Newspapers of the United States.”⁴⁰ The practice was discontinued the following year, when all papers were listed by city.⁴¹

Writing in 1969, journalist Jules Witcover found that six of 650 media organizations with Washington bureaus had black reporters in those bureaus. Two of the three major networks, and two out-of-town newspapers or newspaper groups, had black correspondents in Washington. Other than the fact that the city's population was two-thirds black, Witcover pointed out a key reason for Washington bureau diversity. “A reporter can scarcely avoid covering racial stories,” he wrote. “They flow from every branch and agency of the government.”⁴²

Three years later members of the Congressional Black Caucus would join in the criticism,⁴³ following an incident that drew attention to the lily-white population of media elites. In 1972 the Gridiron Club – then composed of white, male Washington journalists – invited U.S. Rep. Shirley Chisholm and several other women to the annual dinner at which the club traditionally satirized politics and politicians. Chisholm, who in 1969 became the first black

woman in Congress, was running for president at the time. Outraged at the invitation, the representative from New York sent a letter of refusal citing the scarcity of blacks and women in eighteen Washington news bureaus. Armed with data from the EEOC, Chisholm said newspapers lagged behind other industries in hiring non-whites, and broadcast performance was not much better.⁴⁴

The industry did take some action. In 1971 the ASNE directed its past president, former Louisville *Courier-Journal* editor Norman Isaacs, to form a committee to examine non-white hiring at newspapers. In reporting his findings a year later, Isaacs said committee members deserved a “Bronze Star for combat duty,” having been denounced by their fellow editors as meddlesome trouble-makers. Other editors responded to queries about non-white hiring levels with personal slurs or patent evasions.⁴⁵ The organization’s first national survey of newsroom employees (reporters, photographers, and editors) found only 1 percent of journalists to be non-white – a level that would not exceed 2 percent for another five years.⁴⁶

Fred Friendly and the Ford Foundation

Kerner did not single out journalism schools in its call for media reform but nudged academia with the suggestion that “training programs should be started at high schools and intensified at colleges.”⁴⁷ The United Negro College Fund reported that only two historically black institutions had journalism programs in the mid-1960s, a figure that would rise to forty by 1970.⁴⁸ In a 1968 study, the UNCF estimated that seven hundred students had enrolled in one or

more mass communications classes at historically black colleges and universities.⁴⁹ However, a subsequent Newspaper Fund study found the numbers significantly lower for journalism graduates. That survey indicated fifty-seven non-whites earned journalism degrees in 1969, twenty-one of them securing jobs at daily newspapers and seven at television stations. According to the study, those hiring levels held steady in 1970 even as the number of non-white journalism graduates increased to ninety-eight.⁵⁰

In Kerner's aftermath, training programs were assembled to prepare people of color for news jobs – some short-lived, others enduring.⁵¹ At Columbia University's acclaimed Graduate School of Journalism, "we . . . felt that we shared the blame,"⁵² recalled Fred W. Friendly, Columbia's Edward R. Murrow Professor of Journalism and chairman of the school's broadcast program. Friendly has been described as "a six-foot-four package of whirling energy."⁵³ He had worked at the highest levels of network news, yet his background as a documentarian had introduced him to civil-rights coverage. Fueled by the urgency of the Kerner report, Friendly the educator immediately saw the opportunity to start something in New York. Ruth Friendly said she and her new husband scrapped plans for a trip to Europe in the summer of 1968 in order to address the training issue. Weeks before Columbia opened its doors to the first Summer Program students, Friendly outlined a plan to her as he was shaving:

He said, "What we have to do is get role models in the media, we have to get minorities in the media." He talked about the 90-day Wonder program in the Army in World War II. In three months, all of a sudden you were an officer. At that moment he said, "We should get a hundred – a hundred people here who want to be journalists, who can't get into graduate school through the normal course."⁵⁴

Friendly wanted people with some experience – not necessarily in journalism – and believed the news media should play a role in the training.⁵⁵

A Broadcast Pioneer

In 1950 Friendly and broadcast legend Edward R. Murrow had developed *Hear it Now*, an award-winning news magazine for CBS radio that evolved into the television documentary series *See it Now*. This showcase for investigative reporting would be a forerunner of *60 Minutes*.⁵⁶ Through *See it Now*, the partners made CBS the first network to address the segregation issue with a 1954 report on how *Brown v. Board of Education* affected two Southern towns.⁵⁷ Their 1957 documentary on school integration in Clinton, Tennessee, was one of the first to examine motives behind race-related violence.⁵⁸

From 1959 to 1964 Friendly served as executive producer of a new documentary news series, *CBS Reports*.⁵⁹ Here, Murrow and Friendly would be best known for two exposés: one revealing the tactics of Communist-hunter Sen. Joseph McCarthy, and another – called “Harvest of Shame” – on living conditions of migrant farm workers, many of whom were black.⁶⁰ The show continued to cover the story of racism in America, documenting Atlanta’s school-integration crisis in a 1960 program entitled “Who Speaks for the South?”⁶¹ Two years later, another documentary showed officials in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, employing a rigorous “literacy test” to prevent blacks from voting.

The network later hailed the Clinton and Hattiesburg documentaries, and others, as “a treasure trove of living history,”⁶² releasing them as a collection of newscasts that chronicled the civil rights movement. But when such programs first were offered to broadcast affiliates, Friendly encountered low acceptance in the Deep South. He wrote that any Southern station manager who aired them “would be under considerable criticism in his community.”⁶³ Alexander Kendrick, in his biography of Murrow, noted that only fifty-seven CBS affiliates bothered to air the civil rights documentaries from *See it Now*.⁶⁴ When Newton Minow assumed leadership of the Federal Communications Commission in 1961, Friendly was among those who complained to him about such lack of cooperation. Minow did not respond.⁶⁵ At the time, regional groups like Monitor South of Bossier City, Louisiana, functioned as a support system for broadcasters leery of network civil rights coverage. Through organized campaigns aimed at “controversial” broadcasts, Monitor South hoped to discourage affiliates from airing shows it deemed offensive.⁶⁶

CBS named Friendly president of its news division in 1964.⁶⁷ He resigned two years later because CBS refused to run live broadcasts of the Senate hearings on Vietnam. In their place the network aired a fifth re-run of *I Love Lucy*, followed by an eighth re-run of *The Real McCoys*.⁶⁸ At the time, according to Columbia journalism school historian James Boylan, Friendly was “the best-known off-camera presence in television.”⁶⁹

The day after his resignation Friendly received a phone call from McGeorge Bundy, the national security adviser to John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, who in 1966 left the White

House to become president of the Ford Foundation.⁷⁰ Journalist Walter Lippmann had alerted Bundy that Friendly might have ideas about non-commercial television, and soon Friendly signed on as the foundation's part-time adviser.⁷¹ While the Ford Foundation occupied Friendly's mornings, another new position claimed his afternoons: the broadcast program at Columbia.⁷² Boylan noted that Friendly was "no stranger:" the school had considered him for a faculty position seven years earlier and had bestowed upon him the Columbia Journalism Award in 1964.⁷³

At the Ford Foundation, Bundy and Friendly shared a vision on two key issues: public television and racial equality. With Friendly's advice, Bundy in 1967 would use millions of the foundation's dollars to help the newly launched Public Broadcast Laboratory. Later hundreds of millions more would create the Public Broadcasting Service and numerous local public stations.⁷⁴ Bundy was passionate about eradicating racism, and he funded projects on the belief that white prejudice was the most destructive of problems facing blacks.⁷⁵ As Bundy biographer Kai Bird noted, "Bundy had taken many risks in his first several years at Ford. He could have played it safe. But he thought the foundation had to be the scout on the battlefield of social reform."⁷⁶

Under Bundy's tenure the foundation would finance eight journalism training programs, of which the Summer Program was the largest and longest-running. Over seven years the Summer Program received \$1 million, or two-thirds of its funding, from the Ford Foundation.⁷⁷

The FCC and License Renewals

The Ford Foundation also played a role in a broadcast reform effort that would have implications for the Summer Program. While all news media were challenged to hire people of color, by the late 1960s broadcasters could lose their licenses over the issue. What came to be known as the WLBT case – or *Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. Federal Communications Commission* – began in the segregationist South at an NBC affiliate in Jackson, Mississippi. In time that station would be transformed by legal challenges to its license – but so would the entire television industry.

Jackson was not the only Southern city where white and black civic leaders clashed over media access, but it was the first community to have its local drama played out before the FCC and later in court. As communications historian Steven D. Classen observed,

During the fifties and sixties the popular media institutions of Mississippi and the South were sites of pitched warfare. What conservative forces within Mississippi and other states perceived as a cultural invasion was fought against with determination and dedication to the status quo and a particular southern “way of life.”⁷⁸

Journalist Kay Mills noted that

WLBT had not covered the issue of segregated schools with any balance, not when [NAACP General Counsel] Thurgood Marshall’s appearance on an NBC network show encountered “cable trouble” and was not broadcast, when NAACP field secretary Medgar Evers unsuccessfully sought airtime to discuss desegregation in Little Rock schools. Station WLBT and others across the South distorted coverage of racial matters or omitted them entirely in their local newscasts. Stay tuned after the national news for the true story, their viewers would be told; then they saw one-sided reports about an epic struggle that was reshaping the country.⁷⁹

Marshall was a guest on the NBC program *World at Home* on September 7, 1955. As director of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the attorney who would one day become the first

black U.S. Supreme Court justice had won *Brown v. Board of Education* a year earlier by successfully challenging the “separate but equal” standard before the Supreme Court.⁸⁰ After the “cable trouble,” the NAACP complained to the FCC. Charging that the Jackson NBC affiliate failed to cover both sides of important issues, the group said a license revocation was in order.⁸¹

WLBT general manager Fred Beard was one of the prominent Mississippi businessmen who belonged to the White Citizens’ Council Association. Beard would later say the station never used a “cable trouble sign,” but he admitted cutting off Marshall’s interview.⁸² Responding in late 1955 to an FCC query, Beard wrote that programs promoting black-white social equality amounted to propaganda. His station and the CBS affiliate, WJTV, wanted to avoid “becoming involved in the issue” by denying air time to both sides in the segregation debate. If he aired the Marshall interview, Beard explained, WBLT would have had to offer time to opposing viewpoints.⁸³

While black activists attempted to get air time in Jackson, Martin Luther King Jr. was complaining that Southern broadcasters distorted coverage of civil-rights demonstrations.⁸⁴ A fateful meeting between King and a fellow minister with a broadcasting background would culminate in a landmark legal case against WLBT, one that would pave the way for more journalists of color to assume prominent roles in television. The minister was Everett C. Parker, director of the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ. According to Mills, sometime in the late 1950s or early 1960s King asked Parker to help address the problem.⁸⁵ Parker obliged by making a tour of the South, where he watched newscast after newscast in six cities. Two factors led Parker to choose Jackson: the negative situation involving local television and the black community, and the church’s affiliation with Tougaloo College, a historically black institution nearby.⁸⁶

Parker, with support of two minister friends, first hoped to effect change through the National Association of Broadcasters.⁸⁷ They asked the NAB to write a letter to member stations, urging them to air the viewpoints of blacks, address them with courtesy titles, and offer racially balanced children's programming. The NAB board unanimously refused.⁸⁸ Next, Parker – as the NAACP had done earlier – turned to the FCC. He enlisted a crew of sympathetic local whites to monitor Jackson's television stations, gathering evidence to challenge the stations' broadcast licenses.⁸⁹

Those who united to contest the license were Mississippi civil rights leaders Aaron Henry and Robert L.T. Smith, the Office of Communication, and the UCC at Tougaloo College.⁹⁰ This citizens' group petitioned the FCC to hold a hearing on license renewals for the two Jackson stations. While the CBS affiliate obtained a three-year license, WLBT received a one-year license, with restrictions. Parker considered that “a slap on the wrist.”⁹¹

But the commission also ruled that the challengers had no legal right, or “standing,” to petition. In 1965 the group took the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. There, the panel led by Chief Circuit Judge Warren Burger held that representatives of the listening public had the right to challenge license renewals. Burger wrote that an FCC hearing was needed to determine the station's qualifications to continue broadcasting in Jackson.⁹² As for the FCC, he wrote:

. . . [I]t elected to post the Wolf to guard the Sheep in the hope that the Wolf would mend his ways because some protection was needed at once and none but the Wolf was handy. This is not a case, however, where the Wolf had either promised or demonstrated any capacity and willingness to change, for WLBT had stoutly denied Appellants' charges of programming misconduct and violations.⁹³

The citizens' group presented evidence at the hearing that the station aimed programming almost exclusively at whites, but after the FCC again ruled in favor of WLBT, the case came before the appellate court once more. In a 1969 opinion written just before assuming his new position as chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court,⁹⁴ Judge Burger took the FCC to task for renewing the license and for the way it handled the challenge. As the court took the unusual step of revoking a license, it paved the way for others to take control of WLBT.⁹⁵

The case has been widely recognized for establishing the right of citizens to bring matters before the FCC. Among them were equal employment opportunities, improvement in children's programming, license-renewal proceedings, and the sales of television stations.⁹⁶ Following the WLBT case the Office of Communication again petitioned the FCC, this time asking the commission to issue and to enforce rules that stations hire and train non-whites and women.⁹⁷ With funding from the Ford Foundation the Office of Communication began actions in twelve Southern cities and in other communities across the country.⁹⁸ It also helped finance the Citizens Communications Center of Washington, D.C.,⁹⁹ a public-interest law firm that helped local groups gain a voice in local programming.¹⁰⁰

Broadcasters who saw their mission as serving a mass audience viewed such developments as expensive, time-consuming problems. "[T]o a growing number of groups across the country, it is clear, broadcasting is too important to be left to the broadcasters," declared the trade journal *Broadcasting* in 1971.¹⁰¹

Television Access

A sympathetic FCC had helped broadcasters hold the line against “public intrusion in their decision-making processes,” yet court decisions after the WLBT case came down on the side of public access.¹⁰² Community groups now pressed stations for pledges to adopt inclusive practices. In signed policy statements broadcasters agreed to cover non-white communities, offer in-depth programs on issues such as poverty, economic development, and culture, and to broadcast public-service announcements for those communities. Groups asked stations to hire non-whites as on-camera reporters, anchors, and public-affairs staff. Parity – seeking employment for non-whites in proportion to their representation in a community – was sought as well.¹⁰³ Meanwhile, in 1971 a New York labor-union initiative reported that twenty-six white network newscasters – including Walter Cronkite, Frank Reynolds, Edwin Newman, and Barbara Walters – signed a statement asking networks to hire more people of color in their newsrooms.¹⁰⁴

While blacks led the charge for newsroom parity, a petition at the National Association of Broadcasters 1970 convention asked that the definition of minority include “Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, American Indians and other disenfranchised and disadvantaged people in the United States.” A spokesman for the National Mexican-American Defamation Committee confronted broadcasters, asking why they “discuss only one ethnic brushfire at a time.”¹⁰⁵

Parker and his associates continued to keep a watchful eye on FCC regulations. Ralph M. Jennings, associate director of the United Church of Christ Office of Communication, analyzed reports stations filed with the FCC in 1971 – the year they began recording employment from

under-represented groups.¹⁰⁶ Those data painted a picture of an industry that was still nearly all white. Jennings found seventy percent of commercial stations had “pure white” management personnel; half the stations had no non-whites in professional jobs; and a number of stations had reduced their non-white employment over the previous year. The study did show that on a national level, non-whites achieved 1 percent gains in overall employment at the 609 commercial stations studied (119 stations did not file documents, or their reports were missing from the files).¹⁰⁷ Yet in four job categories – management, professional, technical, and sales – 34 percent of stations were found to have no people of color.¹⁰⁸ And, of women who worked fulltime, three-fourths held office or clerical jobs.¹⁰⁹

“This dismal report of employment of minorities and women in television is the record broadcasters have made for themselves, putting their best foot forward,” Parker, the Office of Communication director, said at the time.¹¹⁰ “Professionals” did show overall gains, according to the report: 636 non-whites held professional jobs in 1971 (8 percent), rising to 776 a year later (10 percent).¹¹¹

At the same time, CBS issued a report stating non-white overall employment was at its highest levels, rising from 4.8 percent in 1965 to 12.2 percent in 1969, then to 14.3 percent in 1971.¹¹² The Radio and Television News Directors Association also published its own data, saying a newsroom census revealed that 14 percent of news jobs in commercial television were held by people of color.¹¹³ University of Texas journalism educator Mercedes de Uriarte has since noted that those figures were flawed by the inclusion of Spanish-language broadcasters.¹¹⁴

Other factors clouding the employment picture were noted by Wilson and Gutiérrez: the practices of counting a non-white woman “once in the gender category and again in the ethnic category – a ‘two-for-one’ employee;” and of “reclassifying non-white employees into upper job categories while keeping them on the same old jobs with the same low salaries.”¹¹⁵

While broadcasters hired people of color to fulfill expectations of an empowered public, how managers employed them varied by station. As broadcast journalist and educator Lee Thornton noted, after the urban riots “their participation was not a matter of priority for management.”¹¹⁶ At the networks, at least, black viewpoints rarely appeared “in the context of world and national affairs.”¹¹⁷

Churchill Roberts’ content analysis of ninety weekday, early-evening television network newscasts from 1972 and 1973 revealed only fourteen black news correspondents – eleven in the study’s 1972 testing period and three for the period in 1973. Of the fourteen, ABC had black news reporters in six segments, NBC had five, and CBS had three. “While blacks appeared in approximately one-fourth of the news segments,” Roberts wrote, “the majority of the time they were seen but not heard.” Roberts reported that blacks appeared about one-fourth of the time in the analyzed newscasts, yet in forty-seven of them (52 percent) no black was presented in a speaking situation. The study found that blacks often appeared in race and crime-related stories. An occupational analysis of the newscasts indicated blacks often were shown in “blue-collar jobs.”¹¹⁸

In 1968 *Black Journal* appeared at New York City public television station WNET as a four-week special,¹¹⁹ evolving into a weekly show that was “the only national black public affairs series on either public or commercial television.”¹²⁰ Journalism educator Jannette Dates noted that under executive producer Bill Greaves, the award-winning show later “became an incubating center for a generation of young, independent black media producers and directors.”¹²¹ As broadcasters looked for ways to fulfill FCC programming requirements, *Black Journal* inspired a wave of local public-affairs shows across the country. While such programming served as a vehicle for airing diverse viewpoints, the system had yet to achieve true diversity. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1977 released its findings from a study of 40 television stations in major markets, reporting that women and minorities held “subsidiary positions,” with decision-making overwhelmingly in the hands of white males.¹²² The commission contrasted this lack of authority with the “relatively high proportion of minority females (and to a lesser extent minority males)” appearing on-air, suggesting their presence amounted to mere window-dressing. The report also charged that stations misrepresented employment data when it came to minorities, implying that clerks and administrative workers held decision-making positions.¹²³

CHAPTER 3

THE SUMMER PROGRAM

Laying the Groundwork

The Vietnam War, racial injustice, and other issues fueled campus demonstrations across the country in the 1960s. At Columbia, more than one thousand students took part in an April 1968 demonstration, taking over five buildings and “effectively shutting down the University until they were forcibly removed by the New York City police.”¹ In the aftermath Columbia’s finances and morale declined, but students and faculty won “a larger voice in University affairs.”² That year, Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism had fifteen non-white applicants for its regular program.³ At least nine blacks were accepted – a record high.⁴ Previously the school could expect to receive about five applications annually from blacks, from which it would accept one.⁵

Correspondence from Dean Edward W. Barrett to a prospective student suggested that for some members of under-represented groups, cost was a major consideration. In one of seven similar letters he wrote to applicants that spring, Barrett said the journalism school had no way of giving financial aid – but that he hoped to “develop some additional scholarship resources.”⁶ The Higher Education Act of 1965 had authorized student financial aid programs, one of which – the Guaranteed Student Loan Program – would allow graduate students to obtain government-backed loans from commercial lenders. But it would take seven years and several government incentive programs before such loans became widely available.⁷

While the price of a Columbia education prevented some non-whites from entering the graduate school of journalism, the school functioned under fiscal constraints of its own. Author George N. Allen, a Columbia journalism school graduate, wrote that finances at the university had “dried up” after the student demonstrations and that Barrett’s role in calling for more student and faculty participation would eventually cost him his job as dean.⁸ This led to another blow for the journalism school: An interim dean would cut paybacks, or tuition paid to the journalism school by its graduate students, from 100 percent to just 30 percent.⁹

Tuition-paying students could earn a master’s degree at Columbia, whereas the new Summer Program would provide a crash course that offered free tuition, room, and board. With the Ford Foundation grant to cover the bulk of a \$121,000 budget, the program paid a weekly stipend of \$40 to \$60, plus family allowances as needed.¹⁰ Eight participating stations, along with the CBS and ABC news departments, picked up all or part of students’ stipends and family allowances. Companies sponsoring out-of-town students paid travel costs.¹¹

Students needed a college degree to enter the regular journalism school, but the first Summer Program had no such restriction. It aimed to bring people of color into broadcast news while also upgrading skills of those working in the field, giving them greater chances for advancement. “The program will attempt to secure guaranteed employment for persons in the first group and to obtain meaningful promotions for those in the second,” Columbia’s proposal to the Ford Foundation stated. “No commitment can be made, of course, to persons who do not complete the course successfully.”¹²

Columbia minimized publicity that first year to avoid raising expectations of more people than the school could handle. Staff sent telegrams to thirty-five radio and television stations in

cities across the country and made calls to stations in New York – an effort that yielded the names of twenty people already employed in broadcasting. Another drive would target “unaffiliated students” not formally connected with a station or network. The National Urban League Broadcast Skills Bank in New York and other organizations supplied names of people interested in broadcasting careers. Others learned of the program by word of mouth. With 120 applicants for twenty slots, faculty and staff members held interviews in Los Angeles, Denver, New Orleans, Jacksonville, Philadelphia, and seven other cities.¹³

“These spots were so precious that you couldn’t afford to bring anybody in who was not going to take advantage of it and be able to deliver for their employer and for themselves,” recalled Gary Gilson, an adjunct instructor at Columbia. To test the students, Gilson devised a test he considered “almost fool-proof:”

I would send them into a room with a copy of a column on the My Lai Massacre by William F. Buckley Jr. And I said, “He’s written this in 650 words. I want you to re-write what he wrote in three hundred words.” So now I find out if they did their own typing or if their uncle did it; I also find out if they have the discipline to rewrite somebody else’s stuff without putting their own opinion in it. And then they come out, tremendously relieved, after forty-five minutes, and I send them right back in. And I say, “Now use Buckley’s column as a springboard to write your own opinion about the issues he raises, and you don’t have to limit yourself to Mi Lai. You can write about anything you want.” Now I can find out whether they had the ability to think independently.¹⁴

Of those who made the final cut, seven were beginning their careers in the news business; thirteen others had little or no journalism experience. They included a schoolteacher, a postal clerk, a federal employee, a television mailroom supervisor, and a film librarian for a television network. Students ranged in age from twenty to thirty-five, and nine of the twenty had college degrees.¹⁵

Winning startup money from the Ford Foundation was not difficult,¹⁶ but convincing news executives to buy into the concept took some finesse. As they traveled the country to interview candidates, instructors also sold the program to television managers.¹⁷ Columbia wanted more from them than the commitment to sponsor a student for the summer. In a letter to a CBS executive, Friendly reminded him that “one of the Program’s goals is to obtain from each employer an assurance that his candidate will be given a shot at a more responsible job if he completes the course successfully.” Friendly did not ask for a guaranteed promotion but suggested a “tryout at a more responsible post in the news department as a result of the intensive training he’ll receive here.” If the manager did not agree to those terms, the student entered provisionally until Friendly received assurance there would be a chance for his or her promotion.¹⁸

Friendly’s teaching assistant, Tom Bettag, recalled how most of the first-year instructors were Columbia staff members who gave up their summer vacation:

Fred leaned on just about everybody and said, My God, man, this is just too important. Nobody could twist arms like Fred. That first year I think he just held the best members of the faculty that he could get his hands on and said, “You’ve got to do this.” And everybody believed that they did have to do it. It was a good cause and people felt needed and were delighted to be asked.¹⁹

Meanwhile, Friendly dispatched night letters describing the “bold new experimental program” to people he thought the students should meet, including pollster Louis Harris, John Chancellor and David Brinkley of NBC, Roger Mudd and Bill Small of CBS, and Howard K. Smith of ABC.²⁰ The plan called for students to write their own radio and television broadcasts for closed-circuit television, appear on-air to deliver their reports, then view their work as a

group at the end of the day. Students and faculty would critique the final product before watching the network newscasts of Brinkley or Walter Cronkite.²¹ Monday nights were exceptions; the Friendlys would invite the whole group – plus a prominent media figure – to suppers at their spacious home in the Fieldston section of Riverdale, N.Y.²²

The Summer of 1968

Training began early in the morning and ran well into the night as instructors tried to condense the graduate school curriculum for the summer students. Bettag said the small class was an advantage that first year, allowing faculty to work with students individually.²³ Gilson, who also worked as a producer for the Public Broadcast Laboratory, recalled how an instructor would accompany a student on assignments.

It was extremely helpful because the instructor didn't tell them how to do things but was there to ask them hard questions. Like, "What do you think the news is here?" And, "Who are you going to interview?" and "Why are you going to interview that person?" . . . It tended to telescope a lot of the learning that takes longer periods in regular journalism education.²⁴

Columbia professor Melvin Mencher, a former Nieman Fellow at Harvard²⁵ who ran the school's reporting and writing program, borrowed from the law school case-study method and insisted students study the community. Mencher aimed to teach the craft through substance by assigning stories that required background knowledge.²⁶ Turned loose on assignments, they reported on local government issues and attended speeches and press conferences.²⁷ Students

were expected to take part in discussions, produce at least two stories a day, and – as homework – complete reading assignments ranging from *Public Opinion* by Walter Lippmann to *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White. In their spare time students could peruse the *New Yorker* stories of Lillian Ross or the Chicago radio broadcasts of Studs Terkel, plus other readings that dealt with diversity in urban America.²⁸ As Mencher later recalled,

The concept was not to sit them down and talk to them. That's not journalism. While you have to know something, you can't be an empty vessel and set sail in journalism . . . The emphasis was to put them out on the street . . . They were trained to go into the community. You can't report sitting on your duff. You've got to go out and climb the stairs and knock on doors. That was our guiding principle.²⁹

Gilson said faculty tried to guide students, not hand them formulas:

Students would say, "How do you cover a fire?" and we said, "We don't want to tell you how to do anything. We'll tell you things that you're doing that are wrong. But we don't want you all to be cookie-cutters. We want you to be who you are – bring who you are to this thing. We'll try to help you understand what some of the fundamentals are, but it's up to you to go out there and exercise your curiosity."³⁰

Gilson said race relations, as one of the era's top stories, entered the curriculum because students would need to put a race story in context, as they would any other issue.³¹ While the Summer Program would address the black experience, urban affairs, and civil rights,³² Mencher said students "needed no lectures on what it is to be members of a minority group. They wanted, and deserved, training that would enable them to function as journalists in the mainstream media."³³

In that first year Friendly and his staff, working toward a July 8 opening date, had scrambled to assemble an eight-week session on how to report the news. According to Bettag, what became clear from the start was Columbia's own lack of diversity:

These kids were being brought into this place that was being ruled almost completely by white males. That was the beginning of a certain consciousness-raising. Again, everybody at that time felt like, "We're all liberal and socially conscious." And people come and say, "You don't have any women. You don't have any African-Americans. You don't have any Hispanics." And it was demonstrably true.³⁴

Another truth was that Friendly, the former CBS News president, lived in a world far removed from that of much of the class. On one Monday night, as a black student made his way from the subway stop to the Friendly home, a police officer stopped him for questioning and insisted on escorting him to the door. "Fred was furious. He said, 'How dare you stop anyone?'" recalled Ruth Friendly.³⁵ Bettag said those evenings would challenge Friendly in other ways:

These students had never seen that kind of neighborhood. And they said, whether they said the words, the sense of, "You've drawn all the wealth to you, yourself. You should be sharing it with all kinds of people." And those challenges were very, very tough on Fred. But he slowly dealt with it. And it was a huge growth experience.³⁶

Friendly, a dyslexic whose father died when he was eleven and who once spent two years looking for a job in New York, did not envision himself the product of a privileged life. He told students he understood discrimination – he grew up in the 1930s in Providence, R.I., where he would have schoolyard brawls over his Jewish faith.³⁷ Yet to the students, his career and neighborhood proved he was not held back.³⁸

Bettag saw such exchanges as healthy, considering how the topic of race was avoided in those times. “Perhaps one of the better parts of the program was that a lot of these students had never gotten to yell at a white man before,” he said. “And they were allowed to say, ‘Mr. Friendly, you don’t know what you’re talking about.’ But they usually said ‘Mr. Friendly.’”³⁹

While Summer Program staff stayed in contact with employers throughout the session, they devoted the two weeks before the August 30 graduation to interviews for those who lacked sponsors. Some secured jobs through on-campus interviews while others found employment in September. At the end of that month only one of the twenty students lacked employment; by December that student had a radio news job.⁴⁰

Diversity, Jobs, and Print

Besides an extension of the course by two weeks, several new developments would mark the Summer Program’s second year: diversity in faculty, job guarantees, and newspaper journalism. By 1969 Columbia had integrated the staff, in color if not in gender, by hiring two black reporters: Joseph Strickland, a former Nieman Fellow who had reported for the *Detroit News*, and Bob Reid, a 1968 Summer Program graduate in broadcasting.

One of the lessons of 1968 was that training people was not enough: They needed the assurance of a job. Gilson said employers were skeptical and students were frantic during the two-week interview session at the end of that first summer.⁴¹ Out of that came the third component of Columbia’s program – partnership with media organizations. Mencher credited

program administrator Dick Kwartler with asking employers to guarantee jobs for the graduates.⁴² In 1969, if a good candidate came along, Columbia now would try to arrange an interview with a sponsoring news organization in his or her city. On-campus interviews remained part of the program, however, and Friendly would send out a list of graduates and their accomplishments as he invited broadcasters to meet the new trainees.⁴³

According to Gilson, an employer agreed to a job guarantee if their student graduated successfully. If a station nominated someone who did not pass Columbia's test, the company would be offered another candidate identified through the school's application process. Matches and job guarantees prevented awkward moments with campus recruiters desperate to make a safe hire.⁴⁴ "Many of them had no sensitivity whatsoever," Gilson recalled. "I remember one guy coming in and saying in a job interview to an individual student, 'Are you a militant?' I'll never forget that. It was humiliating."⁴⁵ Al Goldstein, who would join the broadcast faculty in 1971, explained that the job guarantees extended to the first year of employment. If employers felt graduates were not performing as expected, they could be fired.⁴⁶

"The sponsors were committed to hiring them," Mencher said of the participating newspapers. "Of course, we had no say in whether the sponsoring paper found them competent on the job. I know of one paper that decided after a time to put the graduate in the business office."⁴⁷

A third change in 1969, a print component, would be under Mencher's direction. After he traveled the country looking for sponsoring papers, Mencher wrote to Friendly, noting some of the obstacles students faced:

Almost all the editors are worried about "qualifications." They believe that few Negroes can write well, and they pride themselves on their staffs. These are large newspapers, most of which hire experienced staffers from other newspapers. They are reluctant to take risks with reporters.⁴⁸

Sensing that the program could do the most good with those with the greatest need, Mencher hired tutors to help students who struggled with grammar.⁴⁹ He chose only one candidate who was college-educated, a man nominated by a Fort Worth editor who wanted to make him the city's first black city hall reporter.⁵⁰ As Mencher found in his travels,

Minorities were passed over for reporting jobs not only because they lacked college training but in some cases because the papers and stations would not hire minority journalists, e.g. Media General, whose director in Richmond made that explicit to me. The papers and stations that cooperated with the program were conscious of this discriminatory past and needed help to break the pattern. There were very few college-trained minority journalists available to them then, and the few around would have had no trouble landing a job. But there simply were not enough of them for these papers and stations.⁵¹

Mencher chose large papers because they were outspoken about the need for non-white journalists, they could afford sponsorship, and they would provide students a setting in which to make an impact.⁵² As he encountered journalists who would be good Summer Program instructors he recommended making outside hires instead of relying solely on Columbia faculty. "A twelve-month teaching year," he told Friendly, "is debilitating."⁵³

Broadcast students used cameras and film to tell their stories on the Summer Program's evening newscast, but print students would have their own newspaper. Stories reflected the program's goal of teaching through real reporting rather than classroom assignments. "Tenants tell of being evicted; Lindsay blamed" and "U.S. urged to use veto on the Mideast" made page one in an early student publication.⁵⁴

Faculty knew students would learn from their mistakes and hoped they would occur over the summer instead of on the job. Broadcast student Joel Garcia didn't bother to read the press kit during a July 16 visit to the Apollo 11 launch site at Kennedy Space Center. Hence, he, another student, and their instructor were apprehended by security guards for taking photographs from a restricted area. Garcia would later detail his missteps in a memo to the instructor, explaining how he misunderstood a press center announcement but noting how it led to a story on lax security at what was then called Cape Kennedy. "It is amazing," he wrote, "how easily one can pass through guards and roadblocks without being properly checked."⁵⁵

The Florida trip had been set up by an ever-determined Fred Friendly, who worked behind the scenes to arrange experiences that would give students "a sense of the journalist's role in society and in history."⁵⁶ Friendly's clout notwithstanding, he received his share of rejection letters. When he failed in a bid to secure President Richard Nixon as a commencement guest,⁵⁷ Friendly asked if he could bring the students to a presidential press conference. The White House again declined, saying that thirty-five extra people would overcrowd the East Room.⁵⁸ In the end, the commencement speaker was Lerone Bennett Jr., former senior editor of *Ebony* magazine,

whose words to the graduates would be recorded in the program's annual report: "Freedom of the press also requires equal access to the media."⁵⁹

The Middle Years

By 1970 the staff was emphatic about securing job guarantees at the program's outset. While most of the 1969 class had been placed successfully by the end of the summer, instructors now began arranging matches in January to avoid the hiring tensions that cast a shadow over the program.⁶⁰ Another 1970 requirement limited candidates to no more than one year of professional news experience.⁶¹ Recruitment, aided by the success of the previous years, drew an even larger pool of applicants – many of whom would be turned away. "[W]e have thrilled and delighted 35 highly qualified, very worthwhile people and we have bitterly disappointed 240 highly qualified, very worthwhile people," complained a Boston broadcaster in a 1970 letter to Friendly.⁶²

Finances

Guaranteed jobs represented the first step toward industry partnership, but Columbia now pressed television and newspaper managers to absorb more of the program costs. The school asked the three major networks and public broadcasting stations for significant contributions to reduce dependence on the Ford Foundation. By 1971 the parties agreed to a two-year commitment to help the industry "recruit, train and employ more minority newsmen."⁶³

Sponsoring stations and newspapers had contributed a total \$35,000 in stipends and travel costs in 1969, but a \$250,000 grant from the Ford Foundation financed most of the program.⁶⁴ That year Columbia President Andrew W. Cordier had written to Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy, expressing hope that tuition payments, along with the “very real costs of administration services,” could be contributed in view of the “[u]niversity’s financial position.”⁶⁵ Stuart Dim of the New York Urban Coalition Communications Skills Bank for Minorities wrote in a 1969 letter to *Columbia Journalism Review* that the foundation’s support had been “crucial,” adding: “What we need, and we do not have it now – is a *genuine* commitment from the media to hire those who are trained in special programs such as the Columbia summer program under Fred W. Friendly. . . .”⁶⁶

Believing the school would be successful in securing outside funding, foundation officials in 1970 expected their Summer Program involvement was nearing the end.⁶⁷ But donors were few: the New York Urban Coalition, at \$5,000; Standard Oil of New Jersey, \$4,000; plus five others who collectively gave \$1,325.⁶⁸ While sponsoring news organizations paid salaries to their candidates during the summer, the Ford Foundation remained the largest donor, allocating more than \$231,000 to the 1970 Summer Program.⁶⁹

Maintaining a student-faculty ratio of three to one, plus hiring top journalists as instructors, meant the Summer Program “had to be extremely well-financed,” Mencher recalled.⁷⁰ The Ford Foundation bore most of the costs for the first three years, but by 1971 an internal funding request indicated a change in strategy. The Ford Foundation now wanted to offer

matching funds for media contributions, since the news industry was the beneficiary. That year the Ford Foundation cut its funding by half as NBC and the CBS Foundation signed on as major sponsors.⁷¹ But the print section would not enjoy the same support. In March 1971 Summer Program instructor Joe Strickland, then assistant to the dean of Harvard University's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, made a last-ditch funding plea aimed at newspapers that had sponsored students in 1969. Touting the Summer Program's success at keeping all but two of its nearly one hundred graduates in journalism, Strickland explained how NBC and CBS had given \$80,000 each, and that he hoped to find ten supportive publishers who would contribute. "Newspapers have, thus far, failed to support the program on a large scale," he wrote to newspaper executives.⁷²

The Partners

Again, news executives from print and broadcasting likely faced different pressures. One of Friendly's many acquaintances was Everett Parker, who would hear of broadcast candidates during his work in challenging station licenses. "We sent people to Friendly all the time, so they could get training and go back and hold jobs. Fred and I were close friends and collaborators," Parker recalled.⁷³ Another helpful contact was Irv Margolis, a NBC executive who wrote a favorable article about the program for a broadcasting trade publication.⁷⁴ CBS, which said non-whites represented 13.8 percent of staff at its owned television stations and 14.9 percent at its radio stations, sent news of the Summer Program to some six hundred affiliates in 1971.⁷⁵

Despite earnest efforts by Norman Isaacs and other ASNE leaders, no parallel system existed for funneling trainees into print journalism jobs. Newspapers functioned on a more independent basis, particularly in the era before widespread chain ownership. Some preferred in-house training. *Wall Street Journal* publisher Dow Jones & Co. sponsored The Newspaper Fund in 1968, which in turn conducted training through the Urban Journalism Workshop in Washington and in eight other cities. The *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *San Francisco Chronicle* also developed training programs for journalists of color.⁷⁶

A Threat to Survival

Other troubles posed a threat to the survival of the Summer Program in 1972. Alice Bonner, a 1972 print graduate who went on to a Nieman Fellowship, wrote that issues of “race, identity and authority were at stake.” According to Bonner, journalists and educators involved in the program engaged in an intense debate over the program’s future, as described in letters housed at the Maynard Institute archives.⁷⁷ She noted:

The central controversy at Columbia in 1972 was in many ways a reflection of the larger challenge journalism diversity efforts faced in the early 1970s: What was the role of black journalists in newly desegregated newsrooms once the urban uprisings they were mostly hired to cover had dissipated? The fate of the program, and especially its print journalism section, remained suspended as professors at Columbia who had made the program successful corresponded with journalists elsewhere who had helped, all weighing its future.⁷⁸

The Broadcast Class of 1971

Part of the uncertainty stemmed from events of the previous summer. Friendly's fondness for teaching on standards, ethics, and the First Amendment had not resonated with some of the 1971 students who viewed them as white-generated ideas.⁷⁹ According to broadcast instructor Goldstein, Friendly wondered if he should continue the program after the academic teaching style used from the start met with resistance from that year's all-broadcast class – which happened to be the program's largest, at thirty-one students.⁸⁰ An incident that occurred when Friendly lectured on a First Amendment court case illustrates how, in those times of racial tension, misplaced words could have lasting effects. As Goldstein recalled:

Finally one student raised his hand and said, "The Supreme Court today made a decision about Muhammad Ali. We want to hear about that. We don't want to hear about this First Amendment stuff." Fred said, "Oh, Muhammad Ali. He's a good boy." The class just exploded. Now, Fred meant it in boxing terms. Boxers are often referred to as boys. But in the context of the dynamics of that course, that was taken as a racial slur.⁸¹

As the 1971 Summer Program came to a close, the class sent Friendly a memo suggesting he invite as speakers former EEOC chairman Clifford Alexander and activist/dramatist Imamu Amiri Baraka.⁸² Goldstein said the students also wanted to dispense with the traditional graduation ceremony. "They said, 'We'd rather see the money spent on social causes.'" As they became outspoken, the students posed a challenge for Friendly. Goldstein recalled how Friendly questioned the students' attitudes. Not understanding their rebellion, Friendly saw the more vocal students at times as disrespectful, not taking into account how much had been done on their

behalf. On the other hand, many students believed the course had a paternalistic aspect they saw as demeaning. One student later described it to Goldstein as a culture clash.⁸³

Gilson, too, found the 1971 program challenging. One student, disruptive from the outset, expressed skepticism and cynicism about the sincerity and motivations of white faculty members. Gilson said he ignored it, mistaking this behavior for what had been an annual three-week “breaking-in” period.⁸⁴

Every year that I did this it would take about three weeks for the students to understand that the faculty was not trying to mold them into something they were not, but that the faculty was trustworthy. It took about three weeks because there was a lot of wariness. Even though the program was generous in terms of paying their living expenses, plus a generous stipend, they wanted to understand where these people [faculty] were coming from. And we did have a mixed-race faculty. But that wasn't good enough. You had to prove to them all we wanted to do was tell them as fast as we can, as much as we can, of what we have learned as working journalists. So they came to understand that and to accept it.⁸⁵

But in 1971 the wariness of the first three weeks persisted for three students, even though Gilson said he thought it would evaporate with each new day of work. Later he would wish he had given the students an ultimatum: Stay and work to earn their jobs, or leave so that others, who had complained about the disruptions, could learn without interference. Toward the end of the summer, as tension grew, Gilson said he called Friendly at the Ford Foundation and asked him to postpone his regular Friday lecture to the students. Gilson said Friendly became furious about missing his weekly session with the class, but he agreed to stay away.⁸⁶

Two Advocates

Mencher said that some of the 1970 print students, during a class interview with Friendly, had grilled the former CBS president instead of letting him depart after speaking. Print instructor Joe Strickland, who apparently had encouraged students to do so, later suggested to Mencher this was the reason Strickland was never rehired.⁸⁷ Mencher left in 1970, he said, because he and Friendly had “pedagogical differences” involving Mencher’s desire to push students into the field versus Friendly’s preference for classroom instruction.⁸⁸

Among the Summer Program papers donated to Columbia University after Friendly’s 1998 death is a 1970 manual outlining a system of instruction that was part newsroom, part class instruction.⁸⁹ Coursework included a twice-weekly reporting class taught by Mencher; a Monday-morning class on issues in the news, featuring invited speakers; and a Friday-morning seminar on news judgment and media issues, led by Friendly.⁹⁰

Without citing reasons, Friendly later would write that he thought he might “lay down the burden and let others pick it up or perhaps merge it into scholarships for the more formal Columbia Master’s program.”⁹¹ At that point Michele Clark, a 1970 broadcast graduate who made a meteoric rise as the first black network correspondent at CBS News, intervened with the insistent message that the Summer Program must go on. She called and visited Friendly in New York, volunteering to teach part-time and to help recruit minority faculty. Friendly said someone in the program called her “our guardian angel.”⁹²

Strickland also played a role in the resurrection of the print program by confiding in a letter to Friendly that students had hurt his feelings, too.⁹³ Quoting from letters between the two men from the Summer Program files, Bonner noted how Strickland ultimately convinced Friendly to stay the course. Friendly wrote that Strickland's encouragement "came just as we were making the final decision on the disposition of the summer program, and it may have been the final shove that helped us decide to go ahead."⁹⁴

Black Leadership

By 1972 seven newspapers and one newspaper chain had pledged enough sponsorship funding to secure a matching contribution from the Ford Foundation, guaranteeing another year of print instruction.⁹⁵ With Mencher no longer involved in the program, Friendly found new direction for newspaper training from two pioneering black journalists of national prominence: *Washington Post* staffer Robert C. Maynard and *New York Times* reporter Earl Caldwell. Caldwell was in the midst of what would become a landmark First Amendment case before the Supreme Court, in which his refusal to appear before a grand jury investigating the Black Panther party led to the test of a reporter's right to protect news sources.⁹⁶ Caldwell agreed to come to Columbia if he could run the print program in partnership with his longtime friend, Maynard. Maynard had recently spent a year as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard and was on sabbatical from the *Post*.⁹⁷

The two met while working for small newspapers in Pennsylvania and had once talked about creating their own school in Washington. Maynard worked in newsroom administration at the time, providing another vantage point that complemented Caldwell's own interest in reporting.⁹⁸ They called on their many friends in the industry to teach and to provide jobs for graduating students. As both men had "an appreciation of what young people could get by going to the small markets," Caldwell said, he and Maynard could share that with recruits and also use it to forge relationships with the sponsoring editors.⁹⁹

Caldwell and Maynard taught about the realities of day-to-day journalism in what they called "armor building." In addition, a nutritionist taught students how food affects their work, and on Sundays the class would gather for ethnic meals to learn about diverse cultures. Students would learn speed-reading, watch the evening news together, and go over the morning newspapers together. At dress-up events – special forums with invited speakers – students even were offered wine so they could learn to keep alcohol consumption in check on the job. In this setting they learned to conduct interviews, to question sharply, if needed, and to pursue a point with a source.¹⁰⁰

Visiting Editors

Because small papers were targeted for sponsorship, Caldwell felt the importance of winning the confidence of editors. "People aren't going to say, 'Yes! Bring us anybody and we'll hire them!' We're talking about bringing into their newsroom something they have not had,

which is the black journalist,” he recalled.¹⁰¹ As the program expanded to eleven weeks, a “Visiting Editor Project” connected sponsors to the Columbia training.¹⁰² Editors who pledged to hire graduates would rotate in and out of the program, helping produce the class newspaper.¹⁰³ “We would always try to get a really gruff white person to be their city editor, so they would get used to this, so they would know the person who is going through their copy – it’s not racial, it’s just the way this is,” Caldwell recalled.¹⁰⁴ The staff formed relationships with editors, and those who came for a short stint one summer would stay for longer stretches the following year.¹⁰⁵ Over time, Caldwell said, the rapport with editors would lead them to think about reporting in new ways:

The idea was we could change the way the . . . large voices, the papers that set the tone, reported the news, [the way they] told these entire communities all of the things they felt they needed to know. We wanted to change that. We wanted to change the voice of America.¹⁰⁶

A Survival Course

After Gilson left the program to return to public television, Friendly filled the broadcast director’s slot by promoting Goldstein, who had taken a leave as administrator of news training programs at NBC News. Lou Potter – one of *Black Journal’s* early directors – would serve as faculty coordinator.¹⁰⁷ Friendly remained an executive director along with Journalism School Dean Elie Abel.¹⁰⁸ Goldstein said he modified the broadcast course by minimizing the lectures on journalistic ethics, philosophy, standards, and practices. While educationally informative, he

said, those lectures “became unintended flashpoints of tension and resentment;”¹⁰⁹ Goldstein preferred to concentrate even more on basic skills:

I turned it more into a survival course: “Here are the basics you need to survive in your first year, because the first year is critical.” They were under a microscope and they needed to be able to survive that first year in order to move on. And I took the position that you will learn the standards, the ethics, the First Amendment, all of those things you will learn as you go along.¹¹⁰

Two tragic developments in 1972 underscored how close the program came to dissolving. Strickland was murdered in September in his Boston apartment, and Clark died December 8 in a Chicago airplane crash.¹¹¹ Although not part of the 1972 staff, Strickland left a stamp on the program by encouraging its leaders to bolster the confidence of students, and by stressing the need for interaction with editors.¹¹² As Bonner has written:

By several measures, the later history of the Summer Program became partly Joe Strickland’s legacy to journalism. From the beginning, Maynard and Caldwell had the benefit of Strickland’s experience and insights to bolster their own considerable backgrounds as they took up the mission of changing the color of the news.¹¹³

The Michele Clark Fellowship Program

In memory of Clark, the Summer Program began its sixth year as the Michele Clark Fellowship Program for Minority Journalists.¹¹⁴ Despite behind-the-scenes negotiations that ensured its 1972 survival, the program once again operated under the threat of funding cutbacks. The Ford Foundation grew more serious about shifting the financial burden to the news industry, and Friendly planned a sabbatical for the 1973-74 academic year.¹¹⁵ Early that summer the

foundation acknowledged the program “has already made a significant contribution” to correcting the under-representation of minorities in communications media. A later study would show that 383 non-whites entered newspaper journalism during the five years of Columbia’s print Summer Program.¹¹⁶ The Summer Program’s seventy print graduates represented 18.2 percent of that total.

With McGeorge Bundy’s approval, a phase-down was planned that would culminate in 1974.¹¹⁷ “If the program is to fly,” Ford official Harold Howe told Friendly, “it will have to seek outside support in appropriate amounts.” Howe added that those involved should be notified soon.¹¹⁸ By then the program operated on a \$391,000 budget, nearly half of it from media sources. But according to a Ford Foundation analysis, the program fell far short of operating as a stand-alone venture:

It had been our hope that broadcasters and newspaper publishers would assume the full costs within a few years of 1971. Movement in this direction is apparently minimal, however. This circumstance may be partly explained by the feeling of the news media that they have now substantially acceded to the demands of the Kerner Commission, and perhaps partly by their lessening perception of public pressure to do so.¹¹⁹

Other pressures arose prior to the 1973 session: one from a white woman who claimed the program discriminated by excluding her,¹²⁰ and the other from the complex means by which money made its way from the foundation, through the university controller’s office, to the journalism school. At one point early in 1973 Summer Program administrator Bryant Rollins

wrote Friendly that finances were so confused that he planned to “get everyone involved locked up together for as long as it takes” to resolve them.¹²¹

Meanwhile, Maynard tapped newspaper reporter Charlayne Hunter-Gault, the first black woman to enter the University of Georgia,¹²² to co-direct the print side of the 1973 program. She recalled student reaction to one of her reading assignments: Zora Neale Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God*. “They were complaining, ‘Oh, man, why do we have to do this? We want to be journalists,’ she recalled. And I said, ‘You’ll know when you finish. And if you don’t know, you don’t belong here.’”¹²³ Then a reporter for the *New York Times*, Hunter-Gault wanted students to learn from Hurston how to listen for dialect, how to make people come alive through words and – most importantly – that people are the most important product. She warned them about job competition, stressing the need for distinctive writing that is accurate and interesting.¹²⁴ Students had no time to complain about editing or sulk over assignments. Hunter-Gault describes the program as “hard-nosed” and remembered dispensing this advice:

“If you want to be a journalist in three months, you’ve got to do what we tell you to do and you’ve got to come back here with a product.” They hate you about half-way through. And they might even hate you when the course is over. But when they walk into a newsroom, and some white editor who doesn’t give one [expletive] about who they are, or what they came through, or what their aspirations are, who just wants the facts, man, you’ve got to be able to do that.¹²⁵

According to Hunter-Gault, students would play key roles in a news media that portrayed blacks as “either some sort of exotic creature or some symbol of existential, problematic life.”¹²⁶

As she recounted, faculty had several reasons for spending summers at Columbia:

We did it out of a love for the profession, we did it out of love for our people, and we did it out of love for justice – to see that black people got into the mainstream of American journalism. And I think overall it was out of a commitment to making sure the public was informed in the best possible way they could be. They had not been, up to that point, because those who were reporting the stories of – IF they were reporting the stories of black America – they were reporting them through a prism that was totally removed from the reality of black American life.¹²⁷

Rollins also recalled the intense commitment from faculty. Editors and reporters, hired as teachers, envisioned what graduates could do:

It wasn't just the students who were tired. It was the faculty. It was incredible. You had folks staying up late at night, early in the morning, going at it because it was more than a program . . . It was a cause. The intention was to make a major shift in the composition, the complexion of American journalism in major markets. So people really believed in the program.¹²⁸

The Second Track

Maynard turned to John L. Dotson Jr., Los Angeles bureau chief for *Newsweek*, to oversee the print program for 1974. Dotson in turn invited *Washington Post* West Coast correspondent Leroy Aarons, a previous Summer Program instructor, to join him as co-director. With an eye toward developing a national program, Dotson hired Frank Sotomayor of the *Los Angeles Times* as well as Walter Stovall of the Associated Press in New York. “We had more West Coast involvement in the program than I think had been involved at any time before that,” Dotson recalled.¹²⁹

He remembered the program as “inclusive of all aspects of newspaper reporting,” taking students from interviewing through profile writing and feature writing. Invigorated by his first

working experience in New York, Dotson credits the Summer Program with inspiring him to look at his career in a different way. He asked *Newsweek* for a New York assignment, became news editor for the magazine, and worked in various newspaper management positions before retiring as president and publisher of the Akron (Ohio) *Beacon Journal*. “I really attribute to that program all sorts of good things, not only creating the excitement for those young journalists but also for giving me ideas that I had never really had before about moving up in the organization at *Newsweek*,”¹³⁰ Dotson said.

Such ideas were also circulating among Summer Program instructors who envisioned ways to groom students for newsroom management. When he joined the program as administrator in 1973, Rollins said, he understood that would be part of his contribution. “It wasn’t enough to be training foot soldiers,” he recalled. “We wanted to take the program to the next level – newsroom management and newsroom decision-making.” Rollins, a former reporter for the *Boston Globe*, had owned a newspaper in Boston and had also been executive editor of the *Amsterdam News*.¹³¹ Goldstein, too, anticipated what he called a “second track” that trained former broadcast students or journalists identified by broadcasters as potential managers. “One of the main goals of students in every class, every year that the program ran was, ‘We want to get our perspective on the air,’” he said.

Additionally, bringing students back could round out the education for Summer Program graduates working in the field. While the program never professed to teach reporters everything they needed to know about journalism in three months, it was not without its critics. In a 1971

interview, NBC executive Irv Margolis was quoted as saying the graduates were “far from finished journalists” who still needed some on-the-job training.¹³² Rollins remembered instructors calling or sitting down with graduates who were having rough experiences on the job.¹³³ The chance to come back would have afforded new opportunities to deepen students’ understanding of the business.

While 1974 faculty entertained hope of a management program, several factors that contributed to the Summer Program’s success – urban tensions, limited access to journalism training, tough FCC requirements – were dissipating. Later research based on a survey of 1,038 newspapers would show that 1974 was a banner year for hiring non-white journalists in print journalism – apparently coinciding with their higher enrollments in journalism schools. According to an ASNE Committee on Minorities survey of newsroom employees conducted by Jay T. Harris of Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, the 108 non-whites entering newspaper jobs that year compare with only thirty in 1969, the first year of the print Summer Program.¹³⁴

Friendly, aware of the Ford Foundation’s waning interest, told Goldstein he would have to find strong support. “He said to make it economically feasible for the Ford Foundation and NBC and CBS to continue funding it I would have to come up with five stations in the top twenty-five markets that would support that idea,” Goldstein said. “I couldn’t get one. And the program folded.”¹³⁵

Ambassadors for Journalism

Among Friendly's papers is a file marked "Michele Clark Material," containing an unsigned speech dated August 16, 1974. It details the accomplishments of the program's graduates:¹³⁶ reporting at all three network flagship stations in New York City, as well as for stations in Los Angeles, Chicago, Cleveland, Washington, Atlanta, Fort Worth, Little Rock, and Jackson, among others; winning newspaper jobs at the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Milwaukee Journal*, *Louisville Courier*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *St. Petersburg Times*, *Atlanta Constitution*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Minneapolis Star*, *Boston Globe*, and other papers. Geraldo Rivera, a 1970 graduate, earned awards for television documentaries and news reports.¹³⁷ The speech grew nostalgic at times, noting that:

Every time I travel to whatever part of the country, when I turn on the local television news program or pick up the local newspaper, I find minority journalists who were discovered, trained and placed on their jobs by this program and its staff.

And who were the Michele Clark Fellows before they entered the program? Approximately half had no prior experience in journalism. They were writers with ability and promise and they had that indefinable something that marked them as potential journalists. They were postmen, secretaries, policemen, librarians, clerks, housewives, doormen, social workers, salesmen and women, office clerks, teachers, welfare case workers, mail room supervisors, anti-poverty workers, receptionists, bookkeepers, cab drivers, firemen, waiters ... and a couple were just plain unemployed.¹³⁸

If Friendly stirred at the thought of how the program opened doors, he appeared to be weary of challenging entrenched employment practices of his profession. The speech acknowledged little progress had been made in hiring and promoting non-whites in the media,

adding: “The fact that we may see a few more non-white faces on our screens may only serve to camouflage the figures that show a far sadder story.” The speech put the 1974 representation of non-white television reporters at 1.5 to 2 percent, compared to 1 percent for newspapers, adding: “It is obvious, from the figures, that reliance on a single program at Columbia, no matter how effective, will not solve the problem.”¹³⁹

In an earlier interview with a *Washington Post* reporter, Friendly had hinted that job placements – a key to the program’s success – were harder to come by. “I think the desire of the broadcasters is a little less than it used to be,” he reportedly said. “The pressure is off. Maybe they feel they’ve done as much as they can.”¹⁴⁰

Nathaniel Sheppard Jr., a 1970 Summer Program graduate who covered the graduation for the *New York Times*, wrote that students had earlier written an editorial objecting to the program’s demise for their in-house newspaper, *Deadline*.¹⁴¹ Quoting Friendly, the *Times* story attributed the program’s closing to waning interest from both the news media and financial backers. In the article, the founder of the Summer Program also vowed to help continue the program in another form, adding:

But now I ask you to put yourself in the shoes of those other minority-group students who pay \$5,000 to attend the regular [Columbia] graduate program but who do not get stipends or guaranteed job placement. The program is discriminatory and cannot continue in its present form.¹⁴²

Complaints from other journalism students had long dogged the program. In 1969 Columbia had nine black graduate students out of an enrollment of 103, and in 1970 the school

accepted eighteen black students in a class of 110.¹⁴³ By then the financial aid that eluded Dean Barrett in 1968 had materialized. Most of the black applicants for the year-long program needed such assistance, and Columbia now had more than \$46,000 available for them.¹⁴⁴ Gilson, who attended the Graduate School of Journalism before he joined the broadcast faculty, noted that “Columbia did not have a good record of placing students. No wonder they felt put upon.”¹⁴⁵ He added,

The country needed journalists of color and you weren’t going to get them unless there was a job guarantee. And I would have pitted most of the students in our program against anybody in the graduate master’s program. These were outstanding young people.¹⁴⁶

Another element was cost. As the *Times* story noted, the average expenditure for each Summer Program student was \$12,000 – more than fees at some medical schools.¹⁴⁷ Rollins, the program’s last administrator, argued that it was money well spent:

This was an extremely sophisticated program. It had all of the elements that would virtually ensure its being successful. So it was expensive. Dollar for dollar, I would say it was certainly worth every penny that Ford and the media folks put into it.¹⁴⁸

Caldwell said that when he learned that lack of money was an obstacle, he personally secured funds for another summer – only to be told the effort was too late. The pressure from Columbia students was an embarrassment, he said, that played a significant role in closing the program.¹⁴⁹ But to Goldstein, one of the most critical factors was the changing climate for broadcasters.¹⁵⁰ FCC regulations requiring minority hiring as a condition of license renewals

were no longer enforced as they were in the early 1970s. Goldstein said the program owes much of its success to historical developments, among them Parker's case against WLBT.¹⁵¹

The demise of the Summer Program, as Boylan has noted, "left hard feelings in its wake, and suspicions that it had not spent its support funds prudently."¹⁵² After the news reached Washington, other objections were voiced by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Taking him to task for the program's demise, staff director John A. Buggs advised Friendly that early results from a commission study on civil rights and broadcasting showed that the closure of "one of the major training vehicles" for people of color could only hinder their employment opportunities.¹⁵³

Whatever storms he may have weathered over the previous seven years, Friendly assured Buggs that "[n]othing in my professional life has been closer to my heart or had higher priority."¹⁵⁴ He told Buggs that funding uncertainty came not only from the foundation but from media. Broadcasters and newspapers had given notice two years earlier that they would curtail support. "It was only after considerable pleading that they agreed to stay on through the 1974 program," he wrote. "Some of these organizations now have their own minority training programs and others, quite frankly, just don't regard minority training with the urgency they once did."¹⁵⁵

Meanwhile, the Ford Foundation had other projects vying for attention. As Friendly explained to Buggs, two groups that had fought to ensure equal access to broadcast media – the United Church of Christ and the Citizens Communication Center – continued to receive the

foundation's grants. In addition, the foundation was funding a \$100 million, five-year program for traditionally black colleges.

Friendly then outlined the situation from an academic perspective, describing the “unique problem” the Summer Program presented to Columbia University. Calling it discriminatory against minority graduate students – who by now numbered twenty-three in a 133-member class¹⁵⁶ – he maintained that running two tracks “so different in their scales of benefits” made sense at a time when few candidates met the standards of the regular program. Such was not the case in later years, when most Summer Program students could have qualified for graduate school admission.¹⁵⁷

Friendly, who came to Columbia School of Journalism at a time when he had to buy broadcast equipment out of his own pocket,¹⁵⁸ would turn his energies to two new projects: writing a book on the First Amendment¹⁵⁹ and creating a series of televised seminars addressing media-law issues.¹⁶⁰ He resigned as professor two years after the closing of the Summer Program, although he returned for occasional lectures.¹⁶¹ The Columbia University Seminars on Media and Society evolved into public television programs that Friendly hosted from 1984 to 1992.¹⁶² The project continues as the Fred Friendly Seminars, still operating from offices at the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism.

Friendly never accepted payment for directing the Summer Program, yet he certainly reaped intangible rewards.¹⁶³ His personal papers contain a letter from one of Melvin Mencher's Nieman Fellowship classmates. Kenneth E. Wilson, an editor at the *San Francisco Chronicle*,

had returned home from serving as a Summer Program instructor to find himself promoted to a news editor's post. Thanking Friendly and Mencher for including him in the project, Wilson wrote of the "happy chemistry of the right time, the right place and the right individuals that produces something very vital and important." Wilson said his education over the summer provided "rare insights" that would later affect what news the *Chronicle* would carry, and how it was presented.¹⁶⁴

Bryant Rollins said Friendly had not failed in his objectives, even as he came to the conclusion that the Summer Program had done all it could at Columbia:

What Fred did was courageous, I think, and tremendously innovative. And I think it came out of his values . . . He did have these dual positions and he was walking a fine line in some ways in trying to figure out how to keep Columbia involved and to keep the Ford Foundation involved.¹⁶⁵

Lee Thornton noted that CBS launched its own "limited" minority training program two years later, as did other individual stations and station groups. But as she wrote in 1990, "[T]here has been no other program like the Columbia model for preparing minority broadcast journalists."¹⁶⁶

Of the graduates, 176 (79 percent) were black, thirty-three (14.8 percent) Hispanic, ten (4.5 percent) Asian American, and four (1.8 percent) Native American. The 136 men represented 61 percent of graduates, while the eighty-seven women represented 39 percent.¹⁶⁷ The print portion of the Summer Program would survive but not in New York. An embittered Maynard took it to the University of California at Berkeley.¹⁶⁸ There, with grants from the Gannett Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and other sources, it would train more than a dozen reporters

and copy editors – again, with job guarantees awaiting them.¹⁶⁹ Under Maynard’s Institute for Journalism Education, the Summer Program would graduate 206 journalists of color before it closed for good in 1989.¹⁷⁰

Caldwell, Dotson, Aarons, Sotomayor, Stovall, and Maynard’s wife, Nancy Hicks Maynard, were among Columbia Summer Program instructors who helped form the institute into what today is a leading advocate for newsroom diversity.¹⁷¹ Known as the Robert C. Maynard Institute for Journalism Education since the 1993 death of its founder, the organization operates under the direction of Maynard’s daughter, Dori J. Maynard. In 2004 it announced a new year-long training program for newspaper managers and the revival of its editing program at the University of Nevada-Reno.¹⁷² Another Institute project, Maynard Management at Kellogg, is a month-long program at Northwestern University that prepares journalists to become senior-level managers.¹⁷³

Caldwell said moving the Summer Program to California afforded new opportunities to send reporters into small communities, yet nothing compared with hopping a subway train in New York to get a story.¹⁷⁴ To Caldwell, the Summer Program’s greatest legacy was its graduates:

You’re talking about a program that has its fingerprints on so many careers . . . the way they became ambassadors, really, for journalism, role models for the black journalists. They had a tremendous impact.¹⁷⁵

Mencher, too, saw what could happen with highly motivated people:

I think it proved one thing. You can take students who don't know much about journalism – my students were truck drivers, elevator operators, delivery men – and train them to become working journalists if the commitment is there, the drive, the desire.¹⁷⁶

CHAPTER 4

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The term “minority” has come to describe an increasing number of social groups since the Kerner Commission report of 1968. Growth within such groups has altered the complexion of American society to such an extent that, as Clint Wilson and Félix Gutiérrez have argued, minority is now a “misleading label.” U.S. population growth rates for blacks, Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans should surpass that of whites through the middle of the 21st Century. Combined, those groups actually represent a majority of the world’s population.¹

Along with this growth has come an explosion in scholarship on the status of news people of color. Education, time in first jobs, number of jobs held, expectation for staying in journalism, job satisfaction, freedom in news coverage – these all came into play as researchers drew portraits of the nation’s non-white press corps. Despite abundant research on retention of non-white journalists, few studies have focused on why they abandoned first jobs or news careers.

What Research Said about Ethnicity

The four groups involved in the Summer Program – blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, have appeared together in quantitative research only in recent literature. At the time of the program a landmark study addressed newsroom ethnicity, but not in terms of

color. In 1971 sociologist John W.C. Johnstone and his colleagues surveyed 1,313 journalists, reporting the percentages of Anglo-Saxons, Germans, Irish, Scandinavians, French, African-Americans, Jews, Italians, and Poles. “Spanish-Americans” and “Orientals” were fewer in number, mentioned only as belonging to “all other groups.”² As a result of this framework, Johnstone’s study has comparative value only in regard to the overall demographic makeup of newsrooms.

Johnstone’s work – along with the research of David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit a decade later – illustrated how little progress had been made in newsroom diversity immediately after Kerner. Johnstone and his colleagues acknowledged their probability sample under-represented blacks. They reported that 2.9 percent of mainstream media journalists were black – 3.9 percent when ethnic media were included. Hispanics represented 1.1 percent of participating journalists at a time when they accounted for 4.7 percent of the population. Native Americans received no mention. The study population was “full-time editorial manpower responsible for the informational content of English-language mass communications in the United States,” including “media which define their target audiences in terms of characteristics such as sex, educational level, or race.”³ As the Johnstone study encompassed more than mainstream news media, it thus may reflect a larger proportion of respondents from non-white groups.

Revisiting America's newsrooms eleven years later, other researchers found little change. In 1982 Weaver and Wilhoit's partial replication of the Johnstone study showed no increase in the proportion of blacks but suggested the presence of Hispanic journalists had dipped to 0.6 percent.⁴ Unlike Johnstone, Weaver and Wilhoit limited their study to mainstream media, excluding the ethnic press.⁵ Asian Americans appeared in this 1982 study as 0.4 percent of respondents. The authors did not view European-Americans as distinct social groups. They consolidated all Caucasian groups, except for Jewish journalists, into an "other" category that accounted for 90 percent of respondents.⁶

A 1992 follow-up study by Weaver and Wilhoit reported gains in proportions of black, Hispanic, and Asian journalists and added data for Native Americans.⁷ In that research, as well as in a 2002 replication, Weaver et al. compensated for an anticipated under-representation of news people of color by over-sampling from the four major non-white journalism associations. Weaver and Wilhoit found in 1982 that non-whites accounted for 3.9 percent of all journalists, with the proportion increasing to 8.2 percent in 1992 and 9.5 percent in 2002.⁸

The Makings of a Journalist

Edmund Lambeth characterized journalism as "a craft with professional responsibilities," arguing that due to its service function and ethical component it cannot be dismissed from the

ranks of the professions.⁹ Yet, as Johnstone and his colleagues acknowledged, journalism has “no single set of procedures or requirements for certifying its practitioners. One does not need a college degree to work as a journalist, and there is no other specific credential, license, or certificate necessary to enter the field.”¹⁰

The 1971 Johnstone study found that 9.4 percent of journalists aged 25 to 34 had no college, 26.6 percent had some college education, and 64 percent held post-secondary degrees.¹¹ A year later, journalism educator Vernon Stone’s study of television news people of all ages found 14 percent had no college, 28 percent had some college, and 58 percent had college degrees.¹²

Having studied journalism in college did not appear to be the norm among news people in the Summer Program era. Johnstone reported that 542 U.S. schools offered some degree of journalism training by 1940, yet at the time of his study only three of every five journalists held college degrees. “[T]he main problem confronting the field today may be in requiring practitioners to complete *any* college or university program rather than in insisting upon their exposure to a specialized curriculum,”¹³ he and his colleagues wrote. Journalism majors made up 22.6 percent of the members of Johnstone’s 1971 national sample, while English majors represented 15 percent.¹⁴

Nonetheless, new hires increasingly found journalism school to be the ticket to jobs in the business. Jay Harris’s study of newspaper journalists found that after 1973 a majority of non-

whites embarking on newspaper careers had earned journalism degrees.¹⁵ And Weaver and Wilhoit in 1982 found that reporters with college majors or minors in journalism were more likely to stay in the news business than those who took other courses of study.¹⁶

Up to 17.5 percent of respondents in Johnstone's 1971 survey did not enter journalism until after age 25, indicating early decision-making was not required for news work. Thirty percent of respondents held other jobs before entering the media, while 70 percent came directly from school.¹⁷

Johnstone and his colleagues found that news managers "are much more likely to fill staff openings with experienced personnel than they are to hire, train and promote their own raw recruits."¹⁸ They found that particularly true for the television industry, which recruits much of its personnel (63.8 percent) from other news outlets and is less likely than other news media to hire the inexperienced.¹⁹ That finding was supported by the work of Michael L. Hilt and Jeremy H. Lipschultz, who surveyed broadcast managers, producers and students on their views about college training. Results indicated that of managers, producers and students, only students believed they were adequately prepared by their college training.²⁰ Hilt and Lipschultz found broadcast professionals skeptical about such college programs, noting:

Maybe we should assume that professionals will tend to believe that few students ever receive adequate hands-on training until they enter the "real world." After all, for a broadcaster who has spent ten or twenty years toiling in the field, they may expect that their efforts naturally make them more knowledgeable than a graduate right out of college.²¹

Similarly, newspaper editors have shown a preference for hiring the college-trained journalist only if they themselves were journalism majors, according to results of Fred Bales' study.²²

On the Job

Journalists in general were a fairly content lot in 1971, with nearly half of Johnstone's respondents (48.5 percent) saying they were very satisfied with their jobs and 38.6 percent saying they were fairly satisfied. Discontent prevailed among about 13 percent of respondents: 11.7 percent said they were fairly dissatisfied with their jobs, and 1.2 percent said they were very dissatisfied.²³ When education was considered, Johnstone found "it is newsmen who come to the media with the strongest educational backgrounds who are the ones most likely to become disenchanted with what they find there."²⁴ The study found journalists who held "participant values," or a preference for investigative, analytic, and advocacy reporting, faced challenges not experienced by colleagues who "define their role in more neutral terms."²⁵

What role does age play in satisfaction? Johnstone found younger broadcast journalists more satisfied than their older colleagues, while the reverse was true for journalists in print.²⁶ This finding for print journalists was supported by a secondary analysis of data from the 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey of 1,455 American workers. In that study, respondents in their twenties to their forties showed job satisfaction increasing with age. Older workers perceived

their jobs are more rewarding, whereas intrinsic job characteristics were most important to younger workers.²⁷

The literature on satisfaction among non-white journalists has offered contradictory findings. A survey conducted at the 1988 National Association of Black Journalists convention indicated 20.7 percent of respondents (N=416) were very satisfied with their jobs and 49.5 percent were fairly satisfied, for an overall satisfaction rating of 70 percent.²⁸ But when those who left journalism were included, a different picture emerged. A 2000 follow-up to the Newspaper Association of America *Preserving Talent* study (a mail survey that included several of the Summer Program's sponsoring newspapers) attributed the highest level of dissatisfaction to black newspaper employees because of "their relatively high expectations of the work environment." That survey included current as well as former employees.²⁹

Pay was another area in which further analysis revealed discrepancies between categories of journalists: In this case, gender was a factor. Johnstone found male journalists under age 25 earned a median income of \$6,934 in 1970, compared to \$5,111 for females. Journalists as a whole averaged \$11,333 a year, with one-fourth of respondents earning less than \$8,000. Only 3 percent of journalists earned more than \$30,000 annually.³⁰ Those from age 25 to 34 were paid a median annual wage of \$10,243 for males and \$8,744 for females.³¹ Comparing that to average U.S. wages indicated male journalists were slightly above the \$6,186 national average for 1970, while females fell slightly below. For the seven years of the Summer Program U.S. workers as a

whole had a mean wage of \$6,699, based on annual averages obtained from the National Average Wage Index.³²

Covering Stories

How successful have reporters been in translating ideas into stories? Variables include climate within a news organization, job description, and individual initiative. Sociologist Herbert J. Gans in 2003 likened news production to an assembly line, with news organizations striving to supply “an always new product to a large number of people, regularly and on time.”³³ In Gans’ view, the “routinization” of news production favors sources that best fit production requirements: government officials who create newsworthy events or statements regularly and quickly while offering more credibility to editors than sources with less authority.³⁴ “Passive reporting,” according to Gans, involves disregarding news about and from people who “lack the power and resources to schedule predictable, especially predictably newsworthy, events.”³⁵

Johnstone’s 1971 study reported 60.1 percent of reporters (N=4,084) had “almost complete freedom” in choosing story topics, with those at large news organizations enjoying less freedom and those at small organizations having the most.³⁶ Overall, 46 percent of respondents said they made their own assignments.³⁷ In their 1992 study, Weaver and Wilhoit found that 41.2 percent of non-white broadcast reporters and 42.8 percent of those in print could get a story covered that they thought should be covered. Among white reporters, the success rate was 48.3 percent for broadcast and 47.1 percent for print.³⁸

But as Gaye Tuchman noted in 1973, certain news positions are likely to produce only one kind of story. In observations at a daily newspaper, Tuchman found staff assigned to the city room between 8 a.m. and midnight typically “covered minor stories by telephone, rewrote copy phoned to them by correspondents scattered in small towns around the state, and wrote obituaries.”³⁹ While available to cover spot news, reporters in such positions did what amounted to “busywork to alleviate the boredom of sitting and waiting for a specifically unforeseen event to happen,”⁴⁰ Tuchman wrote.

Gans, who launched his participant-observer studies at CBS News, NBC News, *Newsweek*, and *Time* between 1965 and 1969, later found most of the black journalists hired at the newsmagazines in the late 1960s left because “they could neither persuade editors that news about the black community was newsworthy nor could they find anyone with whom to discuss their interests in the culture and politics of the black community.”⁴¹ At the networks Gans found that “many of the initially hired blacks left when the ghetto was no longer newsworthy, and went to work at local stations in cities with large black populations.”⁴²

One study suggested even at the local-news level, rank-and-file reporters may not be relied on for story origination. John H. McManus in 1994 examined news discovery at three television stations, finding that reporters at a large station said they submitted ideas for one out of four stories the station covered. However, a check with the station’s assignment desk indicated a “lower level of reporter initiative.” Most of the reporters McManus polled at a “very large

station” considered such enterprise “not their responsibility,” although the research found substantive enterprise work conducted by that station’s investigative team.⁴³

First-Job Longevity

How long did entering journalists work at their first jobs? Two studies from the era of the Summer Program provided reference points for news people of color. Data from the Harris study – collected from newspapers, but not directly from employees – measured retention rates as of 1978. Based on the findings of the survey, 40 percent of those hired in 1968 had left their first newsrooms within ten years. Sixty-five percent of people hired in 1972 had moved on. An average 51 percent of non-white journalists hired from 1968 to 1974 had departed by 1978. For the five years corresponding to the Summer Program’s print classes, the Harris data indicated an average 54 percent of non-white journalists left their first newspaper jobs.⁴⁴

Ten years after the close of Columbia’s Summer Program, its successor organization undertook a survey that measured first-job longevity in year categories and included 204 people of color who had left the news business. The Institute for Journalism Education conducted this study using a sample of 340 journalists. When asked how long they spent at their first newspaper jobs, 19 percent of non-white respondents said one year or less, compared to 25.5 percent of whites. The largest percentage of non-white respondents (24 percent) stayed between one and two years in their first jobs, compared to 29.1 percent of whites. People of color who stayed two or three years represented 21 percent, compared to 18.2 percent for whites. “Four or five years”

accounted for 16 percent of respondents among people of color, compared to 12.7 percent of whites.⁴⁵ Finally, 19 percent of non-white journalists stayed at their first jobs more than five years, compared to 14.5 percent for whites.⁴⁶

Lee B. Becker, Jeffrey W. Fruit, and Susan L. Caudill addressed first-job experiences in their 1983 study on journalism training. Among their findings: Beginning journalists did not earn as much money, or get as much feedback from editors, as they anticipated before entering the news media.⁴⁷ The study sampled journalism graduates at three universities just before graduation, and then a year later (N=184). The researchers reported a 40 percent attrition rate for first jobs – both within and outside the media – just one year after graduation. When asked the reason for job changes, nearly four of ten respondents chose “advancement,” while one-fourth of respondents cited finances. After one year, the percentage of students working in print media declined, while the percentage in public relations “increased noticeably.”⁴⁸

Journalism Careers

Confirming earlier findings by Weaver and Wilhoit, a study by Edward C. Pease noted the relative scarcity of newspaper journalists who stay beyond their mid-forties. Career longevity among non-white journalists, as with news people as a whole, is subject to pressures of burnout, stress, wages and “new horizons beyond the newsroom,” Pease observed.⁴⁹

Two studies addressed careers by measuring job turnover among white and non-white journalists. The IJE study sampled journalists hired from 1969 to 1979, finding an average 3.1 employers for minority journalists (standard deviation: 1.7), compared to 3.8 for whites (standard deviation: 2.4).⁵⁰ Pease's partial replication of that research in 1991 found similar results, with the largest proportion of respondents in both groups having worked for three or four papers. While Pease found a greater percentage of white respondents, compared with non-whites, had worked for five or more papers, he attributed that to an age difference: careers of white journalist were comparatively longer.⁵¹

In 1991 Pease suggested some of the news media's best personnel "were leaving the profession after about twenty years to pursue more lucrative and less stressful occupations."⁵² Indeed, the following year Weaver and Wilhoit's American Journalist study reported a sharp drop in the percentage of non-white journalists who had ten or more years of experience, a phenomenon they attributed to "a combination of less emphasis on hiring minorities before the 1980s and a tendency for minorities to leave journalism." The study found journalists of color averaged nine to eleven years in journalism in 1992, compared to a mean fourteen years for non-minority journalists.⁵³ By 2002 journalists of color spent a mean 12.7 years in mainstream news, while all journalists averaged 16.3 years and non-Hispanic whites averaged 16.7 years, according to Weaver and his colleagues.⁵⁴

Staying in Journalism or Switching Careers

What factors were associated with longer-than-average careers? A study of print journalists suggested early participation in journalism activities paves the way for an early start in the business. Barbara Jill Feldman's secondary analysis of 1989 ASNE survey data indicated the first journalism job "has significant impact on future employment."⁵⁵ The longer a journalist works in print media, the greater the chances of winning an executive promotion at a large paper, Feldman found. Likewise, length of time at a news organization improved a journalist's chances for promotion.⁵⁶ Feldman's work suggested news executives "generally work their way to this position within their organizations," and are more likely to be white males.⁵⁷

What factors were associated with those who planned to leave? Research suggests youth, education, minority status, lack of opportunity and gender.⁵⁸ According to the Johnstone study, in 1971 younger and more-educated journalists said they were most likely to leave the business. Attrition reached its peak among people in the 25-to-34 age group, the research found. "Between a fifth and a quarter of all journalists in this age either decide definitely to leave or question their commitment to remain," Johnstone noted.⁵⁹

Yet in a secondary analysis of the Johnstone data, using respondents of all ages who did reporting at least once a week (N=570), nearly 85 percent were committed to staying in the news media; only 15 percent answered that they preferred to be working elsewhere within five years.⁶⁰ In this 1979 study, Lee Becker, Idowu A. Sobowale, and Robin E. Cobbey found job satisfaction

a significant factor in explaining commitment to jobs and commitment to journalism. Neither background nor training was an important indicator of commitment to journalism.⁶¹

Within twelve years, the picture had undergone a slight change. “[T]he one journalist in ten who has decided to leave the field in the next five years is more likely now to be among the most highly educated, committed journalists who are at mid-career,” Weaver and Wilhoit wrote in 1982. These were 30-to-44-year-old workers who enjoyed job autonomy, as well as reporters who “feel strongly about professional values in the field.”⁶² This study found journalists significantly less-satisfied than in 1971, a development Weaver and Wilhoit attributed to their “youthful median age of 32 years, compared with 36 in the previous decade, and an outlook that seemed to mark the beginning of the end of a romantic view of the craft.”⁶³

Exploring how race and ethnicity affect retention, Pease noted in 1991 that although non-whites changed jobs more regularly, they were not more inclined to leave the newspaper business than their white colleagues. Pease found men were more apt than women to say they would “very likely” remain in newspapers in five years, and more than one-fifth of non-white women said they were “unlikely or “very unlikely” to stay an additional five years in newspapers.⁶⁴

The Associated Press Managing Editors Newsroom Diversity Study of 1996 reported that 31 percent of Native American journalists wanted to leave the news media, followed by 23 percent for African-Americans, 15 percent for whites, 12 percent for Asian Americans, and 7

percent for Hispanics. Nearly half of the black journalists surveyed said they expected to leave newspapers, or leave the media altogether, within five years.⁶⁵

In more recent research, sociologist Lawrence T. McGill's 2001 meta-analysis of thirteen retention studies conducted since 1989 suggested that between one-fifth and one-third of journalists of color did not expect to stay in the news business, a rate much higher than that of white journalists.⁶⁶ The most pronounced statistic came from a 1990 mail survey of 265 Asian American broadcast and print journalists, in which nearly 36 percent of respondents said they were "likely" or "very likely" to leave in the next five years.⁶⁷ In Pease and Smith's 1991 "Newsroom Barometer" report, 18.5 percent of non-whites said they expected to leave newspapers within five years, compared with 14.3 percent for whites.⁶⁸ A study of Hispanic journalists in California found 20 percent of respondents planned to leave in ten years.⁶⁹

While those data are useful in noting commitment to journalism, their comparative value for this research is limited. The studies measured intentions and not outcomes, and reached respondents at differing points in their careers. The few empirical studies encompassing ex-journalists shed some light on why they abandoned the news business. Yet McGill noted that former journalists of color appear in small numbers in much of the research, reducing the reliability of generalizations about their abbreviated careers.⁷⁰ Additional limitations occur when respondents represent select social groups.⁷¹ Samples drawn from membership lists of

professional organizations, as McGill indicated, may not reflect the general population of non-white journalists.⁷²

Advancement Opportunity and Career Longevity

Research analyzed in McGill's study, along with studies by the Institute for Journalism Education and the Newspaper Association of America, examined factors leading people to leave journalism. The 1985 IJE newspaper survey sought respondents at ten cities with "relatively large minority populations with newspapers that have some track record of hiring minorities." In this research, 13 percent of non-whites had left the business and 40 percent planned to leave due to lack of opportunities for advancement, for a total actual and expected departure rate of 53 percent. People of color departed at a rate three times that of whites, and their rate of planned departures was nearly double that of whites.⁷³ The NAA *Preserving Talent* studies of 1995 and 2002 measured causes for departure, but included employees from all newspaper departments. The key reason cited for leaving newspapers was lack of growth and development opportunities, and black respondents reported the highest levels of job dissatisfaction.⁷⁴ McGill's meta-analysis found that advancement opportunities "consistently ranked at or near the top of the list of all factors that might influence the decision of a journalist of color to stay in newspaper journalism."⁷⁵

Yet a conflicting view was provided by Vernon Stone at the University of Missouri, Columbia, who allowed white and non-white respondents to his 1991 study to give multiple answers for leaving the television news business. Among the top reasons for departure were pay, disenchantment, family life, and stress – followed by lack of advancement.⁷⁶

Survey of the Summer Program

The whereabouts of Summer Program graduates had been tracked informally by program staff while the program operated, but Ford Foundation records examined for this study contain no documented follow-up. An evaluation by an outside consultant, based on figures provided by the program, indicated that nine of the first fifty-six graduates, or 16 percent, had dropped out of journalism by 1970.⁷⁷ This seems to contradict instructor Joe Strickland’s statement that only two graduates had left journalism by 1970, although Strickland may have referred only to the print program.⁷⁸ In 1979, citing “difficult decisions” in allocating funds, the Ford Foundation declined to underwrite a follow-up study.⁷⁹

Conclusions and Research Agenda

The Summer Program represented a remarkable undertaking. It combined the best efforts of leading educators and journalists, a new method of training, and promising students from

across the country. History makes clear that the program would meet with resistance as well as acceptance, that sponsoring news organizations would not always stay the course, and that some graduates would soon abandon the business. Others would find lifetime fulfillment in journalism careers.

What did Summer Program graduates – especially those matched to employers – find in their first newsrooms? Were co-workers welcoming or wary of the newly minted journalists? Did new graduates turn ideas into stories? Did they feel satisfied with their first jobs? Ultimately, did they leave to pursue other careers? Did sustained news careers correlate with prior work experience? These and other questions directed this study as it sought to report on that “bold experiment” in journalism training.

CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to locate Summer Program graduates and measure perceptions of their first jobs, careers, and training at Columbia. Based on the absence of previous systematic quantitative research, it is clear that a survey of participants is overdue. The program's small size allows assessment of the number of Summer Program graduates who became career journalists. This study includes questions taken from prior research on non-white journalists. Such studies also offer a context in which to view reasons for leaving mainstream media news careers.

This research tested whether, as suggested by the literature, lack of opportunities for advancement prompted respondents to leave their first jobs and to leave journalism. It also explored whether print or broadcast students, those with prior news experience, people with college degrees, people with journalism degrees, and those promoted at first jobs experienced significant differences in length of careers. The study investigated associations between the independent variable of gender and several dependent variables: career longevity, pay, professional development at first jobs, and managerial experiences. It also measured participation in the ethnic press.

Attempts to draw conclusions from the study should be tempered by the understanding that respondents had a wide range of work experiences, that they comprised a slight majority of all graduates, and that they represented not only the most willing graduates, but also the most accessible.

Research Questions

RQ1: Will lack of opportunities for advancement be the reason most often cited by Summer Program graduates who left their first jobs?

RQ2: Will lack of opportunities for advancement be the reason most often cited by Summer Program graduates who left the news industry

The first research question is based on results from the 1983 study by Becker et al., which suggested advancement issues prompted new journalists to leave first jobs. The second question comes from results of other studies that suggested lack of opportunity motivated people of color to leave journalism.

Eight responses were offered as reasons for leaving first jobs: financial issues, hours, little chance for advancement, issues of race, better opportunity, family, better community, other. Respondents selected from a list of six reasons for changing careers: I discovered I was better suited for other work, salary issues, hours, little chance of advancement, issues of race, other. For both questions, answers that fell into the latter category later would be analyzed. Those who

selected more than one reason would be counted as “other,” although respondents had been asked to choose only one reason.

Hypotheses

H1: “Little chance for advancement” will be the most-cited reason for leaving first jobs.

H2: “Little chance for advancement” will be the most-cited reason for leaving journalism.

These hypotheses were supported by earlier research as cited in the literature review.

Exploratory Research Questions

Eight exploratory questions were developed for this study. Three tested whether an association existed between being matched to news organizations and perceptions and journalism career outcomes of Summer Program graduates. Two questions addressed journalists who, through the Summer Program, represented new entrants to the field of journalism; one measured the degree to which they were given managerial jobs, and another measured career longevity. A question addressed the role of college journalism studies, and another question addressed gender equity. An open question solicited opinions on Summer Program strengths and weaknesses.

The experiences of graduates, a majority of whom were matched with employers, were unprecedented in several respects. Selected from a wide pool of applicants, sent to an elite journalism school, and hired by some of the nation’s top news organizations, they also secured guaranteed jobs. Some would be the first, and often the only, people of color in their newsrooms.

They learned the craft through an intensive crash course that favored hands-on training, and were paid a salary during this process. Such conditions could have led to high expectations on both sides of the employment equation. For these reasons, examining satisfaction with first jobs is one measure of the Summer Program's outcomes. Questions were based on the nature of the program sponsorships. As the system of hiring was unique to the Summer Program, nothing in the literature yielded any indicator of comparable results.

Exploratory Question 1

Did graduates matched to employers report significant differences in job satisfaction, compared with those who were sent by employers?

In matches arranged by the Summer Program, some students worked a few weeks in a newsroom before being sent to Columbia. This question sought to categorize matches of that nature along with those in which the student had no prior experience at a company beyond the initial interview process. Responses from that group of graduates were compared with those from news employees sent to Columbia for training or skills enhancement.

Exploratory Question 2

Did graduates who were matched to news organizations report a significantly shorter amount of time at their first jobs, when compared with those who were sent by employers?

The second exploratory question came from the history. It measured outcomes of a system that placed journalists in jobs, under yearlong guarantees, and at times under the expectation that the employer would promote the Summer Program graduate.

Exploratory Question 3

Did graduates matched to news organizations have significantly lower average career longevity than those sent by employers?

This question, from the research, measures career longevity in years with mainstream media and by the proportion of respondents spending twenty years or more in journalism.

Exploratory Question 4

For graduates who were matched to employers, did those without prior reporting experience stay in journalism as long as those with reporting experience?

Summer Program students had varying levels of experience, but those who had neither reported the news nor worked for sponsoring employers had the most to risk by entering the program. Measuring career longevity for this sub-group provided one indicator of the extent to which the program brought new faces into the industry.

Exploratory Question 5

Among matched respondents, did those with prior reporting experience receive promotions into managerial or supervisory jobs more often than those without prior experience?

The fifth question came from the history. The Summer Program recruited sponsoring papers and broadcast stations by promising training for current employees. But a major function of the program was helping media outlets create new journalism jobs for people of color. The extent to which new hires advanced into news management would be an indicator of the program's success.

Exploratory Question 6

Did Summer Program graduates who studied college journalism stay longer in news media than those who did not?

This question came from the literature review. Prior research has found negative associations between higher education and length of journalism careers. Other research suggested news managers valued experience over education, unless they also received college journalism education. Early research indicated a minority of journalists at the time of the Summer Program had attended journalism school.

Exploratory Question 7

Did female respondents have parity with male respondents for any of the following: pay, professional development, promotions, and years in the news business?

This question was derived from the history. Broadcasters faced sanctions for neglecting to hire women and people of color. This led many to hire an increasing number of so-called "double

minorities,” those both female and non-white. The job histories of Summer Program women would show how they fared in both broadcast and print news organizations.

Exploratory Question 8

What did graduates see as strengths and weaknesses of the Summer Program?

The question also came from the history. Summer Program faculty outlined their objectives, but an analysis of student perceptions would indicate how graduates benefited from the endeavor.

CHAPTER 6

METHOD

Survey of Summer Program Graduates

The Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism provided an unofficial list of Summer Program graduates at the outset of this study. Those graduates later added names of classmates not included on Columbia's roster. Annual program reports to the Ford Foundation verified class size for the seven years of the program.

The author attended UNITY 2004 in Washington, D.C., where an article in the conference newspaper solicited information on the graduates.¹ UNITY produced significant leads on the whereabouts of graduates from some of the participating organizations representing journalists of color: the National Association of Black Journalists, Asian American Journalists Association, National Association of Hispanic Journalists, and Native American Journalists Association. The author also requested information through a notice published in "Hispanic Link Weekly Report,"² along with one in "Journal-isms," Richard Prince's online column on the Institute for Journalism Education website.³

The Fred Friendly Papers at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, contained hometown information for some graduates as well as a list of media organizations that hired them. The Ford Foundation Archives were another source of historical data.

While the program enrolled 225 students, the two students who failed to complete the course reduced the number to 223.⁴ In attempting to find as many of these graduates as possible, the author checked each name using Internet search engines, former employers, online telephone directories, the Leadership Library's News Media Yellow Book, and membership directories for associations serving journalists of color. The LexisNexis search engine provided names of journalists from broadcast transcripts and newspaper bylines. Interview requests were mailed to those without telephone listings, using addresses from online directories such as Anywho and Switchboard.com. Much contact information came from Summer Program participants who retained close ties to classmates.

Names that produced no leads were checked against the Social Security Death Index.⁵ A graduate was eliminated from the survey if his or her name and age, derived from Summer Program records, matched those appearing on the SSDI. Verification was based on addresses, news accounts, or contacts with former employers and persons who knew the graduates. Twelve persons met these criteria, thus reducing the number of potential interviews to 211.

Attempts were made to contact each Summer Program graduate by phone, mail, and electronic mail. Graduates who consented to an interview received a letter that outlined research objectives and stated that the findings would be published, while an accompanying consent form offered confidentiality (Appendix B). Respondents were told they could view quotations from open-ended questions and waive confidentiality, allowing their comments to be attributed. They also could decline permission to be quoted at any stage of the process. Respondents signed forms

granting permission to be interviewed. Later, those selected for quotation authorized use of their comments through a second consent form that offered an opportunity to make corrections. Those who did not return both consent forms were not quoted by name. This procedure was approved by the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University.

Christopher Dunbar makes a case for the benefits of interviewer self-disclosure when research involves issues of race.⁶ In this research, information on both the study and the researcher were provided in response to queries. When asked, for example, “Are you black?” the researcher would answer that she was of European-American, Filipina, and Hispanic heritage. All participants were told in a letter that the interviewer was a news reporter.

Research Design

To avoid a low response bias from mail surveys, a telephone questionnaire (Appendix A) was chosen as the survey instrument. Three groups of questions measured perceptions of first jobs, careers, and the Summer Program. Eliciting responses to open-ended questions yielded information not obtained in closed questioning.

The researcher made initial contact with several respondents at UNITY 2004 but found the convention ill-suited for a face-to-face survey. The one interview begun there later was completed by phone. A telephone pretest of this respondent, plus three others, took place in August and September 2004. Two pretest respondents studied print journalism in the Summer Program and two studied broadcasting; three were black and one was Latino. The remaining

phone surveys occurred from September 2004 to January 2005. The time span reflects the process of obtaining additional phone numbers and addresses from survey respondents.

While a few respondents completed the survey in the estimated time of fifteen minutes, most took considerably more time in recounting stories of first news jobs, careers, and Columbia experiences. One respondent asked to complete the questionnaire through online communication. In the months after the survey, the researcher used electronic mail to verify quotations and elicit missing data.

Questionnaires contained five open and thirty-one closed questions addressing background and professional experience of respondents. Questions covering early job experience used five- and six-point Likert-type scales as response sets. Such scales also gauged perceptions of the Summer Program and how it prepared graduates for jobs and careers. An open question addressed job histories. Finally, graduates identified strengths and oversights of the Summer Program and provided leads on whereabouts of classmates. Interviews were tape-recorded, when permitted. The researcher scheduled phone calls to respondents at home and at work.

Data recorded on five-page questionnaires later were transferred to code sheets. Respondents who could not answer a question were eliminated from the sample for that question. The Statistical Program for the Social Sciences was used to analyze quantitative data using inferential statistics.

Job satisfaction data were compared with findings from previous studies. Qualitative data, taken from open questions and volunteered by respondents, were transcribed and appear as

quotations. Although the lapse of thirty years would suggest a degree of measurement error, it was assumed journalists would remember details from career-shaping experiences.

Threats to Validity and Limitations

Seventy-three broadcast graduates and thirty-seven print graduates participated in the study. In phone calls to sponsoring news organizations, television stations reported more turnover in the three decades since the Summer Program than did newspapers. Thus, more information was available on whereabouts of print students who left their first jobs. The study represents print graduates at a slightly higher rate than for the population, while broadcast respondents appear at a slightly lower rate. The study also under-represents graduates whose surnames have changed in the years since the Summer Program.

Because of the 52.1 percent response rate, the study has a potential non-response bias. A possible factor limiting the number of respondents was the frequent surveys administered to journalists of color. One graduate complained of “being surveyed to death” while another feared the results might be used for “affirmative-action bashing.”⁷

Perceptions of respondents measured by Likert-type scales may reflect differences in response styles. Therefore, comparisons with previous research should be viewed with caution. This is based on the findings of a 1984 study at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, in which black high-school seniors were more likely than white seniors to choose extreme or anchor responses at the end of agree-disagree scales.⁸ Where Likert-type scales are

used, a neutral response was offered on occasion for participants who did not have enough information to make a judgment or have an opinion.⁹

Where respondents were asked about sustained careers in journalism, those who worked as freelance, contract, or part-time journalists were included. While it could be argued that some of these workers no longer work in newsrooms and thus do not contribute to the integration of the workplace, their presence on-air or in print bylines adds to the diversity of the news media. From the news consumer's perspective, therefore, these journalists are still part of the business.

A final limitation concerns broadcast graduates who entered management. While anchor positions at some stations carry management responsibilities, the research did not classify such employees as managers or supervisors. Thus, the data may under-represent the number of respondents who worked as managers.

CHAPTER 7

RESULTS

Introduction

Results from this study might include a list of accomplishments of the most prominent Summer Program graduates: numerous Emmy Awards, a Pulitzer Prize, executive titles, and bylines at elite news organizations. While such achievements carry significance, this research seeks an understanding of how graduates, as a whole, perceived their Columbia experiences and the news jobs that followed. The data allow comparisons between respondents who left journalism and those who stayed.

As the stated purpose of the Summer Program was diversifying newsrooms, frequency data show that participants reflected a mix of cultures and backgrounds extending far beyond ethnicity and color. In gauging their perceptions, dependent variables fell into three categories: first job experiences, career experiences, and evaluation of the Summer Program. For first jobs, separate items were satisfaction, finding parity in assignments, being allowed to turn ideas into stories, co-workers respecting the Summer Program, salary, and length of time in first assignment. For career experiences the dependent variables were number of journalism employers, work as a supervisor or manager, work in ethnic media, and length of time in mainstream media news. In evaluating the Summer Program, dependent variables rated preparation for first jobs, preparation for career, job placements, newsgathering experiences at

Columbia, quality of instruction, and willingness to repeat the experience. Chi-square tests were employed for hypotheses and exploratory research questions.

Respondents

The study located 151 graduates (67.7 percent) of the 223 program participants. Total respondents (N=110) represent 52.1 percent of the population of 211 graduates believed to be living at the time of the survey. Of non-respondents, nineteen came from the broadcasting classes and ten from print. Ten of the non-respondents were working as journalists at the time of the survey or were retired journalists.

Face validity of this survey was indicated by the fact that the proportion of broadcast students to print students (table 1) corresponds to that of the population of graduates, 223. Likewise, the proportion of males and females surveyed (table 2) corresponds to that of the population of 211 believed to be living at the time of the survey. The study slightly under-represents broadcast students and over-represents print students. Sixty-six men (60 percent) and forty-four women (40 percent) responded, compared to the population's 128 men (60.6 percent) and 83 women (39.3 percent).

The median age of respondents was 24 when they entered the program. Both the youngest student (age 20, broadcast) and the oldest student (age 42, print) were sent by sponsoring news organizations. Table 3 indicated the proportions of the population surveyed by class year.

Table 1

Broadcast and print students

	Population	Sample
Broadcast	153 (68.6%)	73 (66.4%)
Print	70 (31.4%)	37 (33.6%)

Note. *N*=223 for population; *N*=110 for sample. Sources for population: Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, Ford Foundation Archives.

Table 2

Respondents by gender

	Population	Sample
Men	128 (60.6%)	66 (60%)
Women	83 (39.3%)	44 (40%)

N=211 for population, excluding 12 deceased; 110 for sample. Source for population: Ford Foundation Archives.

Table 3

Respondents by class year

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Population	20	36	37	31	35	35	29
Sample	11 55%	16 44.4%	19 51.3%	17 54.8%	17 48.6%	18 51.4%	12 41.4%

Note: *N*=223 population, 110 sample. No print section was offered in 1968 or 1971. Source for population: Ford Foundation Archives.

Ethnicity and Geography

Table 4 showed how the sample compares with the population in representation of social groups. Native Americans and Asian Americans were few in number at the Summer Program, and because many of them participated in the survey they are over-represented by the sample. Respondents who volunteered additional information on their ethnicity included members of the Cowlitz, Shoshone-Bannock, and Minnesota Chippewa tribes; Americans of Chinese or Japanese

backgrounds; Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and Cubans with roots in California, Florida, New York, Texas, or New Mexico; blacks born in Aruba, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Urban respondents were predominant, hailing from large markets such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and Newark, NJ. Others came from small cities such as Jackson, MS and Louisville, KY.

Table 4
Social groups

	Frequency, population	Frequency, sample
Black	167 (79.1%)	82 (74.5%)
Hispanic	31 (14.6%)	16 (14.5%)
Asian American	9 (4.2%)	9 (8.2%)
Native American	4 (1.8%)	3 (2.7%)

Note. *N*= 211 for population, excluding twelve deceased; 110 for sample.
Source: Ford Foundation Archives.

Education

One respondent had an elementary-school education, another was a lawyer, and seven held master's degrees. The largest proportion of respondents (sixty-six, or 60 percent) held bachelor's degrees, followed by thirty-five (31.8 percent) with some college education (table 5).

Table 5

Education before Summer Program

	Frequency
Less than high school	1 (.9%)
Some college	35 (31.8%)
College graduate	66 (60.0%)
Master's degree	7 (6.4%)
Doctor of jurisprudence	1 (.9%)

Note. $N=110$.

When those who studied journalism were compared with those who had not, there appeared to be no significant difference in levels of pre-Summer Program reporting experience (table 6). Nine respondents with reporting experience had studied journalism or broadcasting (27.3 percent) while twenty-three did not (29.9 percent). Nine of those who studied college journalism (27.3 percent) worked as reporters before Columbia (table 6). Twenty-four of the thirty-three who studied college journalism or broadcasting (72.7 percent) entered the news business through the Summer Program. Twenty-eight respondents (25.5 percent) had journalism or broadcast degrees, while five minored in journalism.

Table 6

Studied journalism in college/Reporting experience

	No reporting experience	Reporting experience
Studied journalism	24 (72.7%)	9 (27.3%)
Did not study journalism	54 (70.1%)	23 (29.9%)

Note. $N=110$, $\chi^2=.07$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$ Include broadcast studies.

Reporting Experience

As table 7 indicated, fourteen of the forty-two sent by sponsoring media had worked as reporters (33.3%), while eighteen of the matched respondents (26.5 percent) had done reporting. This experience included a person who worked several years as a stringer. Neither a magazine researcher nor a television employee who covered one story before the Summer Program was counted as experienced reporters.

The Summer Program's main objective was placing new faces in the media, although it also helped sponsors train or offer skills enhancement to non-white employees. There appears to be no correlation between sponsorship and reporting experience. Fifty matched respondents (73.5 percent) and twenty-eight "sent" respondents (66.7 percent) had no reporting experience. Among those with experience, eighteen were matched (26.5 percent) and fourteen were sent to Columbia (33.3 percent).

Table 7
Reporting experience/Matched or sent

	No reporting experience	Reporting experience
Matched	50 (73.5%)	18 (26.5%)
Sent	28 (66.7%)	14 (33.3%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=.59$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$ Those with no prior experience include 28 who worked in newsrooms and 14 who were recent college graduates.

The largest group of respondents – thirty-four, or 30.9 percent – came to Columbia from jobs in sales, education, government, and other non-news fields (table 8). Yet almost as many – thirty-two of the 110 respondents (29 percent) – had prior reporting experience, including work

for ethnic media. While the most-experienced respondents had reporting backgrounds, the Summer Program sought applicants with experience in other mainstream media jobs. When those categories are combined, respondents were divided almost equally between those with media exposure and those without. Moreover, inclusion of ethnic media brought the number of students with some background in journalism to sixty-two (56 percent), compared to forty-eight (44 percent) with no news exposure. Seven respondents had reported exclusively for black papers: the *Milwaukee Courier*, the *Atlanta Daily World*, the *San Francisco Sun-Reporter*, and the *Afro-American* papers in Washington and New Jersey. One worked as a part-time reporter and columnist for the black press. One respondent edited a Native American tribal paper, and another worked for black radio station WAOK in Atlanta.

Table 8
Reporting experience, mainstream and ethnic press

Non-news	34 (30.9%)
Reporter	32 (29.1%)
Other, news	27 (24.5%)
Student	14 (12.7%)
Photographer	3 (2.7%)

Note. *N*=110.

First Jobs

First jobs were a major focus of this study because placing graduates in newsrooms was a key objective of the Summer Program. Appendix C indicated where graduates took those jobs, by type of media outlet. The data show a vast majority of respondents went directly into large

markets, large organizations, or both. Small or medium-sized newspapers, as well as broadcast markets, took only twenty-nine of the 110 respondents (26.3 percent).

Respondents were not asked whether they left first jobs voluntarily, although five said they had been terminated. The data show eight graduates left before the end of their first year. Half of them lacked prior reporting experience and had been matched with news organizations. Including those early departures, a total of thirty-three respondents (30 percent) left their first jobs within the first year after graduation; ten (9.1 percent) departed between one and two years later; twenty-two (20 percent) stayed two or three years; fourteen (12.7 percent) stayed four or five years; and thirty-one (28.2 percent) stayed more than five years.

Respondents spent a mean 6.1 years at their first jobs (standard deviation: 8.9), while the median tenure was two years. The shortest stay was just over a month; the longest was thirty-six years. For the class of 1968 alone, five respondents (45.5 percent) said they stayed at their jobs two or three years, while an equal number stayed more than five years (table 9). Only one of the eleven respondents from 1968, the first year of the program, left within the first year (9.1 percent). Of the 1972 class, nine of seventeen respondents (52.9 percent) stayed at their jobs more than five years – the highest rate of all classes in the survey (table 9).

Table 9

Class/Years in first jobs after Summer Program

	1 or less	1-2	2 or 3	4 or 5	+5
1968	1 (9.1%)	0	5 (45.5%)	0	5 (45.5%)
1969	6 (37.5%)	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	6 (37.5%)
1970	6 (31.6%)	2 (10.5%)	4 (21.1%)	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.8%)
1971	7 (41.2%)	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)	4 (23.5%)	1 (5.9%)
1972	4 (23.5%)	0	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.9%)	9 (52.9%)
1973	6 (33.3%)	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	6 (33.3%)
1974	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=30.96$; $df=24$; $p=n.s.$ 1-2 yrs=between 1 and 2 years.

When it came to pay, sixty-seven respondents remembered their initial salaries. Print graduates earned a mean income of \$6,750 upon completing the Summer Program, while broadcast graduates earned an average \$7,270 upon graduation. One graduate said she was paid a salary that amounted to \$3,000 a year to work at a small station in the West. The top annual salary, \$35,000, went to a New York City broadcast journalist. Thirty-eight respondents (56.7 percent of those who reported salaries) had five-figure incomes upon leaving Columbia. Overall, the mean salary for graduates was \$7,090 (standard deviation: \$7,234) and the median was \$7,140.

Bill Deiz, a graduate of the 1968 class who spent twenty-eight years in television and radio before becoming communications director for the non-profit Oregon Partnership, said money was not a primary motivator for aspiring journalists of the era. “When you went into news in the ‘60s it wasn’t with any idea you were going to be enriched by it,” he said. “It was like a public service commitment, like you were going to teach.”¹

While graduates performed a variety of duties in their first jobs, table 10 indicated respondents in broadcasting were more likely than their print counterparts to receive non-reporting duties (twenty-nine of seventy-three, or 39.7 percent). When respondents were divided by media sector, little difference was seen in the proportions of those who became general assignment reporters. Thirty-nine of the broadcast students (53.4 percent) received general assignment positions after the Summer Program, compared to nineteen (51.4 percent) for print journalists. It appears that a significantly larger proportion of print journalists covered beats (fourteen of thirty-seven, or 37.8 percent).

Table 10
First job duties by media sector

	General assignment	Beat	Other
Print	19 (51.4%)	14 (37.8%)	4 (10.8%)
Broadcast	39 (53.4%)	5 (6.8%)	29 (39.7%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=20.51$; $df=2$; $p<.001$.

Forty-six respondents (41.8 percent) said they received promotions – new beats or job titles – in their first jobs after leaving Columbia. Broadcast graduates were promoted at a rate of 45.2 percent, compared to 35.1 percent for print.

Perceptions of First Jobs

To gain a sense of the climate in sponsoring newsrooms, the study posed questions relating to job autonomy (taking a good idea and turning it into a story); job satisfaction; parity in

assignments received; and perceptions of co-worker respect for the Summer Program. Reading response sets to participants over the phone involved repetition and required that questions be clearly stated. Some respondents found the Likert-type scales limiting and could not answer; others elaborated on their answers.

Autonomy

1. When you gathered news, if you had a good idea for a story you thought was important, how often were you able to cover that story?

The first question relates to Weaver and Wilhoit's 1996 study, which showed 42.8 percent of non-white reporters in print journalism could initiate stories "almost always," compared to 41.2 percent for those in broadcasting. In this survey, the response "did not initiate stories" accounts for those whose jobs afforded no opportunities for enterprise stories, as described in the literature review.

The largest proportion of respondents said they enjoyed freedom to cover their own stories (table 11). Respondents who were generally successful in originating stories (those who answered "more often than not" or "almost always") made up 59.2 percent of the sample. When those who did not initiate stories were eliminated, Weaver and Wilhoit's findings were supported. Forty of ninety-four respondents (42.5 percent) almost always were able to pursue an idea for a story. Twenty-one (20.4 percent) said they could do so more often than not.

Owen Wilkerson had worked at the *New Jersey Afro-American* before taking a job at the *Newark Evening News* in 1969. He characterized his experience there as a “fluid transition:”²

They knew of my experience covering things in the city of Newark. I lived in the city of Newark and they relied upon me. Being very honest with you, I had free rein. I would develop a story line and I would give it to the city editor and he would tell me to run with it. After I got out of the Summer Program they broke me in. I remember writing obits for about five months. That was the standard. But they threw me right in the lion’s den.³

Wilkerson went on to become executive editor of *Encore*, a New York-based black newsmagazine. He now works for the city of Newark, N.J., doing legislative analyses and speechwriting for the Newark Municipal Council.

Claude Matthews remembered being the junior person in the newsroom at WTOP in Washington, D.C., which sent him to the Summer Program two months after hiring him in 1968. Matthews recalled initiating some stories from his beat but said covering city government left little opportunity for extended pieces that would effectively take him off the air for long periods of time. The station had an investigative reporter for that kind of work. Matthews asked whether this question was a fair one, as he was learning the business at the time.⁴

Helen Blue, who did her first reporting work after being matched to the *Philadelphia Daily News* in 1972, said she could follow up on her own ideas about half the time:

A couple of times I had very good ideas and they would give my ideas to other people. So that was a major point with me. If it wasn’t like a big deal, they would let me do it. Series and things like that – those I had a hard time getting permission to do.⁵

Another matched graduate from 1972, Francine Cheeks, recounts what happened at WCAU-TV in Philadelphia when she suggested a story on teenage chess players in inner-city schools:

At about the same time that the gang fights were at their peak, the young people were learning and competing and winning awards, state awards and national chess awards. And I wanted to go out and do some stories about the chess teams, and producers said that wasn't news. I had to fight and fight and fight, and argue, and finally after about three or four months of just stonewalling me they finally let me go out and do a story. It probably wasn't because I was persuasive, but because the students were about to go to Europe somewhere to compete!⁶

Table 11
Freedom to initiate stories

Did not initiate stories	Occasionally	Half the time	More often than not	Almost always
9 (8.7%)	19 (18.4%)	14 (13.6%)	21 (20.4%)	40 (38.8%)

Note. N=103.

Satisfaction

2. *All things considered, how satisfied were you with your job at this organization?*

Table 12 indicated the greatest proportion of respondents said they were satisfied with their initial employers. When the thirty-four fairly satisfied (31.8 percent) and the forty-six very satisfied respondents (43 percent) were taken together, eighty (74.8 percent) said they were satisfied with their jobs. Three respondents did not answer this question.

Satisfied employees mentioned names of supportive news directors or editors who gave them opportunities to learn. Longtime Houston anchor Bob Nicholas, a member of the first Summer Program class, recounts his first encounter with the man who would become his news director at Charlotte station WSOC, Carroll McGahee:

When I was in high school in Charlotte, during a time when black people could not walk in the front door, I went to the station looking for a summer internship. Of course, all my friends said, 'You're crazy.' Because I had the gall to walk in the front door and ask for the news director. He threatened to arrest me for coming in the front door. Years later, when they finally integrated broadcasting, McGahee called me and said, 'Remember me?' I said, 'How can I forget you?' . . . We became the best of friends. He became a mentor of mine. And a year later, he said, "You know, there's a program at Columbia University. I'll keep you on full salary and send you up there for this course on how to write for TV." The rest is history.⁷

McGahee made it known that anyone who had a problem with Nicholas also had a problem with him and could look for another job. This smoothed the way for Nicholas' two years at WSOC.

Helen Blue's career includes six years in mainstream media, then eleven years with the black press. Blue recalled her matched assignment:

At first I was satisfied because I was new and I was just happy to be there, to be given an opportunity to be a "real reporter." So I was very satisfied. But after awhile I began to see it was difficult for me to make progress, in terms of the kind of stories I was given generally. I became less satisfied, and by the time I left, I was quite dissatisfied, when they started giving my ideas to other people.⁸

Broadcast graduate Alan Peters was sent to Columbia in 1973 by radio station WBBM in Chicago. He left the company after a year. Peters assesses his first job situation this way:

Columbia was committed to us. My personal impression was that my participation in the Summer Program was a jewel or a feather in the cap of the station, because it gave them

the opportunity to say, “We let a couple of people go to the Summer Program from our station.” But when it came to supervision – a commitment toward developing a career – that was basically lacking. And they didn’t really care. I think they were more interested in appearances.⁹

Table 12
First-job satisfaction

Very dissatisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Neither satisfied/dissatisfied	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
7 (6.5%)	12 (11.2%)	8 (7.5%)	34 (31.8%)	46 (43%)

Note. N=107.

Parity

3. In the assignments you received, did you feel parity with other employees?

Of the 107 respondents who answered this question, seventy-one (64.5 percent) reported parity more than half the time (table 13), with twenty-four choosing “more often than not” (22.4 percent) and forty-seven saying “almost always” (43.9 percent). Eleven said assignment parity occurred about half the time (10 percent).

Several respondents said this question was not specific enough, noting that parity with all employees implied they would have received equal treatment with experienced reporters.

Reporter Gloria Rojas recalled this about her first job at WCBS-TV in New York:

There are guys who have worked in this market a long time and have their beats all cut out for them. And they’re established. And no, I did not have parity with them, nor did I expect to. And every now and then they’d bring in some star, and I didn’t have parity with any of those people. But I certainly had parity with the on-the-street people like myself, after I acquired some skills.¹⁰

Bob Nicholas said his news director, McGahee, mentored him and other black employees, made sure they had good equipment, and became an advocate for civil rights. When Nicholas was assigned to cover a Klu Klux Klan meeting, McGahee called ahead, warning Klansmen not to bother his reporter. Where Nicholas had trouble with parity was in his next job, covering the Midwest for NBC News. “You were always assigned as a backup. You never got to cover the story. Or you did stories on the weekends, or they assigned you to cover stories dealing strictly with poverty,” he recalled.¹¹

Table 13
Parity in assignments

Never	Occasionally	Half the time	More often than not	Almost always
4 (3.7%)	21 (19.6%)	11 (10.3%)	24 (22.4%)	47 (43.9%)

Note. *N* = 107.

Respect for Summer Program

4. My participation in the Summer Program was respected by other newsroom employees.

Thirty-one respondents (29 percent) said they did not know whether other newsroom employees respected their participation in the Summer Program. Yet when categories were collapsed, forty-two of the 107 respondents (39.2 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with the above statement. When those who didn’t know were eliminated, forty-two of the seventy-six

people who answered this question (55.2 percent) said fellow employees respected their participation in the program (table 14).

Some who agreed with this statement added that feelings were mixed regarding the Summer Program. One was Helen Blue, who explained:

They were glad they sent me in that I came back with the right skills, but they felt the Summer Program had given me unrealistic expectations. Because the Summer Program taught us we could do anything, that we could rise to a standard, [that] we should be treated in a certain fashion, and we were good enough to be given opportunities. They felt it was a reason why I could ask to do something. And they felt I didn't have enough experience; they felt I did that as a result of being in the Summer Program. They sent me to learn reporting basics, which I did learn. But they did not expect the other to be there.¹²

Among the seventeen who said they did not encounter respect was a woman sent to Columbia by CBS, who asked that her name not be used. "A lot of people thought this thing [the sponsorship] was imposed on the stations and they had to deal with all these minorities coming into the industry," she said. While still at Columbia, she learned her future station was coaxed into taking her. "So the seeds were planted. They had no respect for the program," she added.¹³

Another reporter said he was looked upon as a curiosity.

"I was asked if I was one of those students who went to the school of magic: You go and, boom! You're a reporter," recalled Sherman Jackson, hired by WNBC in New York. He recalled a co-worker telling him: "You wouldn't be here if you weren't a Puerto Rican."¹⁴ At the time of the survey Jackson worked in Spanish-language broadcasting in New York City, doing consulting work for the NY1 program *Noticias*.

Will Wright, general manager for VOOM HD News – a 24-hour satellite-delivered news program in high definition – said he was sponsored in his first job by CBS News in New York. Wright said co-workers didn't seem to care whether he went to the Summer Program.

“They had more experience; I was the kid,” he recalled. “I had to prove I even should have been there.”¹⁵

Veteran Washington, D.C. anchor Maureen Bunyan, who was sent by Columbia to Milwaukee station WITI in 1970, said she worked there six weeks before moving to a job in a larger market. She described her first broadcast experience this way:

I just remember the attitude toward me was, ‘Oh, you went to that fancy program at Columbia University. So you must be somebody. So you just go ahead and do whatever – you sink or swim’ . . . I was basically a neophyte, obviously I was brand new in the business, but they thought this Columbia imprimatur was supposed to make me into Walter Cronkite over the summer. It certainly couldn't do that.¹⁶

John Milton Wesley was working for Jackson station WLBT when it was run by a multi-racial board, under interim management. His boss, general manager Bob McRaney, urged him to apply for the 1972 Summer Program. McRaney was fired shortly thereafter. Wesley said when he returned from Columbia, colleagues showed respect for the program, even though the news director did not:

He said . . . “You just may have to leave all that new-fangled stuff you learned in New York. You're back in Mississippi now, you know? I just don't want you to forget that you're in Mississippi. I mean, that stuff was good, for you, but that may not have nothing to do with the way we do things around here. I just don't want you and I to have a problem with that because you've been to New York. You understand what I'm saying?”¹⁷

Table 14
Respect for Summer Program

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
4 (3.7%)	13 (12.1%)	17 (15.9%)	21 (19.6%)	21 (19.6%)	31 (29%)

Note. *N*=107.

Career Experiences

When respondents recounted their job histories, data were analyzed to determine patterns of career longevity (table 15). Nine graduates (8.2 percent) said they left the mainstream news industry within the first year. Combining those with three others who departed months later showed a total of twelve (10.9 percent) left journalism within two years of leaving Columbia. Thirty-eight graduates (34.5 percent) worked seven years or less in journalism. However, thirty-four, or 30.9 percent of respondents, stayed in journalism thirty years or more.

Respondents averaged 17.6 years in mainstream news (standard deviation: 12.57), staying a median eighteen years. Fifty-three respondents (48.2 percent) spent twenty years or more in mainstream news media. That includes three part-time columnists or reporters and ten who work on a freelance or contract basis. Excluding part-time, freelance, and contract journalists, forty respondents spent twenty years or more working fulltime in mainstream news (36.3 percent).

Respondents held a mean 2.8 mainstream media journalism jobs after Columbia (standard deviation: 1.96), with a median of two employers. Broadcast students (*N*=73) held a mean 3.05 jobs (standard deviation: 2.10) while print respondents (*N*=37) had a mean 2.30 employers in journalism (standard deviation: 1.56).

Table 15

Years in mainstream news media

	Frequency
1 or less	9 (8.2%)
Between 1 and 2	3 (2.7%)
2 or 3	8 (7.3%)
4 or 5	12 (10.9%)
6 or 7	6 (5.4%)
8 or 9	4 (3.6%)
10 to 14	9 (8.2%)
15 to 19	6 (5.4%)
20 to 24	11 (10.0%)
25 to 29	8 (7.3%)
30 to 34	29 (26.4%)
35+	5 (4.5%)

Note. *N*=110. Years in news are cumulative and not necessarily consecutive.

Mainstream Media: Job Titles

Data on mainstream-media job history were categorized according to job titles in print and broadcast journalism, derived from the job histories supplied by respondents. The highest titled position attained by each respondent during his or her career was recorded in Appendix D. Thirty-four respondents (30.9 percent) remained reporters throughout their journalism careers. Twelve (10.9 percent) had been anchors; ten (9.1 percent) had been producers; nine (8.2 percent) had been an assistant editor or assignment editor; and seven (6.4 percent) had held corporate jobs. Each of the following categories accounted for three of the respondents (2.7 percent): news director, community affairs director, weekend anchor, and copy editor. One or two respondents worked in each of the following categories at some point in their careers: managing editor,

bureau chief, news editor, editorial director, news writer, associate editor, deputy managing editor, print section editor, production assistant or other jobs, both supervisory and non-supervisory.

Sandra C. Dillard, who spent twenty-nine years reporting for the *Denver Post*, sent the interviewer a copy of her 2001 farewell column in which she describes her “wonderful journey” in journalism:

What other career lets you experience parties at The White House and the Colorado State Penitentiary? I had the chance to talk to people as varied as presidents, advice columnists, actors, actresses, coroners, designers, convicts, movie stars, athletes, fashion designers, theater directors and opera singers. The job also gave me the chance to travel to New York, London and Montreal, and several of the 50 states. Where else but in journalism could you observe surgeries and autopsies; or cover fires, murders and events from a state funeral to the 1979 signing of the Camp David peace accord in the White House Rose Garden?¹⁸

Management or supervisory positions in mainstream media were held by twenty-seven black respondents (32.9 percent), two Asian American respondents (22.2 percent) and three Hispanic respondents (18.8 percent), as shown in table 16.

Table 16
Social group/Management or supervisory position, mainstream news

	Supervisor	Non-supervisor
African American	27 (32.9%)	55 (67.1%)
Asian American	2 (22.2%)	7 (77.8%)
Hispanic	3 (18.8%)	13 (81.3%)
Native American	0	3 (100%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=2.85$; $df=3$, $p=n.s.$

Appendix E indicated the last mainstream media employers of Summer Program graduates. When categories are collapsed, major-market network affiliates and large daily newspapers were the most recent employers for forty of respondents (36.3 percent). The largest local network affiliates employed twenty-six, or 23.6 percent of all respondents, while large dailies (circulation 250,000 to 500,000) employed fourteen respondents (12.7 percent). Large-market stations accounted for eleven respondents (10 percent) while major metropolitan dailies (circulation 500,000+) had eight (7.3 percent). Public broadcasting stations accounted for nine respondents (8.2 percent). For those who left journalism, a variety of jobs were reported outside news and outside media.

Appendix F showed later work after leaving mainstream news media. Nine respondents said they left news for other media jobs and nine pursued careers in higher education (8.2 percent each); eight respondents found work in advocacy groups and in government (7.3 percent each). Public relations work drew six respondents (5.5 percent), while the entertainment media drew three (2.7 percent).

Sixty-one of the respondents (55.4 percent) spent some time in media jobs outside the news business (Appendix G). When highest ranking positions were recorded, the most frequently appearing were those in communications or public relations offices for corporations, agencies, advocacy groups, or schools. Fifteen persons (13.6 percent of all respondents) held such jobs. The next most-common position was as media director or government public information officer,

which was reported by seven respondents (6.4 percent). Six respondents (5.5 percent) worked as broadcast or journalism faculty members at colleges or universities.

Organizing

Because Summer Program graduates found themselves in the minority in their newsrooms, if not their communities, several reported attempts to unite non-white journalists to address issues of race and newsroom equality. A few graduates became involved in efforts on behalf of people of color, leading to career interruptions for some and career advancement for others.

Louis Morton had wanted to be in broadcasting since he was eight or nine years old. He got his first break through the Summer Program after Stimson Bullitt, chief executive of King Broadcasting Co., paid a visit to Columbia in 1968. “He had a job of trying to integrate his company,”¹⁹ Morton recalled. Morton moved from his native New York to Seattle to take a radio job with Bullitt’s station but left after two years, citing “issues of race.” Company representatives had offered to send him to Harvard in preparation for a move to the station’s business operations; Morton replied that he preferred journalism. At the time he had been organizing employees “with the intent of getting people of color some voice.”²⁰

Things began to get a little rough because I began to organize some of the minorities in the company and the slings and arrows started coming my way. Because I was the only one to speak up. I guess there are people who live in society and they get conditioned to a certain kind of thing and they don’t want to speak up. Being from New York City, I didn’t know anything *but* that. I decided to go on and pack it up. I stayed there two years, and we moved down to Los Angeles.²¹

Morton still remembered the graduation advice of Columbia Dean Edward Barrett:

“Make sure when you work in the journalism business you keep a bank account labeled ‘Go-to-hell money.’”²²

He said that because you will have to say that to people in this business, because they will compromise you. And I’ve never been compromised, not that I had the ‘Go-to-hell money.’ Sometimes I’d leave a job and I’d come home and tell my wife I quit, and she’d say, ‘No! You didn’t! We’re having a baby!’ But I was one of those people who were motivated by principle.²³

Organizing could happen only if a non-white journalist found other people of color in the newsroom. Harvey Clark used “one of each” to describe the ubiquitous trio of black journalists he encountered at television stations. In 1978 he accepted a job at WCAU-TV in Philadelphia – a city where blacks made up one-third of the population. Clark recalled:

CBS, NBC and ABC in Philadelphia had ‘one of each’ – they had one [black] cameraman, one black reporter, male; one black reporter, female; and zero managers. So it wasn’t way back in the 50s. I can almost name each and every one . . . I can remember when my station hired another black guy. People were concerned about my future. People looked at me and said, ‘Are you okay? Is there something going on?’ They assumed that this was my replacement.²⁴

Clark said he tried to interest the city’s black ministerial association in lobbying media to increase the number of non-white employees, with little immediate response. He recalled telling them: “I can provide you with information but I’m not in a position to lead the charge. I’m in the business and certainly have a career to be concerned about.”²⁵

Will Wright, one of seven Summer Program graduates who immediately went to a network job, describes what took place at CBS News in New York when employees spoke to management through black, Hispanic, and women's "internal civil rights" groups:

We had what was called an organizational summit meeting, where we looked at the fact that the news business always criticized what was going on at the time, in terms of the lack of advancement of people of color and women in America, but then never looked at itself as a microcosm. We found that the very stories we were doing about corporations and institutions that failed to have diversity – well, the same thing existed in CBS News. And we sat down with the top managers at the time . . . as internal civil rights groups to complain and also to challenge CBS News to look at us with the same potential as they did all the white male employees. And as a result, there was a strong movement toward promotion, training, advancement and opportunities. And one would think that initially if you are in an organization and you stand up and become an iconoclast that you would single yourself out [for] non-promotion, but we all decided that none of us could do it alone. If any of us got any benefit out of it, it would be because people before us, and our peers, allowed that door to be opened.²⁶

Wright said at one of those meetings Emerson Stone, then head of CBS Radio News, told employees that he would audition anyone who wanted to work in his department. Wright said he was fortunate: Stone took him under his wing and helped develop Wright's talent. "The point I'm making is, even though African Americans, females and Latinos organized at CBS to challenge the company, it was a positive thing," he said. "There were no reprisals. No one was singled out as trouble-makers. I thought it was very revolutionary for CBS at the time. I don't think there's ever been that type of response at any corporation in America ever since."²⁷

Maureen Bunyan pointed out that because newsroom mentoring was conducted both formally and informally, each Summer Program person affected other people of color entering

the business. Thus, the program's impact was both vertical – in terms of career advancement of individuals – and horizontal, in terms of those brought along by Summer Program graduates. She and others from the program went on to help form outside organizations for non-white journalists: in Bunyan's case, the National Association of Black Journalists, in 1975, and the International Women's Media Foundation in 1990. "The thing about the Summer Program was that it was a precursor," she said. "It showed that an organized effort could bring results."²⁸

The Ethnic Press

Twenty-six respondents (23.6 percent) said they worked as journalists for the ethnic press at some point after they left Columbia. There was no significant difference between the proportions of broadcast graduates and that of print graduates who entered ethnic media. Twenty-one graduates – nearly one of every five respondents – worked in ethnic media at the time of the study or at the end of their careers (table 17). This included part-time work, and at times occurred while respondents held other full-time jobs. Six respondents (percent) became managers in the ethnic media (Appendix F). The inclusion of ethnic media raises the mean time spent in the news business to 18.61 years (standard deviation: 12.31) and the median number of years to nineteen. In this framework, thirty-seven respondents (33.6 percent) said they spent thirty years or more in news media after the Summer Program.

Isabel Bahamonde, a broadcast graduate of the last class at Columbia, spent eight years in English-language news media but also worked twelve years for Spanish-language media. She

said that the term “mainstream media” should encompass ethnic media. The latter include the Spanish-language networks Telemundo and Univisión and their hundreds of affiliates. Spanish language stations consistently earn higher ratings in the South Florida market when compared with their English-language counterparts, she noted.²⁹

Helen Blue, editor of the *Philadelphia New Observer*, explained why she has embraced the black press:

It was almost like you couldn't have skills and work for the African-American press. I did, and people began to really appreciate my work. A lot of things that were going on in the African-American community were not getting covered in the mainstream press, and they were not covering [community events] like I was covering them. I got my reputation in the African-American press. Now I'm a committed advocate: I go out and speak on the importance of telling our own stories, all the time. It's important to support the African-American press. If we weren't there, we'd be really missed.³⁰

Table 17
Print or broadcast/Last job held in ethnic media

	No	Yes
Print	27 (73%)	10 (27%)
Broadcast	62 (84.9%)	11 (15.1%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=2.27$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$

Evaluating the Summer Program

Graduates were asked to rate their training in six areas: preparation for job, preparation for career, job placement, news-gathering experience at Columbia, quality of instruction, and whether they would repeat the experience.

The survey asked respondents whether they agreed with the following statement: “My training at Columbia prepared me for demands of this job.” Of graduates who gave responses (N=107), ninety-two (85.9 percent) felt prepared for their initial employers. Six respondents (5.6 percent) disagreed with the statement, and nine (8.4 percent) were neutral (table 18).

Table 18
Prepared for first job

Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
6 (5.6%)	9 (8.4%)	40 (37.4%)	52 (48.6%)

Note. N=107.

As seen in table 19, fourteen respondents (12.8 percent) said Columbia completely prepared them for journalism careers, while sixty-seven of 109 respondents (61.5 percent) said the training prepared them “a great deal.” Twenty-four (22 percent) said “somewhat,” three (2.8 percent) said “hardly” and one said “not at all.”

Table 19
Prepared for journalism career

Not at all	Hardly	Somewhat	A great deal	Completely
1 (.9%)	3 (2.8%)	24 (22%)	67 (61.5%)	14 (12.8%)

Note. N=109.

Respondents were divided according to whether they held jobs with sponsoring organizations or were matched by Columbia. When asked to rate their job placements, forty-four of sixty-five matched respondents said they were very satisfied (67.7 percent) and ten were fairly

satisfied (15.4 percent). Collapsing categories of “very” and “fairly” dissatisfied showed six were generally dissatisfied (9.3 percent); five others (7.7 percent) were neutral (table 20). There appears to be no significant difference in job-placement rating between respondents who were matched and those who were sent to Columbia.

Table 20

Matched or sent/Job placement rating

	Very dissatisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Neutral	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
Matched	2 (3.1%)	4 (6.2%)	5 (7.7%)	10 (15.4%)	44 (67.7%)
Sent	0	0	3 (8.3%)	5 (13.9%)	28 (77.8%)

Note. $N=101$; $\chi^2=3.7$; $df=4$; $p=n.s.$ Matched respondents had no prior ties to employers, while those sent had worked for the sponsoring organization.

The news-gathering instruction offered at Columbia, which provided students professional guidance as they covered events in New York City, also drew strong approval ratings (table 21). Seventy-seven respondents (71.3 percent) were very satisfied and twenty-three were fairly satisfied (21.3 percent) with this experience, for an overall satisfaction rating of 92.6 percent ($N=108$). Four neutral respondents and four who were dissatisfied together accounted for 7.4 percent of those who answered this question.

Table 21

News-gathering experience rating

Very dissatisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Neutral	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
1 (.9%)	3 (2.8%)	4 (3.7%)	23 (21.3%)	77 (71.3%)

Note: $N=108$.

Quality of instruction received the highest ratings (table 22). Student responses (N=109) showed a 98.1 percent overall satisfaction rating among people who spent twenty years or more in journalism (9.6 percent fairly satisfied, 88.5 percent very satisfied), and a 93 percent satisfaction rating among those who stayed fewer than twenty years (21.1 percent fairly satisfied, 71.9 percent very satisfied). The eighty-seven graduates who were “very satisfied” with the Summer Program instruction represented 83.6 percent of respondents. No significant difference was found between respondents who spent fewer than twenty years in journalism and those who stayed longer.

Ben Wong, a 1974 broadcast graduate who was sponsored by San Francisco television station KRON, remembered the variety of assignments he received as a reporter in the Summer Program.

I would ride the subway to Harlem to cover some drug methadone program, and the next day I would go to Midtown Manhattan to cover a press conference with General Motors, where the PR people would surround us and feed us and treat us like kings.³¹

Wong now works as senior-writer for the morning news program at San Francisco station KGO.

Claude Matthews’ journalism career included fifteen years with NBC News, where he worked as editor, field producer, and on the staff of the Weekend Nightly News in Washington. After attending law school and working as an attorney, Matthews continued his news work on a freelance basis. He characterized the Summer Program instruction as “excellent.”

The Columbia faculty emphasized that what you saw on the evening news was not necessarily good journalism – that we should do better. And whether it was New York or some other major market did not matter. You were to be skeptical. You were to be fair. You were to be accurate. . . . Al Murray, and to a lesser extent, Fred Friendly, threw into relief the societal implications of what we do: how people use language and how pictures are used. How ideas are manipulated. That was the strength of the program.³²

Table 22

20 years+ in mainstream media/Quality of instruction rating

	Fairly dissatisfied	Neutral	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
< 20 years	1 (1.8%)	3 (5.3%)	12 (21.1%)	41 (71.9%)
20 years+	1 (1.9%)	0	5 (9.6%)	46 (88.5%)

Note. $N=109$; $\chi^2=5.95$; $df=3$; $p=n.s.$ None chose the response “very dissatisfied.”

Of the 107 respondents who answered the question “Would you repeat the experience?” ninety-five (88.8 percent) said they would do it again. While the data indicated no significant difference in responses of graduates who were sent by employers and those who were matched, the chi-square value may not be accurate because six cells had expected cell counts less than five. Six respondents matched to first employers (9.1%) said they would have entered a field other than journalism. Four (6.1%) said they would choose journalism school, and one (1.5%) would choose a different training program. When responses were combined, eleven of the sixty-six matched respondents (16.7 percent) said they would choose something other than the Summer Program (table 23).

Table 23

Matched or sent/Would repeat experience

	Select field other than journalism	Attend journalism school	Select different training program	Repeat Columbia experience
Matched	6 (9.1%)	4 (6.1%)	1 (1.5%)	55 (83.3%)
Sent	0	1 (2.4%)	0	40 (97.6%)

Note. $N=107$; $\chi^2=5.63$; $df=3$; $p=n.s.$

José Santiago, news director for Pacifica radio station WBAI in New York City, was a Columbia undergraduate before entering the Summer Program in 1973. As he put it,

It was probably the most important thing that ever happened to me educationally. It's one of the most important things that ever happened in my life. . . . It made my life for me, in terms of focusing, and in terms of what my profession is, and in what I pass on to others.³³

Maureen Bunyan of Washington station WJLA said her Summer Program class provided camaraderie, competition, and valuable criticism for individual work. An oversight was not preparing students for newsroom politics, personnel policies, and "how they're supposed to be treated."³⁴ She added:

Of course, we all expected there were going to be problems, but we really weren't taught how to maneuver through these problems because this had never happened before. Minorities and women had never gone into newsrooms before so even the very progressive and liberal white institutions like Columbia and the Ford Foundation . . . they didn't know how to tell us what to do, what signs to watch out for, how to maneuver through race or gender issues. So we all sort of learned on the job. When our ranks got large enough we formed organizations.³⁵

Hypotheses and Exploratory Questions

Hypothesis 1

H1: “Little chance for advancement” will be the most-cited reason for leaving first jobs.

To test Hypothesis 1, graduates were asked to complete the following statement pertaining to their first jobs:

I left my first job because (choose the ONE reason that best applies): financial issues, hours, little chance for advancement, issues of race, better opportunity, family, better community, other.

The data do not support this hypothesis. “Better opportunity” was the most frequently selected reason for thirty-five respondents (33.3 percent); fourteen had other reasons for leaving (13.3 percent). Little chance for advancement was selected by twelve persons (11.4 percent), all but one of them matched to employers; financial considerations were cited by ten (9.5 percent), all but two of them sent by employers; and race was cited by seven (6.7 percent), all but two of them matched to employers.

When matched and “sent” graduates were compared, response differences were not statistically significant. In both categories, “better opportunity” was the most frequently cited reason for leaving. Data from matched respondents suggest little chance for advancement was the second most-likely reason for departure.

Further analysis of those who chose “other” led to three new categories (table 24). The category “changes in the workplace” applies to eight Summer Program graduates (7.6 percent)

who left due to a buyout, layoff, show cancellation, newspaper closing, strike (and subsequent firing of union members), or early-retirement offer. The five graduates who said they were terminated (4.8 percent) included three who were matched and two who were sent. Two respondents (1.9 percent) said they left due to changes in the industry. Finally, two graduates left to teach in the Summer Program.

Ysabel Duron, now a reporter with San Francisco station KRON, did find advancement opportunities limited early on. She said she left her \$175-a-week job in the writer's pool at station KNXT in Los Angeles after nine months. It was 1970 and the job was her first after college and the Columbia journalism training program. Duron found that the entry-level program offered little formalized training, but she thought it would lead to reporting. "The news director talked to me once a week and said, 'How's it going?' . . . They, like everybody else, said 'Let's do something,' or 'Okay, we'll take one [minority].' That was as far as they thought. And somehow we were supposed to be, fresh out of college, these great, great journalists or something."³⁶

Hilda Tula Gourdin said she was paid an initial wage of \$328 a month at her matched employer, Salt Lake City television station KSL – less than the \$500 she had been collecting while still at Columbia. When offered a raise at the end of a year that amounted to her old salary, she said she complained to the station's minority representative that she "was probably going to be talking to somebody about it." She did not expect him to relay the information to management. After she was fired, Gourdin filed a grievance and won, yet in the aftermath she

was unable to find work in news. She eventually landed a part-time promotions job at a public television station but has mainly worked in public relations and marketing.³⁷ As she recalled:

I won my hearing, that in fact there was discrimination. They had threatened me. They said, 'You do this, Hilda, [and] we will make sure you never get a job again in broadcasting.' It turned out they were true to their word. It took me ten years to get back to work in television.³⁸

Randall Pinkston, now a CBS news correspondent in New York, was a part-time writer/producer/weekend anchor at Jackson, Miss. station WLBT under its interim management, Communication Improvement, Inc. In 1973, approximately ten months after being promoted to Monday-Friday 10 p.m. anchor, Pinkston was sent to Columbia. When he returned for his job as reporter/anchor he was earning between \$600 and \$700 a month. He soon found himself in a symbolic role as the first black anchor of a 6 p.m. weekday newscast in Jackson. Pinkston said he later learned the previous anchor had left in a salary dispute.

What triggered my departure is when I learned how my assignment had evolved . . . I went to the management and asked for a raise. I was doing a bigger newscast with a larger audience that precipitated more revenue for the station. The response was, "Well, we think a lot of people are going to click off. So let's wait and see." I said, "Well, look, they may. But I'm still having to do this job whether they watch or not. I think you should pay me something."³⁹

Pinkston said he wasn't looking for the same wage as his predecessor, who had done the 6 p.m. and 10 p.m. newscasts. "I had not come back from New York intending to look for another job, but the money thing ticked me off," he said. Pinkston took a job at station WJXT in Jacksonville, Fla., then moved on to stations in Hartford and New York. A former CBS White House

correspondent, Pinkston also taught as adjunct faculty at Columbia Graduate School of Journalism.⁴⁰

Table 24
Matched or sent/First job departure reasons

	Better opportunity	Other	Little chance of advancement	Financial	Organizational changes	Race issues	Family	Termination	Better community	Changes in industry	Job with Summer Program	Hours
Matched	22 (33%)	11 (16.7%)	11 (16.7%)	2 (3%)	4 (6.1%)	5 (7.6%)	4 (6.1%)	3 (4.5%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	0	2 (3%)
Sent	13 (33%)	3 (7.7%)	1 (2.6%)	8 (20.5%)	4 (10.3%)	2 (5.1%)	2 (5.1%)	2 (5.1%)	1 (2.6%)	1 (2.6%)	2 (5.1%)	0

Note. $N=105$; $\chi^2=19.3$; $df=11$; $p=n.s.$

Hypothesis 2

H2: “Little chance for advancement” will be the most-cited reason for leaving journalism.

To test Hypothesis 2, graduates were asked to complete a similar statement addressing the news industry, with slight changes in the responses.

If you left the news business, it was because (choose the ONE reason that best applies): I discovered I was better suited for other work, salary issues, hours, little chance for advancement, issues of race, other.

The data do not support this hypothesis. Of the sixty-one respondents who left mainstream media, 29 (47.5 percent) chose “other,” while thirteen (21.3 percent) said they found they were better suited for other work. “Issues of race” prompted departures for seven respondents (11.5 percent). The expected answer, “little chance for advancement,” was chosen by only four respondents (6.6 percent). Six respondents (9.8 percent) cited more than one reason.

Further analysis of those who chose “other” revealed that marriage and family concerns, changes in the industry, changes in media management, organizational buyouts, and the desire to try something else were other factors prompting Summer Program graduates to leave journalism (table 25). The status of two other departing graduates depends on whether teaching college journalism is considered leaving the field. When the new categories are considered, only six respondents cited other reasons for leaving news media. One person cited financial reasons.

Wanting to do something else was another reason cited by six respondents (9.8 percent). “Little chance for advancement” was cited as often as marriage and family, changes in the industry and buyouts. Each of those answers was chosen by four respondents, or 6.6 percent of all who left. Two respondents (3.3 percent) said they left due to changes in media management. Such changes in management and in the industry, taken together, were attributed to consultants hired by stations to boost ratings using a format described as “happy talk.”⁴¹

Harvey Clark, the younger brother of the late Michele Clark, for whom the Summer Program was named, attended the program in 1974 as a broadcast student. He described how he came to leave journalism for public relations work after new management took over WCAU:

I did not have the same point of view about what news was, and what news was not, from the new general manager. We did not come to terms and my contract was terminated. I was 47 at the time. I elected to not go to another city. I had been in Philadelphia for a hell of a lot longer than I thought I'd be there. But by that time I was very comfortable there, very well known there and very successful there. Rather than relocate to another city and stay in the journalism business, I left.⁴²

When 1970 graduate Christopher Chow left his sponsoring employer, NBC News, he crossed what he called the “yellow color line” as the first Asian American on-air television reporter at San Francisco’s KPIX-TV. There he won a local Emmy Award for best documentary – the first Asian American reporter in the country to do so – and became the first Asian American to win a Northern California Associated Press television award. But when his employer hired a consultant to redesign its news program – “one of the chief proponents of trivializing the news” – Chow said he and several other good journalists left or were fired.⁴³ “The news director who fired me said, ‘We’re no longer operating a training school,’” he said.⁴⁴ Chow said he found himself blackballed for a year and a half. He later was hired at Los Angeles station KCET by fellow Summer Program graduate Gail Christian, with whom he won a 1978 Alfred I. DuPont-Columbia University Award for an outstanding news magazine program.

After ten years Chow left the news media, saying the business changed on him. His media involvement includes co-founding the Asian Pacific Caucus of the Democratic National

Committee during its 1984 national convention, political media consulting to Asian American legislators in California, and directing the Richmond Village Beacon Center, an after-school program in San Francisco. Chow still works as an advocate for positive television portrayals of Asian Americans.⁴⁵

Table 25
Career departure reasons

	Frequency
Better Suited for other work	13 (21.3%)
Issues of Race	7 (11.5%)
Wanted to do Something Else	6 (9.8%)
Other	6 (9.8%)
+1 Reason	6 (9.8%)
Little Chance of Advancement	4 (6.6%)
Marriage/Family	4 (6.6%)
Changes in Industry	4 (6.6%)
Buyout	4 (6.6%)
Entered Journalism Education	2 (3.3%)
Hours	2 (3.3%)
Changes in Media Management	2 (3.3%)
Financial Reasons	1 (1.6%)

Note. N=61.

Exploratory Question 1

Did graduates who were matched to employers report significant differences in job satisfaction, compared with those who were sent by employers?

Yes. A significantly greater percentage of the “very” satisfied respondents had been sent to Columbia by employers (table 26A). Collapsing satisfaction categories still showed a

significant relationship between satisfaction and sponsorship (table 26B). Thirty-eight of forty-one respondents sent for training (92.7 percent) said they were satisfied with their jobs; three (7.3 percent) reported dissatisfaction. A different picture emerged from the sixty-six matched participants. Here, combining categories of dissatisfaction showed sixteen (24.2) were unhappy in their first assignments. Nevertheless, of the sixty-six graduates for whom Columbia found jobs, forty-two (63.6 percent) were either “fairly” or “very” satisfied with employers.

Table 26A
Matched or sent/Satisfied with first job

	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Matched	7 (10.6%)	9 (13.6%)	8 (12.1%)	24 (36.4%)	18 (27.3%)
Sent	0	3 (7.3%)	0	10 (24.4%)	28 (68.3%)

Note. $N=107$; $\chi^2=21.25$; $df=4$; $p<.001$; 5 cells (50%) have expected counts less than 5. Neutral = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 26B
Matched or sent/Satisfied with first job

	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied
Matched	16 (24.2%)	8 (12.1%)	42 (63.6%)
Sent	3 (7.3%)	0	38 (92.7%)

Note. $N=107$; $\chi^2=11.9$; $df=2$; $p<.01$; 2 cells (33.3%) have expected counts less than 5. Neutral = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Because most participants came to the Summer Program with no reporting experience, even if some had worked in news organizations, satisfaction levels were analyzed within subcategories based on experience. Table 27 indicated those with least exposure to the news

industry, the matched respondents without reporting experience, had significantly higher levels of dissatisfaction at their first jobs; eleven of the forty-nine (10.2 percent of respondents) said they were dissatisfied, yet thirty of the forty-nine in this sub-group (28 percent of respondents) said they were “fairly” or “very” satisfied. The eight respondents who chose “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” (neutral) lacked prior reporting experience and took jobs arranged by the Summer Program. Of the seventeen experienced reporters who were matched, twelve (11.2 percent of respondents) were satisfied with their first jobs.

Table 27
Sponsorship categories/Satisfied with first job

	Very dissatisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Neutral	Fairly Satisfied	Very satisfied
Reporter, sent	0	1 (.9%)	0	3 (2.8%)	10 (9.3%)
Reporter, matched	3 (2.8%)	2 (1.9%)	0	7 (6.5%)	5 (4.7%)
Not reporter, s	0	2 (1.9%)	0	7 (6.5%)	18 (16.8%)
Not reporter, matched	4 (3.7%)	7 (6.5%)	8 (7.5%)	17 (15.9%)	13 (12.1%)

Note. $N=107$; $\chi^2=27.86$; $df=12$; $p<.01$. 12 cells (60%) have expected counts less than 5. “Not reporter” refers only to prior reporting experience. This data was run with satisfaction categories collapsed, showing no appreciable change in significance.

Exploratory Question 2

Did graduates who were matched to news organizations report a significantly shorter amount of time at their first jobs, when compared with those who were sent by employers?

No. While those who held first jobs a year or less made up nearly one-third of the matched respondents, but only about one-fourth of those sent by employers, the differences were not statistically significant (table 28). One of every five graduates, whether sent or matched, stayed two or three years. Sixteen of forty-two graduates sent by employers to Columbia (38.1 percent) stayed with those companies longer than five years. However, fifteen of the sixty-eight matched graduates (22.1 percent) also fell into the longest-tenured category.

Osker Spicer, a 1973 graduate who was matched with the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, spent 21 years in mainstream media after the Summer Program and retired from *The Oregonian* in Portland. He worked as an independent journalist and researcher at the time of the survey. Spicer said he had been working at his first job a little over a year when the *Pittsburgh Courier*, a black newspaper, offered him the city editor's job. As he recalled,

I was a cub reporter during my college years, so I went there [to the *Post-Gazette*] with a certain hunger and readiness to really go at it. And I didn't feel that the paper at that time was giving me the free run that I wanted . . . I had a good experience with them. I met some good people. I learned some things. But I was a little anxious at the time to really dig in. I had some hot stories and ideas I wanted to do. I ended up being able to do some of that, and other things, with *The Courier*.⁴⁶

Bob Reid left his sponsor, WTVJ in Miami, after the weekend news producer's slot – which he had been filling as a substitute – was given to another reporter. Reid said he was offered the job back, but by then he had decided to move on. He became an NBC News bureau chief, a field producer for the NBC Nightly News, an executive producer and bureau chief for CBS News, an executive producer and vice president of productions with the Discovery Channel,

and executive vice president and general manager of the Discovery Health Channel. Reid was a *Miami Herald* cub reporter and WTVJ reporter-cameraman before entering the Summer Program in 1968. He said the Columbia training worked best “for people with the background, the education and the experience to take advantage of the program.”⁴⁷ Reid is executive vice president and general manager of the Africa Channel, “a new 24/7 network featuring programming from Africa.”⁴⁸

Table 28
Matched or sent/Time in first jobs

	0-1 years	1-2 years	2 or 3 years	4 or 5 years	+5 years
Matched	22 (32.4%)	9 (13.2%)	14 (20.6%)	8 (11.8%)	15 (22.1%)
Sent	11 (26.2%)	1 (2.4%)	8 (19%)	6 (14.3%)	16 (38.1%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=6.22$; $df=4$; $p=n.s.$

Exploratory Question 3

Did graduates matched to news organizations have significantly lower average career longevity than those sent by employers?

Yes. There appears to be a slight positive relationship between being matched to jobs and having shorter journalism careers (table 29). The findings were significant at the .024 level. Forty-one matched respondents (60.3 percent) worked in journalism for fewer than twenty years, compared to sixteen (38.1 percent) sent to Columbia by their employers. Twenty-seven matched

respondents (39.7 percent) invested twenty years or more in the news industry, compared to twenty-six of the “sent” respondents (61.9 percent).

Merv Aubespain was a staff artist for the *Louisville Courier-Journal* before the paper sent him to the Summer Program in 1972. He said the Columbia experience changed his life, as he went from reporter to associate editor for development at the newspaper. He also served as president of the National Association of Black Journalists from 1983 to 1985. “It apparently did a good job because I lasted thirty-five years in the business,”⁴⁹ Aubespain said.

Table 29

Matched or sent/20 years+ in mainstream media

	< 20 years	20 years+
Matched	41 (60.3%)	27 (39.7%)
Sent	16 (38.1%)	26 (61.9%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=5.12$; $df=1$; $p<.05$.

Exploratory Question 4

Among graduates who were matched to employers, did those lacking prior reporting experience stay in journalism as long as those with reporting experience?

No. As table 30 suggests, the fifty matched graduates without reporting experience (61.8 percent of the sample) were half as likely to sustain long careers in journalism. Of those who lacked reporting experience, fifteen (30 percent) stayed in news twenty years or more. Of the matched respondents with experience, twelve (66.7 percent) stayed twenty years or more. The

findings were significant at the .006 level. This exploratory question addressed not only recent college graduates, but participants who came to the Summer Program from other fields.

Table 30

Matched, reporting experience/20 years+ mainstream media

	< 20 years	20 years+
Matched, no reporting experience	35 (70%)	15 (30%)
Matched, reporting experience	6 (33.3%)	12 (66.7%)

Note. $N=68$; $\chi^2=7.43$; $df=1$; $p<.01$.

Exploratory Question 5

Among matched respondents, did those with prior reporting experience receive promotions into managerial or supervisory jobs more often than those without prior experience?

No. For the sixty-eight respondents who were matched to news organizations, there appears to be no significant association between management or supervisory positions in mainstream news and having prior reporting experience before the Summer Program (table 31).

Table 31

Matched graduates and reporting experience/Supervisory jobs

	Not managers/supervisors	Managers/supervisors
Reporting experience	11 (61.1%)	7 (38.9%)
No reporting experience	38 (76%)	12 (24%)

Note. $N=68$; $\chi^2=1.45$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$

Exploratory Question 6

Did Summer Program graduates who studied college journalism stay longer in news media than those who did not?

No. The data indicate no significant association between journalism education and career longevity. Of those who spent twenty years or more in mainstream news media, fourteen (42.4 percent) majored or minored in journalism or broadcast, while thirty-nine (50.6 percent) studied other subjects (table 32). Thirty-three respondents studied journalism or broadcast in college.

Schoolteacher Gloria Rojas came to the Summer Program with some on-air experience: teaching English to Spanish-speaking adults on public television. Hired as a general assignment reporter at WCBS-TV in New York City, she spent twenty-two years in television news. At the time of the survey she continued to work in radio by hosting “Segunda Juventud” (Second Youth), a Spanish-language syndicated program for seniors sponsored by the AARP. Rojas said her Summer Program employer sent her to the New School to learn about civic government, and that she later went back to college to earn a degree in English. She considered the Summer Program “going back to school in the purest way” and would choose it again, even if offered admission to Columbia School of Journalism. “They got us the very best,” she said. “. . . It was an extraordinary experience.”⁵⁰

Table 32

20 years+ in mainstream media/Journalism education

	< 20 years in MSM	20 years+ in MSM
Journalism education	19 (57.6%)	14 (42.4%)
No journalism education	38 (49.4%)	39 (50.6%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=.62$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$; Five respondents minored and 28 majored in journalism.

Exploratory Question 7

Did female respondents have parity with male respondents for any of the following: pay, professional development, promotions, and years in the news business?

Yes, for professional development at first jobs; no, for entry-level pay, promotions, and career longevity. Among the sixty-seven respondents who answered a question about salary, women had a mean annual wage of \$6,150, compared to \$7,720 for men – although the highest-paid respondent was a woman who earned \$35,000 as a general assignment reporter for a New York City station. No significant difference appeared in responses to a question about professional development: About one-fourth of respondents, both male and female, said they were given such opportunities at the companies that sponsored them in the Summer Program (table 33).

Royal Kennedy Rodgers, a 1971 graduate who has worked for two NBC stations, the ABC network news bureau in Chicago, and for PBS in Chicago, now is an independent producer developing a documentary project. She said her first job, as a general assignment reporter for station WDSU in New Orleans, afforded her every opportunity. “I can’t even remember a time I

felt slighted,” she said, noting that in the few instances when other reporters were sent to big stories, they also had more seniority. She said station management, and a supportive news director, set the tone by conveying this unspoken message to the staff: “We’re going to do this and we’re going to make it work, but if you think it’s a waste, you keep it to yourself.”⁵¹

Table 33
Gender/First job development opportunities

	Development opportunities	None
Women	13 (29.5%)	31 (70.5%)
Men	17 (26.2%)	48 (73.8%)

Note. $N=109$; $\chi^2 = 1.51$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$

Over the span of their careers, ten responding Summer Program women became managers (22.7 percent), compared to twenty-two responding men (33.3 percent). However, a chi-square analysis showed no significant association between gender and promotions (table 34).

“Little by little, we’re coming up as managers,” Kennedy Rodgers said. “There are stations run by black men and women. If the [Summer] Program came back, maybe it should be a management program, to develop management skills – some of the financial skills, the budgeting skills you need.”⁵²

Ianthia Hall-Smith, a Stanford University graduate sponsored by San Francisco station KRON when she was only twenty years old, stayed in her job for twelve years. She noted that no one at her station offered her a “corporate level” promotion, even though as a producer she had

the experience and aptitude for the job. She was married, pregnant, and had another child at the time. Hall-Smith said managers told her, “We just thought you wouldn’t leave your family.” She left KRON to work as a freelancer, then went into public relations.⁵³

Although she said she felt pushed on camera to demonstrate that her employer hired minorities, Jacqueline Casselberry King, a broadcast graduate in 1971, saw opportunities in the Summer Program era that do not exist today:

[P]eople wanted women, and blacks, specifically. I was allowed to do and learn some things. That may have been a moment in time, really, before [the industry] became jaded . . . I think there was a point where people’s commitments were good but they did not necessarily stay that way. People within the business can start feeling threatened that you’re getting something they never got.⁵⁴

After working a year at her sponsor station, KCBS radio in San Francisco, Casselberry King reported for the *Rocky Mountain News*, NBC radio station WMAQ, and CBS television network. Her journalism career lasted ten years.⁵⁵

Table 34
Gender/Management or supervisory post, mainstream news

	Not supervisor	Supervisor
Women	34 (77.3%)	10 (22.7%)
Men	44 (66.7%)	22 (33.3%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=1.44$; $df=1$; $p=n.s.$

A slight positive association existed between women and early departures from the news business. A smaller proportion of women spent twenty years or more in journalism careers when compared with the rate for men. The findings were found significant at the .043 level (table 35).

Table 35

Gender/20 years+ in mainstream media

	< 20 years in MSM	20 years+ in MSM
Women	28 (63.3%)	16 (36.4%)
Men	29 (43.9%)	37 (56.1%)

Note. $N=110$; $\chi^2=4.10$; $df=1$; $p<.05$.

Exploratory Question 8

What did graduates see as strengths and weaknesses of the Summer Program?

Exploratory Question 8 is based on responses to open-ended questions. Graduates quoted here represent print and broadcast students from several classes and various social groups. As the program’s staff was subject to change over the course of the program, comments reflect each year’s teaching thrust as well as individual perceptions and expectations of graduates.

Karl Nurse, a longtime television producer who operates his own communications firm in Boston, found himself “in the wrong place, doing the wrong thing” after his 1969 placement at Boston’s WHDH-TV.⁵⁶ He found the quality of teaching at the Summer Program to be inconsistent with the job placement help he received. Nurse said he learned that the Boston television station had no job for him beyond the one he was given – writing fillers for the noon and 6 p.m. news broadcasts. Already a Peabody Award-winning radio documentary producer

before entering the Summer Program, Nurse said he wished someone would have understood his true capabilities and matched him with a station that would have allowed him to do television production. “Basically, it seemed that the program’s policy was that if I was able to get a newsroom job, then I would be taught the principles of journalism to secure it,” he recalled. The Columbia program was “so hell-bent on putting blacks in America’s newsrooms,” he said, that a job had to be arranged before he could be accepted. Nurse said it seemed Fred Friendly’s influence led the CBS affiliate to hire him as a television news editor, despite his lack of experience. “The job interview didn’t last very long, and although I was hardly qualified to be writing news, I was given a job in the newsroom of the number one television station in Boston. And that, and a few other things, made it possible for me to be admitted into the Columbia Journalism Summer Program class of 1969.”⁵⁷

Ana Thorne, who had previously worked for the Seattle School District as a special programs assistant, also struggled at her matched position at station KOMO in Seattle in 1970. Although she considers her Columbia instructors and guest speakers “the best and the brightest,” she was unprepared for the culture shock upon going to work in a newsroom.⁵⁸ As she recalled:

I had the hardest time after I went back, being in an environment of totally white people and feeling like the other, the alien, and not any support in dealing with those feelings and issues. I just did not belong there. I had not been in a situation like that before.⁵⁹

Thorne stayed four months. She now works as a grant writer for non-profit organizations.

Joe Olvera considered the 1971 Summer Program excellent in offering top-notch instructors, hands-on experience, and the chance to “explore ourselves as journalists.”⁶⁰ But he, too, felt unprepared to handle certain aspects of his job at television station KROD in his native El Paso. While studying at the University of Texas at El Paso he had participated in activities of the student group MEChA, or Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Atlán. In his first weeks on the job, Olvera said that his news director asked him to follow up on a newspaper article that claimed MEChA wanted to take over the United States. Olvera said he was unprepared for a MEChA leader refusing to give him an interview, calling him a sellout because he joined a mainstream media organization. “My Chicano friends started pulling away from me. I said, ‘This isn’t worth it.’ So I left,” Olvera said. “Others in the program with me did fine. I guess I was more radical than they were.”⁶¹

Then there were working conditions that, by Columbia standards, seemed primitive. At a station that owned only one sound-on-film color camera, Olvera often found himself filming one-minute stories with a silent Bell & Howell camera, then using a tape recorder for sound bites. “At Columbia we had full news crews: a cameraman, a sound man, a light man,” he said. “When I got back to El Paso I said, ‘Where’s all this equipment?’ It just wasn’t available.”⁶²

Olvera still works with various media entities, writing columns and articles on a freelance basis. He is the deputy director for drug prevention services for an agency known as Aliviane, Inc.

Kevin Dilworth, another 1973 print graduate, said he appreciated the Summer Program's potential for greatness and the fact that instructor Earl Caldwell accompanied him on a story, offering a critique of his work. But Dilworth said aside from Caldwell and instructor Ralph Whitehead, faculty members were unavailable when he needed them that summer.⁶³ After graduating, Dilworth did not feel prepared for the difficult situation he encountered on his first job at the Rochester, N.Y. *Democrat and Chronicle*, where he was placed by his sponsoring employer, the Gannett newspaper chain. Dilworth said he entered a "racist environment," that he felt the paper was forced by Gannett to hire him, and that he was essentially ignored.⁶⁴ He added:

I remember it was like five weeks straight [that] I came to work every day and just sat there. There was absolutely nothing to do . . . They gave me nothing, nothing, nothing. It was a very frustrating thing and I would honestly tell you I really began to lose all my journalistic skills, as anybody else would, coming to work from 1:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and being ignored.⁶⁵

Dilworth said the program gave him nothing to fall back on for help. "The people I thought would help me either did not or could not,"⁶⁶ he said. Dilworth said he became increasingly frustrated, concluded that accepting the corporation's Rochester offer was "the biggest mistake of my life," resigned, and returned to his hometown, New York City. He said he soon found his own job as a part-time news writer at all-news WINS 1010 Radio in Manhattan. Later, with the help and recommendation of Christopher Trump, a Columbia Graduate School of Journalism dean, he got a job as a reporter at *The Star-Ledger* newspaper in Newark. He's been there ever since.⁶⁷

Dilworth said in 2002 he ran into a retired Gannett executive at a tribute to the late Robert Maynard at the Waldorf Astoria in Manhattan. The former corporate official, he said, “admitted being embarrassed” about the way the *Democrat & Chronicle* treated him, and acknowledged “having felt helpless about the racially insensitive situation” in which Dilworth was placed. “Despite those frustrations and attempts to derail my career choice, the inability or unwillingness of the Summer Program folks to rescue me from the Rochester situation, I’ve made it in journalism, feel great about my reporting work and love my job,” he said.⁶⁸

Dean Toji, who graduated in 1974, the last year of the program, was among those who said Columbia did not prepare him for television station politics. He left his first employer, and the industry, after three years, saying the PBS station that hired him was using a commercial model – complete with gimmicks and “cute consumer items”⁶⁹ – to boost ratings. Toji is now assistant professor for Asian and Asian American Studies at California State University, Long Beach.

Bob Nicholas, the former Houston anchor, said the failure to teach the dynamics of politics was a major oversight in the field of broadcasting, “where you are dealing with huge egos.”⁷⁰

Former Hackensack *Record* reporter Karlynn Carrington, a 1974 Summer Program graduate who went on to the Hartford *Courant* and now works as a bank industry computer analyst, wondered how Columbia could have taught office politics when situations are highly individualized and many students had already worked in newsrooms. She added:

I'm not sure, given what we had to cover and the cost of the program, that it would have been the best use of their time to talk about newsroom politics. That's something – if you want to get into it outside the classroom – you can go to a neighborhood bar.⁷¹

John Raye, a native of northern Louisiana who had never seen a television until his teen years, said Columbia never prepared him for the adulation that came from being a rare black media celebrity. He was sent to the Summer Program in 1969 by his employer, King Broadcasting, and over seven years rose to become an anchor at the company's Seattle station. Raye spent nearly ten years in journalism and now is an entrepreneur, active in what he describes as the black economy. "Dealing with the public, how you condition yourself to the autograph-seekers, women coming on to you – you can get messed up real quick," he said. "I grew up in the segregation era. Louisiana was completely segregated. It was very challenging to make the transition from an all-black environment to one that was all white. I couldn't even type when I went into the Summer Program. You talk about a paradigm shift."⁷²

Raye said journalism was his "ticket out of the mental ghetto." He will forever be indebted to Fred Friendly, the former president of CBS News, who helped him find a sense of identity and told him what to expect from the business; and to King Broadcasting, for "giving me an opportunity to be the first black anchor in the Pacific Northwest."⁷³

[A]nd for taking a chance on an unknown who had little knowledge of his own people, and even less of himself. But today, because of Columbia University's Summer Program, I am totally liberated. Free! And empowered to help so many others.⁷⁴

1973 broadcast graduate José Santiago appreciated “the commitment of the people who put this program together and who executed it.” As for the graduates, Santiago noted this important contribution of the program:

Overall, we probably put a lot of new issues on the table and a lot of things on the map that nobody ever even considered, and were not part of the public discourse. And they became so. Wherever we went, I think the program had a tremendous impact.⁷⁵

David Early, now race and demographics editor for the San Jose *Mercury News*, likened the rigors of the 1973 print program to Navy SEAL school but said it prepared him for being one of only a few black reporters in the newsroom of the *Minneapolis Star*. He said instructors, who “wouldn’t accept that we were just a little Summer Program paper,” imposed high standards on students writing for the in-house publication. They also demystified the news business, giving him the attitude of “I know I can do this.”⁷⁶ He added:

So when I’m getting hate mail and all that stuff, I don’t let that bother me. I think it’s because that program just *steeled* me. I knew that I knew what I was doing. And they did that for me. I didn’t come to the program that confident, but I left there like that.⁷⁷

Johnathan Rodgers, who studied broadcast at Columbia in 1973, said he still carries with him a First Amendment card that Fred Friendly gave him while he attended the Summer Program. A print journalist who had prior experience at *Sports Illustrated* and *Newsweek*, Rodgers was placed in a writer and show producer’s job at WNBC in New York City. He said Summer Program instructors – Friendly, Harry Arough, Al Goldstein – were his idols. In addition to showing respect for students, Rodgers said instructors taught values: “The importance of

having values in reporting and gathering the news. Tabloid news was foreign to us. They taught us journalism as a noble calling.”⁷⁸

He said a program weakness stemmed from the way “business” was portrayed in the Summer Program era as “something to monitor and attack.”⁷⁹ Rodgers built a career in media management, became president of the CBS television station division and is chief executive of TV One, the black-oriented cable network. He would have liked to have acquired a better understanding of business at Columbia. “Our generation missed opportunities to buy television stations,”⁸⁰ he said.

Don Savage, a photographer sent to Columbia in 1971 by Duluth, Minn., station WDSM, mentioned the Summer Program’s method in teaching journalism skills.

We were going out on stories with a news crew – real crews on their off-time. We did a story a day. It was excellent. You knew right away. They asked you, ‘Why did you ask this question? Why did you go this way, when you could go that way?’⁸¹

Savage, a member of the Ojibwe-Chippewa tribe, left the news business in 1977. He died of an aneurism in August 2005.

John Wesley, now a writer in Columbia, Md., said the program taught him to think of television as a visual medium. Rather than rely on stand-ups, he learned to “become well-known for the images that you present and the narratives that you place over them.”⁸² As director of public relations and advertising at WLBT he later won a Mississippi Association of Broadcasters award – the first African American to do so – for producing a commercial promoting the station.

Using techniques he learned at Columbia, Wesley said he paired film of the Jackson skyline at sunset with twenty seconds of music: “Think,” from the soundtrack of the film *Superfly*.⁸³

Wesley recalled Lou Potter, a black instructor, predicting that students would survive in the communications industry but within ten years they most likely would be doing something different. Because they were trained using an Afro-centric model, students would not endure unless they could “speak two languages,” Wesley recalled. The challenge, he said, was “How do you manage to display [it] when necessary, mask it at other times, maintain your pride and stay in the industry?” While unprepared for the confrontation he would have with his news director, Wesley said Columbia readied him for this incident at WLBT:

When I got off the air I got the call about the bank robbery. I got there just as the police got there. The police asked the lady from the bank, what did the robber look like? She turned to me and she said, “He looked just like that nigger right there.” *That* I was prepared for because of my training at Columbia.⁸⁴

Karl Nurse recounted how Columbia instructors taught broadcast students the art of telling a story in as few words as possible. They were given an article and told to reduce it by half. Next, they were asked to cut it in half again, then shorten it to a paragraph, and finally, to summarize it as a headline.⁸⁵

Bill Deiz said the main thing he learned at Columbia was writing, taught through the practice of rewriting. The idea was to be “talking through your typewriter . . . Magically using your typewriter as an extension of your brain.”⁸⁶

Merv Aubespin came away from the program with “a sense of giving back.” Today he works with the *Louisville Courier-Journal* to teach journalism to students at Louisville’s Western Middle School, using newsroom employees as instructors. What he valued at Columbia was:

The opportunity to learn from some of the true giants in the industry, minority and otherwise – to be able to sit at the feet of these mega-stars and have them tell you what this business was about.⁸⁷

Rosa Morales, a 1971 broadcast graduate, now works as an educator and journalist, directing the Hispanics in Journalism and the Minorities in Journalism Programs at Michigan State University. She agreed with Aubespin that the program was a life-changing experience. Morales recalled what she valued most:

Being able to speak my mind in a room with people who shared the same feelings, the frustrations, the uncertainties we all had. We didn’t know if we were going to be successful or not. Some of us were already successful . . . We were like a band of, I don’t want to say revolutionaries, but in a way we were. We had high ideals and we knew the system was going to have to change a lot more to fulfill the goals the Kerner Commission had outlined . . . I felt really special. I think we all kind of felt it was historic.⁸⁸

Vern Smith entered the program in 1969 as a sports copy boy for the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Smith went on to build a thirty-year career with *Newsweek*, retiring as Atlanta bureau chief and national correspondent. Smith said it is difficult to appreciate the revolutionary aspect of black people working in newsrooms in the 1960s. “We used to joke at Columbia that if the riots hadn’t happened, none of us probably would have been there,”⁸⁹ Smith said. He explained:

When we left Columbia we really felt like we were on a mission. I did. . . . The country was in great racial turmoil. The Vietnam War was going on. Dr. King had just been killed. You really felt like what you were about to embark upon was important, not only to your career, but also because the kind of stories you were going to be writing about, the papers hadn't printed before. The papers didn't cover black communities . . .

I think there was this urgency and the fact that we knew this was a truncated version of the Columbia master's program, so a lot was being thrown at us in a short period of time. We were sort of trained like insurgents, getting armed with all the stuff we'd need, being thrown out there behind enemy lines, so to speak, sink or swim. It had that sort of adventure to it. And I'm sure more for some of the people who had never been around newspapers or TV stations, where the whole thing was Greek.⁹⁰

Because of the Summer Program, 1971 graduate Tanna Beebe Chattin moved from a position at a California inter-tribal council to a high-profile reporting job at Seattle station KIRO. Chattin spent five years in journalism, later working for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.⁹¹ As she looked back on the Summer Program era, Chattin offered this perspective:

Because of the Civil Rights movement of the '60s, newsrooms realized people of color were needed in the news business, doing their own reporting, telling their own stories. Good, bad or indifferent, reporters were needed to reflect the diverse population of this country. Columbia was an amazing pioneer force to make the newsroom changes quickly.

Were the new transition reporters up to the immediate challenge? In hindsight, I believe I was. That's why you couldn't throw names at me, like "token" or "sellout." Or that I was under prepared because Columbia didn't do a good job. I never thought of the Columbia experience in those terms. Columbia had a fantastic idea, and the tenacity to make it happen. I had the courage to embrace the challenge. And after Columbia gave me the tools to compete in a newsroom, the rest of my career was my responsibility.

For me, there's no need to plumb the question or anguish over it: "Did Columbia do a good job?" The relevant questions are: Did *I* do a good job? Did I continue to pick up knowledge where Columbia left off? Did I have staying power in the tough world of news gathering, regardless of the personality politics of a particular newsroom? Darn right I did. And for me, that's the only evaluation that matters for the whole Columbia experience . . . how will each person evaluate himself or herself?⁹²

Ardie Ivie Jr., a 1969 broadcast graduate who went from the Summer Program to *Seattle Magazine*, ended his journalism career at Westinghouse Broadcasting and Cable as regional program director. He later became a marketing and education consultant to the University of California, Los Angeles, and died of cancer in March 2005. In a September 2004 interview he looked back on his summer in New York, recalling the way Columbia “gave me the license to run the city.”⁹³

It was a moment in history, that I had access to as a result of being in the program in the same way that you would have access to the world by working on a newspaper. There was stuff happening in the classroom that gave you a foundation to get out into the world. And journalism is about getting out into the world . . .

The Ford Foundation did the right thing at the right time. Columbia did the right thing at the right time. I think that the personalities that came together, Fred Friendly and Elie Abel, Andy Stern, can't be cloned. It's like that old song, “Again, never again”— it was from the '30s and 40s. The idea is that some things happen once. It blossomed. . . . And trying to replicate it as it was is hopeless because there are too many variables that have to be configured. And I was lucky over and over and over again to be in the right place at the right time.⁹⁴

CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE STUDY

Introduction

Thirty years after the closing of the Summer Program, participants who took part in this study had far surpassed the career longevity of the average journalist of color, while also exceeding the median stay in journalism for all U.S. news people. Respondents to the Summer Program study had a mean 17.6 years in the news business, a median career length of eighteen years, and a mean career of 18.6 years when ethnic media are included. That compares with Weaver and his colleagues' findings that journalists of color worked a mean 12.7 years in mainstream news, and all journalists averaged 16.3 years in news.¹ Moreover, thirty-four of these Summer Program graduates, or 30.9 percent, worked in journalism thirty years or more. And nearly 90 percent said if they could do it again, they would return to the Summer Program. The findings demonstrate benefits to the news industry from this intensive, yet expensive, venture.

Some journalists trained at the Summer Program considered it a life-changing event, and indicated overall satisfaction with training and first jobs. But somewhere along the way a slight majority of respondents decided it was time to leave mainstream media news – either by moving to the ethnic press or, more frequently, by changing careers. As this study explores that leave-taking, key findings emerge that both support earlier research and offer new insight into job experiences for journalists of color.

Survey of Major Findings

Summer Program respondents spent a median two years in their first jobs and worked a median eighteen years in mainstream news media. Close to half spent twenty years or more in the news business. Nearly forty-two percent said they were promoted in their first jobs, and 29.1 percent became managers or supervisors in mainstream media news. Yet those findings lie in contrast with qualitative data from the respondents who described feeling isolated or underused on the job. Those stories lend support to the argument that, in the aftermath of the rioting that drew press attention to the needs of people of color, some organizations were ill-prepared to bring diversity to their news coverage.

While prior research suggests otherwise, data from this study do not indicate that early exposure to the world of journalism moved significantly more Summer Program graduates into managerial and executive positions in the industry. This study does support Feldman's finding that traditional pathways to management in print journalism – an early start, followed by long tenure at a company – might have been out of reach for those who had a greater-than-average number of employers. However, taken as a whole, Summer Program respondents were not job-hoppers. They held an average of 2.8 journalism jobs over the course of thirty years – lower than the average 3.1 jobs for non-white journalists and the 3.8 jobs for whites interviewed for the 1985 IJE study. This finding is noteworthy because, of the two studies, that of the Summer Program reflects a much longer time span. However, one cannot overlook the fact that for either

study, a person leaving journalism after a brief stint in one job carries the same weight as one who holds that job for many years.

Better-educated than the average journalists, and with Columbia training to their credit, the Summer Program graduates nevertheless took first jobs in urban markets where competition was keen. Given that the largest percentage of respondents came from non-news backgrounds (thirty-four, or 30.9 percent), it is understandable that – despite the high hopes of their instructors – approximately one-third of the sample would leave journalism within seven years.

Participant accounts of first job experiences indicated that making their way in the industry was of greater initial concern than getting ahead in any one media corporation. Given what has been shown about the lackluster progress in desegregating newsrooms in those times, it may be concluded that few executives would have supported the program had its thrust been to prepare non-whites for management.

When employer-sponsored participants were compared with those who needed journalism jobs, those with early ties to news organizations held a clear advantage. The data suggest this form of employee training was associated with significantly higher levels of first-job satisfaction and career longevity. However, a separate data analysis from matched respondents indicated 32.4 percent of the Summer Program graduates paired with news organizations left their jobs in the first year – a figure lower than the 40 percent reported in Becker's 1983 study of newly hired journalism school graduates.

Real-world experiences of the Columbia training may have instilled enough confidence in graduates to keep two-thirds of them at their first jobs past year one. Another possibility is that employees sent to Columbia felt more committed – although, with the exception of CBS and NBC networks, sponsors’ financial contributions were modest overall. Why graduates left first jobs had more to do with pursuing new opportunities than with any other factor, as cited by 31.4 percent of respondents. Considering the demand for trained journalists of color in the post-Kerner era, it is likely these graduates were prime targets for recruiters.

As for reasons for leaving journalism, respondents most often cited the desire to pursue other work, followed by issues of race. Advancement opportunities were the primary cause for departure in studies by the IJE, the Newspaper Association of America, and McGill. However, the Summer Program data show opportunity for advancement was no more a career-change issue for graduates than marriage and family, changes in the industry, or buyouts – echoing the 1991 findings of Vernon Stone.

Weaver and Wihoit’s 1982 research on journalists as a whole suggests that in the period immediately following the Summer Program, journalists with more education and those with a strong sense of professional values – two characteristics of the Columbia students – were at risk for leaving the field. The curriculum at Columbia was shown to have instilled a sense of professional values, and all but one of the respondents attended college. Survey data show that most Summer Program graduates who left the business made a career change in this time period.

A troubling finding is that race issues were listed by 11.5 percent of participating graduates when asked why they left journalism. While this represents a minority of respondents, first-job narratives suggest that some new journalists walked into situations of race and ethnicity that would test the mettle of the most committed news people – let alone recent graduates with three months of training. Further study would be needed to determine what effects perceived racism and participant advocacy work may have had on individual careers.

As noted, little previous research offered indicators of what might have been expected for Summer Program graduates who left Columbia with a spirit of hope and idealism. Moreover, this study did not attempt to measure attitudes of co-workers or employers, assess individual competence, or contextualize comments in terms of communities. From the data it might be concluded that the Summer Program practice of recruiting, training, and placing students had three results. It met the job needs of employees, it satisfied the staffing needs of newsroom managers, yet it also could have enabled expression of newsroom racism at a time when workplaces were decades away from holding diversity training sessions.

Summer Program respondents had a lower turnover rate than non-white journalists from both the 1985 IJE and the 1991 Pease and Smith studies, which supports graduates' perceptions that the training prepared them for journalism. Again, it is necessary to consider the time difference. The average first-job tenure of 6.1 years for Summer Program graduates was based on a span of thirty years, while the IJE study encompassed only ten. A closer look at other data

reveals that the proportion of Summer Program respondents who left journalism within seven years equals the proportion of graduates who stayed thirty years or more.

It might be assumed more expertise and better assignments would accrue to those with longer-than-average first job tenure. The survey's assessment of first-job satisfaction did not restrict answers to a specific time interval. Hence, those who stayed longer – who tended to be the “sent” employees – expressed satisfaction based on familiarity with both the organization and the news business, particularly if they had prior training. New reporters, especially those matched to employers, faced a steeper learning curve in terms of newsroom culture. This group of respondents came to journalism from other professions, or from college, and likely spent their first years adjusting to new expectations. In some ways, assessing the career longevity for the matched reporters is like studying the success rates for arranged marriages. It might have been anticipated that journalists who were, in extreme cases, shipped cross-country to employers they had met only once, would stand in marked contrast with those welcomed home after Columbia.

Table 6 suggested respondents who were almost always allowed to initiate stories made up a smaller proportion of the Summer Program graduates when compared with those in Weaver and Wilhoit's 1992 study. The questionnaire's response of “about half the time,” which drew 13.6 percent of participants, lowered response rates for other categories. Another consideration is that Weaver and Wilhoit took random samplings from the four major minority journalists' associations, reflecting opinions from people at all career stages. The news business in the 1990s benefited from two decades of diversity efforts. It could not help but be more inclusive, both in

personnel practices and in news judgment, than it was in the 1960s and 1970s, as indicated by news accounts and ASNE hiring studies.

Response sets relating to autonomy in news coverage did not take into consideration that the journalists were young and relatively unseasoned. In a large market, reporters meeting the Summer Program's relatively low age requirement would have to prove themselves before winning autonomy in story selection, as some respondents have noted; Appendix C indicated seventy-one of 110 respondents (64.5 percent) went to large markets. Receiving fair treatment in assignments also would depend on a journalist's experience. Measuring graduates against other beginning reporters would provide a more reliable means of assessment. Thus, the literature on news-coverage autonomy is of limited value for direct comparison.

McGill's 2001 meta-analysis indicated that lack of professional challenge was one reason people of color gave up careers in journalism, and including this choice might have drawn other comments from Summer Program graduates who left the business. However, as all respondents were given a chance to cite reasons for leaving, it is clear several factors came into play.

While Columbia and the Ford Foundation receive credit for their initiative in starting the Summer Program, it also relied on supporting newspapers and broadcasters. At times individual organizations reflected a spirit of tokenism, according to some quoted participants. Yet this study indicated an overall commitment by managers during the program's tenure, as 42 percent of those accepting Columbia's invitation to diversify newsrooms later promoted Summer Program graduates.

Future Study

The Summer Program data warrants further analysis to address subgroups within the population and to explore other issues affecting journalists of color.

To better understand how FCC guidelines affected station hiring practices, correlations could be made between citizen-group actions against stations and their hiring of Summer Program graduates. Opportunities afforded Summer Program broadcast graduates could be analyzed to test whether non-whites and women held titles in keeping with job duties. And, as this study indicated women were under-represented as managers, a further look at job histories for women in broadcasting may reveal whether they were placed before the camera in keeping with “window-dressing” practices of the Summer Program era.

For both print and broadcast graduates, anecdotal information from interviews could be analyzed to report the degree to which the journalists were used as resources in their first newsrooms or served merely to integrate staffs. Interviews could be conducted with news managers, eliciting viewpoints from those who supervised Summer Program graduates. Finally, content analysis could show the extent to which the Summer Program people were put to best use at sponsoring newspapers, expanding the sample to include graduates who did not participate in this research. Similarly, content analysis could examine respondents’ contributions to the ethnic press after they left mainstream media.

As for graduates’ impact on the news industry, analysis of participant narratives also could explore job histories of career journalists. Those who played key roles in the founding of

minority-journalist associations offer another perspective on the struggle for newsroom equality. Graduate participation as teachers for journalism training programs – both at Columbia and later through the IJE at Berkeley – merits further study. Additionally, inquiry can be made into the career outcomes of graduates who challenged discriminatory actions through the courts, grievance procedures, or individual actions.

As the history indicated, the Summer Program was one of several training projects assembled after the Kerner Commission reported racism in the news industry. Studies of similar programs may shed further light on the conditions that dissuaded media from fully participating in diversity initiatives begun so long ago.

The tragic developments in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina drew attention to other issues that first stirred debate in the Summer Program era. Questions raised by the Hutchins and Kerner commissions – whether journalists and journalism managers are in touch with needs of all members of the public, particularly non-white urban residents outside the power structure – are as relevant in 2005 as they were in 1968. Various factors – cost-containment, a move toward news as entertainment, a decline in newspaper readership – may prevent the media from encouraging enterprise stories that show diverse perspectives to viewers and readers. Yet the stories remain. Summer Program people are still telling these stories and inspiring others to do so.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Summer Program Survey Questionnaire
Phase II

Questionnaire # _____ Survey date _____

Participant name _____

Designated phone number(s) _____

Area of study in Columbia Summer Program Broadcast ___ Print ___

Year attending (circle) 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974

Non-participants:

___ Refused to answer questions ___ unable to locate ___ deceased

Section I – Job secured by Summer Program

1. Before coming to the Summer Program, did you hold any newsroom editorial jobs?

___ Yes → What was your job? ___ Reporter ___ Other _____ Months in job: ___

___ No → What was your job? _____ Months in job: ___

2. What was the name of the organization that hired you through the Summer Program?

3. What was your exact job title at this organization? _____

4. What was your main responsibility? _____

5. What was your yearly salary? _____
6. How long did you remain in this position? _____
7. What was your next titled position at this organization? _____
8. What was your main responsibility? _____
9. How many years did you remain in this position? _____
10. List other positions held at this organization.

Job	Responsibility	Years
1 _____		
2 _____		
3 _____		

11. At this organization, were you given opportunities for professional development, subject matter seminars, or fellowships? ___ Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No

If yes, did you participate? ___ Yes ___ No

How many times were these opportunities made available to you? _____

Was this consistent with policy for other employees? ___ Yes ___ No ___ No Policy

Were opportunities equal for people who were not journeymen reporters? ___ Yes ___ No

12. When you gathered news, if you had a good idea for a story you thought was important, how often were you able to cover that story?

___ Almost always ___ more often than not ___ about half the time ___ only occasionally

___ I usually did not initiate stories ___ N/A (job did not involve news gathering)

13. In the assignments you received, did you feel parity with other employees?

___ Almost always ___ more often than not ___ about half the time ___ only occasionally ___ never

___ N/A

14. All things considered, how satisfied were you with your job at this organization?

very satisfied fairly satisfied neither satisfied nor dissatisfied fairly dissatisfied very dissatisfied don't know

15. Did editorial employees at this organization belong to a union? Yes No

If yes, were you a member? Yes No

Here are some statements pertaining to your job at (news organization). Please choose the answer that best applies.

16. My participation in the Summer Program was respected by other newsroom employees.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Don't know

17. My training at Columbia prepared me for demands of this job

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. I felt I was a token hire:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Section II - Career

19. How long did you stay at the first company? years What year did you leave?

20. Where was your next job?

21. I left my first job because (choose the ONE reason that best applies)

Financial issues

Hours

Little chance for advancement

Issues of race

Better opportunity

family

Better community

Other:

22. List other positions held.

Employer	Responsibility	Duration in job (ex: 5 yrs)
1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

5 _____
6 _____
7 _____
8 _____

23. If you left the news business, it was because (choose the ONE reason that best applies)

I discovered I was better suited for other work Salary issues Hours Little chance for advancement Issues of race

Other: _____

24. Did you further your education after Columbia? Yes No

If yes, did you obtain:

Undergraduate degree Master's degree Doctorate degree

Field: _____ Field: _____ Field: _____

25. Do you think your training at Columbia prepared you for the demands of a career in journalism:

Completely A great deal Somewhat Hardly Not at all

Please give your impressions of the following aspects of the Columbia experience:

26. Job placement

very satisfied fairly satisfied neutral fairly dissatisfied very dissatisfied don't know

27. News-gathering experience in the Columbia Summer Program

very satisfied fairly satisfied neutral fairly dissatisfied very dissatisfied don't know

28. Quality of instruction from Summer Program staff

very satisfied fairly satisfied neutral fairly dissatisfied very dissatisfied don't know

29. If you had a chance to repeat the experience would you:

Do it all again

- Select a different training program
- Go to journalism school
- Enter a field other than journalism

30. Which category best fits your educational experience before you began the program?
 less than high school High school grad Some college Community college graduate
 College grad If college, did you study journalism? Yes No

31. The social group with which you identify:
 African American Hispanic Asian American Native American Other
 declines

32. Gender: Male Female

33. Date of birth _____

34. If there was an outstanding aspect of your training at Columbia, it would be ...

35. If there was an oversight in your training at Columbia, it would be ...

36. Was there anything important about the Summer Program you would like to add?

A part of this study is talking to Summer Program graduates who left the news business early. If you know any I'd like to contact them.

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter and Release

Dear _____,

I am a veteran news reporter now studying Mass Communication at East Tennessee State University. The research I have chosen for my master's thesis is the Columbia University Summer Program for Minority Journalists. Because the Summer Program made significant contributions to the industry, I believe such a study is important. I am trying to locate many of the 210 graduates of this program to learn more about their experiences.

I would be most grateful if you would consent to participating in a 15-minute survey. It is my hope that collecting this data will provide the first comprehensive survey of the Summer Program graduates.

Your anonymity is assured. No one but myself, and in the unlikely event that it becomes necessary, members of my thesis committee and the university Institutional Review Board would have access to the records. The surveys will be destroyed after publication of the study's findings.

I would like to contact you by phone to conduct this interview. You may terminate the interview at any time. Should you wish to call me with any questions, I am at (423) 929-2081 or 306-2070. My e-mail address is basema@aol.com. I look forward to talking with you, and I appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Alice Basconi
112 Heather Lane
Johnson City, TN 37601

**TRAINING MINORITY JOURNALISTS:
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S SUMMER PROGRAM,
1968 – 1974**

A research project
By Mary Alice Basconi
Graduate Student
East Tennessee State University

INTERVIEW RELEASE

___ Yes, I agree to have my legal name and personally identifiable information used for the purpose of this study. I understand the material will be used in educational and professional presentations, publications and online thesis posting. I understand I may review the passages in which my quotes appear, and may make changes or correct any information that I feel may not be clear.

_____ initials of participant

___ No, I do not give permission to use any personally identifiable information that I have given in a phone interview.

_____ initials of participant

SIGNATURE OF VOLUNTEER PARTICIPANT DATE

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR DATE

Mary Alice Basconi

7.23.2004

APPENDIX C

First Employers after Summer Program

	Frequency	Percent
TV network affiliate, large market ^a	24	21.8
TV network affiliate, major market	20	18.2
Medium-sized daily ^b	16	14.5
Large daily	11	10.0
Network television	7	6.4
Major metropolitan daily	6	5.5
TV network affiliate, medium market	6	5.5
Radio, major market	5	4.5
PBS station, major or large market	4	3.6
Small daily	3	2.7
National daily or large market magazine	2	1.8
Radio, large market	2	1.8

Note. *N*=110.

^a Sources: Market rankings for broadcasters based on Nielsen Media Research ratings. “Major” represents markets 1-10; “Large,” markets 11-50; “Medium,” markets 51-100; “Small,” markets ranked 101 or higher. Data from “Telestatus,” *Broadcasting*, March 3, 1969.

^bMajor Metropolitan Daily=Circulation of +500,000; Large Daily=250,000-500,000; Medium Daily=100,001-250,000; Small Daily=50,001-100,000. From *Editor and Publisher International Yearbook*, 1970.

APPENDIX D

Highest Titled Position in Mainstream Media News

	Frequency	Percent
Reporter	34	30.9
Anchor	12	10.9
Producer	10	9.1
Assistant editor/Assignment editor	9	8.1
Executive, corporate	7	6.4
Correspondent	5	4.5
Editorial writer/Columnist, fulltime	4	3.6
News director	3	2.7
Community affairs director	3	2.7
Weekend anchor	3	2.7
Copy editor	3	2.7
Managing editor	2	1.8
Other, supervisor	2	1.8
Bureau chief	2	1.8
News editor	2	1.8
Editorial director	2	1.8
News writer	2	1.8
Associate editor	1	.9
Deputy managing editor	1	.9
Section editor (print)	1	.9
Other, non-supervisory	1	.9
Production assistant	1	.9

Note: *N*=110

APPENDIX E

Last Mainstream Media Employers of Graduates

	Frequency	Percent
TV network affiliate, major market ^c	26	23.6
Large daily newspaper ^d	14	12.7
TV network affiliate, large market	11	10.0
PBS station	9	8.2
Major metropolitan daily newspaper	8	7.3
Medium-sized daily newspaper	6	5.5
Network television	6	5.5
National publication/TV news magazine	5	4.5
TV network affiliate, medium market	5	4.5
Radio station, major market	4	3.6
Radio, large market	3	2.7
Small daily newspaper	3	2.7
TV network affiliate, small market	2	1.8
Network radio	2	1.8
Corporate staff	2	1.8
Local cable TV	2	1.8
News service	1	.9
National Public Radio	1	.9

Note. *N*=110.

^c Sources: “Major” represents markets 1-10; “Large,” markets 11-50; “Medium,” markets 51-100; “Small,” markets ranked 101 or higher. Data from Nielsen Media Research Local Universe Estimates, 2004, <http://www.nielsenmedia.com/DMA.html> (accessed 21 January 2005).

^d Major Metropolitan Daily=Circulation of +500,000; Large Daily=250,000-500,000; Medium Daily=100,001-250,000; Small Daily=50,001-100,000. Data from Audit Bureau of Circulations, “The Top 150 Daily Newspapers,” <http://www.accessabc.com/reader/top150.htm> (accessed 21 January 2005).

APPENDIX F

Later Work after Leaving Mainstream Media News

Employer	Frequency	Percent
Media, other	9	8.2
College or university	9	8.2
Advocacy group	8	7.3
Government	8	7.3
Self-employed	7	6.4
Corporation	6	5.5
Public relations	6	5.5
Social services organization	5	4.5
Other	4	3.6
Media, entertainment	3	2.7
Policy organization	1	.9
School	1	.9
More than one field	1	.9

Note. *N*=68

APPENDIX G

Highest Position in Media, Outside News

Job	Frequency	Percent
Communications or public relations for corporation, agency, advocacy group or school	15	13.6
Government public information officer, or Media director	7	6.4
Ethnic news media management	6	5.5
Broadcast or journalism faculty	6	5.5
Public relations agency owner	4	3.6
Manager, media production company	3	2.7
Producer	3	2.7
Writer (history, non-fiction, drama)	3	2.7
Executive, broadcasting	2	1.8
Director, community media center	2	1.8
Manager, media funding	2	1.8
Editor, non-news publication	2	1.8
Radio show host	2	1.8
Other	2	1.8
Actor	1	.9
Owner, printing company	1	.9

Note. *N*=61. Includes returnees to news media. Does not necessarily indicate last jobs.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

¹ Phyl Garland, "Staying with the Black Press: Problems and Rewards," in *Perspectives of the Black Press: 1974*, ed. Henry G. La Brie III (Kennebunkport, ME: Mercer House Press, 1974), 168.

² Lee Thornton, *Broadcast News*, in *Split Image: African-Americans in the Mass Media*, eds. Jannette L. Dates and William Barlow (Washington: Howard University Press, 1990), 393.

³ James B. King, "Minorities: From Now Till 2000 A.D.," *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 615 (May/June 1978): 11; "News Staffs Shrinking While Minority Presence Grows," news release, American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 15, 2005, <http://www.asne.org/index.cfm?ID=5648> (accessed May 17, 2005). ASNE reported that "newsrooms have lost a net of more than 2,200 journalists while the number of minority journalists has increased."

⁴ ASNE, "News Staffs Shrinking."

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Bill Dedman and Stephen K. Doig, "Newsroom Diversity has Passed its Peak at Most Newspapers, 1990-2005 Study Showed," Report Summary, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, June 1, 2005, <http://powerreporting.com/knight/> (accessed 15 September, 2005).

⁷ Lori Demo, "The Shameful Delay: Newspapers' Recruitment of Minorities Employees, 1968 – 1978," paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, History Division, New Orleans, August 1999. <http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9909E&L=aejmc&P=R32349&m=1393> (accessed 16 March 2004).

⁸ Bonnie Brennen, "Toward a History of Labor and News Work: The Use of Oral Sources in Journalism History," *Journal of American History*, September 1996, 571. <http://www.jstor.org>.

⁹ Fred Friendly Papers, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University.

¹⁰ Clint C. Wilson II and Félix Gutiérrez, *Race, Multiculturalism and the Media: From Mass to Class Communication*, 2nd (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995), 5.

¹¹ Joann Keyton, *Communication Research: Asking Questions, Finding Answers* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001), 178-79.

CHAPTER 2 – THE ‘WELCOME MAT’

¹ Joseph A. Califano Jr., *The Triumph and Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 209.

² Alice Carol Bonner, “Changing the Color of the News: Robert Maynard and the Desegregation of Daily newspapers,” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 1999), 108-9.

³ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁴ “Editors Seek Negro Candidates for Jobs,” *Editor & Publisher*, September 23, 1967, 22.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 207-13.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 217-18.

⁸ *The Johnson Presidential Press Conferences*, vol. 2 (New York: Earl M. Coleman Enterprises, 1978), 803.

⁹ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 218.

¹⁰ *Johnson Presidential Press Conferences*, 779; Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 219.

¹¹ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 219.

¹² *The Kerner Report on the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1968), preface.

¹³ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 219 ; William L Clay, *Just Permanent Interests: Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1991* (New York: Amistad Press, 1992), 242-43. Congressional hearings took place during Richard Nixon’s presidency – but under the direction of the Congressional Black Caucus. Caucus chair William L. Clay of Missouri called media policies “demoralizing” for African-Americans, as mainstream media discriminated in distorting the

black movement. Witnesses cited inequities in media hiring and firing practices, the lack of decision-making positions and mistreatment as “second-class” reporters.

¹⁴ *Kerner Report*, introduction, v.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 260-61.

¹⁷ *Johnson Presidential Press Conferences*, 914.

¹⁸ Califano, *Triumph and Tragedy*, 261-62.

¹⁹ *Kerner Report*, 362; *Johnson Presidential Press Conferences*, 914.

²⁰ Commission on Freedom of the Press, *A Free and Responsible Press* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), 26.

²¹ Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, *1969 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups* (New York: Columbia University, 1969).

²² *Kerner Report*, 382.

²³ *Ibid.*, 383.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 384-85.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

²⁶ Ben W. Gilbert, “Race Coverage,” *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 515 (January 1968): 1-2.

²⁷ “Journalism and the Kerner Report,” *Columbia Journalism Review*, Fall 1968, 42.

²⁸ Carolyn Martindale, *The White Press and Black America* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 10.

²⁹ Herbert J. Gans, *Democracy and the News* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 40-41, 138. Gans refers to the period from the 1960s to the mid-1970s as “the golden age idealized in

the journalistic imagination,” although some say it began in the time of Edward R. Murrow, during World War II. In this era, journalists were able to report a “long set of important and audience-attracting events, one after the other.” Gans credits the phrase to sociologist Larry McGill and author Richard A. Posner.

³⁰ Felix R. McKnight, “Downplay Their Stupidity,” *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 515 (January 1968): 3.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

³² Lester A. Sobel, *New York and the Urban Dilemma* (New York: Facts on File, 1976), 13-14.

³³ Woody Klein, “News Media and Race Relations: A Self-Portrait,” *Columbia Journalism Review*, Fall 1968, 42.

³⁴ Print and broadcast media in all 50 states received the survey. Magazines responded at a rate of 94 percent, compared to 48 percent for newspapers and 41 percent for radio and television stations.

³⁵ Klein, “News Media and Race Relations,” 43.

³⁶ Edward J. Trayes, “Still Few Blacks on Dailies, But 50% More in J-Schools, Recent Surveys Indicate,” *Journalism Quarterly* 47 (Summer 1970): 356-57.

³⁷ Jay T. Harris, *Minority Employment in Daily Newspapers* (Evanston, IL: Frank E. Gannett Urban Journalism Center, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University) 1978, I-2.

³⁸ James Aronson, “Black Journalists: Why the Dearth?” *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 558 (March 1972): 6. The 23,112 journalists represented in this study worked at papers in the U.S. and Canada.

³⁹ Sobel, *New York*, 13-14. At the time of the Summer Program, six cities had African-American majorities: Compton, CA; Washington, D.C.; East St. Louis, IL; Newark, NJ; Gary, IN; and Atlanta. Eight other cities were 40 percent African-American.

⁴⁰ Editor & Publisher, *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook* (New York: Editor & Publisher, 1969), 299-300.

⁴¹ ———, *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook* (New York: Editor & Publisher, 1970).

⁴² Jules Witcover, "Washington's White Press Corps," *Columbia Journalism Review*, Winter, 1969-70, 42-44.

⁴³ Richard G. Hatcher, "Mass Media and the Black Community," *Black Scholar*, September 1973, 2.

⁴⁴ Shirley Chisholm, "The White Press: Racist and Sexist," *Black Scholar*, September 1973, 20-22.

⁴⁵ Alice Bonner, "Norman Isaacs' Idealistic Quest," *American Editor* (December 1, 1998), <http://www.asne.org/kiosk/editor/98.dec/bonner2.htm>, (accessed 24 April 2005); Orayb Najjar, "ASNE Efforts Increase Minorities in Newsrooms," *Newspaper Research Journal* 16, no. 4 (Fall 1995): 126. At the time, Isaacs also taught journalism at Columbia.

⁴⁶ Deirdre Carmody, "News of Minorities in Media is Debated," *New York Times*, 25 Sept. 1977, 19 (M). The Gannett Urban Journalism Center of the Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, conducted the study.

⁴⁷ *Kerner Report*, 385.

⁴⁸ Aronson, "Black Journalists," 8; Lincoln University, "Lincoln Journalism," <http://www.lincolnu.edu/pages/620.asp> (accessed 7 September 2005); Scripps Howard Foundation, "Scripps Howard Foundation, Hampton University open New School of Journalism and Communications," news release, 9 September 2002, <http://www.scripps.com/foundation/news/newsrelease/02> (accessed 7 September 2005). Lincoln University in Missouri created a school of journalism in 1942, while Hampton University in Virginia established a Department of Mass Media Arts in 1967, through which it offered a journalism-related curriculum.

⁴⁹ Roland E. Wolseley, *The Black Press, U.S.A.*, 2nd (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1990), 222.

⁵⁰ Aronson, "Black Journalists," 9.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 7-8; Wolseley, *Black Press*, 213-217; Gerald Astor, *Minorities and the Media*, (New York: Ford Foundation, November 1974), 7-12; Bill Wood, "Black Women in Television News," *Essence*, July 1972, 30. Programs included the Newspaper Fund's Urban Journalism Workshop; the *Afro-American* newspapers' Frederick Douglass Fellowship Program in Virginia, and

Syracuse University's graduate fellowships in broadcasting. Also offering training were Project Able in San Francisco, the Joint Equality Committee in New York and the Washington Journalism Center.

⁵² Fred W. Friendly, Remarks Prepared for Delivery at the Memorial Service for Michele Clark, Rockefeller Chapel, University of Chicago, 17 December 1972, Fred Friendly Papers (see intro., n. 9).

⁵³ Sperber, A.M., "Murrow: His Life and Times" (New York: Freundlich Books, 1986), 320.

⁵⁴ Ruth Friendly (widow of Fred Friendly and vice president, Fred Friendly Seminars) in interview with the author, 22 September 2004.

⁵⁵ Ibid; Fred Knubel, Director, Office of Public Information, Columbia University, press release, June 30, 1969, 2-3, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives. The Summer Program was not Columbia's only effort on behalf of interracial relations. In 1968 the school hosted eight mid-career journalists, five of them black, for an interracial reporting fellowship program funded by the Rockefeller Foundation.

⁵⁶ Daniel J. Leab, "See it Now: A Legend Reassessed," in *American History, American Television*, ed. John E. O'Connor, 6-7, 26 (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983).

⁵⁷ Fred W. Friendly, *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control* (New York: Random House, 1967), 68-9.

⁵⁸ J. Fred MacDonald, *Blacks and White TV: African Americans in Television Since 1948*, 2nd (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1992), 100.

⁵⁹ Fred Friendly Seminars, "About the Seminars: Who was Fred Friendly?" <http://fredfriendly.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=about.who> (accessed 9 April 2005).

⁶⁰ "Friendly is Recalled as Loud Voice of Integrity," *New York Times*, sec. A, March 7, 1998, late edition; MacDonald, 100.

⁶¹ MacDonald, 100.

⁶² CBS News, "Mississippi and the Black Vote – 1962," *The Civil Rights Movement: Primary Sources*, VHS, (Princeton, NJ: Films for the Humanities and Sciences, 2000).

⁶³ Friendly, *Due to Circumstances*, 134.

⁶⁴ Alexander Kendrick, *Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 348-49.

⁶⁵ Mary Ann Watson, "Eleanor Intervenes," *Television Quarterly* 32 no. 2-3 (2001 Summer-Autumn): 51.

⁶⁶ Herm Schoenfeld, "TV Networks Cracking Dixie Barrier on Controversial Showed Despite Campaign by 'Monitor South,'" *Variety*, September 27, 1961, 25, 46; Steven D. Classen, *Watching Jim Crow: The Struggles Over Mississippi TV, 1955-1969*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 49. Classen noted that stations acted out of fear of losing advertising dollars or audience support.

⁶⁷ Fred Friendly Seminars, "About the Seminars."

⁶⁸ Friendly, *Due to Circumstances*, 250.

⁶⁹ James Boylan, *Pulitzer's School: Columbia University's School of Journalism, 1903-2003* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 163.

⁷⁰ Kai Bird, *The Color of Truth: McGeorge Bundy and William Bundy: Brothers in Arms* (New York: Touchstone, 1998), 377.

⁷¹ Friendly, *Due to Circumstances*, 302-3.

⁷² R. Friendly, interview.

⁷³ Boylan, *Pulitzer's School*, 163.

⁷⁴ Bird, *Color of Truth*, 378-79.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 383, 387. Friendly also would arrange for Foundation aid to reach Hispanic communities.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 391.

⁷⁷ Ford Foundation, *Minorities and the Media*, 7-12.

⁷⁸ Classen, *Watching Jim Crow*, 11.

⁷⁹ Kay Mills, *Changing Channels: The Civil Rights Case that Transformed Television*, (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2004), 9.

⁸⁰ Fred W. Friendly, *The Good Guys, the Bad Guys, and the First Amendment: Free Speech vs. Fairness in Broadcasting* (New York: Random House, 1975), 89.

⁸¹ Classen, 42-43. Also cited in the complaint were WLBT's two affiliated radio stations.

⁸² Mills, *Changing Channels*, 20-21. Mills quoted Beard's testimony at a May 8, 1967 FCC hearing on the renewal of WLBT's license.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 21. The FCC in 1949 set forth the "Fairness Doctrine," requiring stations to allow for the expression of both sides of a controversial issue. It became law in 1959, although stations charged that it violated the First Amendment. For further discussion, see Mills, 27-28, 253.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 65, 169-170. WLBT former news director Richard Sanders would later feel the challenge was unfair, and that the station eventually made a turnaround even under the old management.

⁸⁷ Everett C. Parker, note to author, 20 September 2005.

⁸⁸ Mills, *Changing Channels*, 66.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁹⁰ *Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. FCC*, 359 F.2d 994 (U.S. App. 1966); Classen, 61-62. Pressured by its trustees, the UCC at Tougaloo later withdrew from the challenge.

⁹¹ Parker, note to author, 8 October 2005; Mills, *Changing Channels*, 85, 97. The CBS affiliate, WJTV, had demonstrated signs of improvement. Those involved at WLBT would later say the station's first team of attorneys advised turning over programming records to the FCC, while WJTV made no such response.

⁹² *Office of Communication v. FCC*; Parker, note, 8 October 2005.

⁹³ Ibid, 1008.

⁹⁴ Mills, *Changing Channels*, 165; Parker, correspondence. Parker said the decision was handed down in the morning of the day Burger was sworn in as chief justice.

⁹⁵ *Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. FCC*, 425 F.2d 543 (U.S. App. 1969); Parker, correspondence. Parker noted that the process took seventeen years.

⁹⁶ Mills, *Changing Channels*, 104.

⁹⁷ Parker, correspondence; Glen W. Naves, "Women's Orgs Charge Job Bias, Bid FCC Withhold Nine S.C. Renewals," *Variety*, November 15, 1972, 57. Parker noted that the United Church of Christ acted alone in seeking equal employment opportunity rules. He said neither churches nor women's groups joined in the effort, although members of Congress and two FCC commissioners showed support after the petition was filed. After the rules took effect in 1971, other actions ensued: women's rights groups in 1972 challenged the licenses of nine South Carolina stations based on under-representation of women.

⁹⁸ Ford Foundation, *Minorities and the Media*, 13.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 14.

¹⁰⁰ "The Pool of Experts on Access," *Broadcasting*, September 20, 1971, 37.

¹⁰¹ "The Struggle Over Broadcast Access," *Broadcasting*, September 20, 1971, 32.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 35.

¹⁰⁴ "Talent Unions Want More Minority-Group Newsmen," *Broadcasting*, March 29, 1971, 100.

¹⁰⁵ "Spanish-Americans Want Piece of Action," *Broadcasting*, April 13, 1970, 35. The remarks came during a panel on the absence of blacks in mainstream radio.

¹⁰⁶ Bill Greeley, "Portrait of TV: White, Male," *Variety*, November 22, 1972, 51.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

- ¹⁰⁸ “Parker Assails Hiring Practices at TV Stations,” *Broadcasting*, November 27, 1972, 26-7. The four categories represented two-thirds of the full-time employment at those stations.
- ¹⁰⁹ Greeley, “Portrait of TV,” 51.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 51, 60.
- ¹¹¹ “Nationwide Comparative Employment Report for TV,” *Broadcasting*, November 27, 1972, 31.
- ¹¹² “CBS examines its ranks,” *Broadcasting*, November 27, 1972, 26.
- ¹¹³ Wilson and Gutiérrez, *Race, Multiculturalism*, 203.
- ¹¹⁴ Mercedes Lynn de Uriarte, *Diversity Disconnects: From Class Room to News Room*, report (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 2003), 4, <http://journalism.utexas.edu/faculty/deuriarte/diversity.html> (accessed March 5, 2005).
- ¹¹⁵ Wilson and Gutiérrez, *Race, Multiculturalism*, 201.
- ¹¹⁶ Thornton, “Broadcast News,” 396.
- ¹¹⁷ Churchill Roberts, “The Presentation of Blacks in Television Network Newscasts,” *Journalism Quarterly*, no. 52 (Spring 1975): 51-2, 55.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 52, 55.
- ¹¹⁹ Richard Prince, “Veteran Broadcaster, 71, Opened Howard U School,” Richard Prince’s *Journal-isms*, 20 July 2004, available from http://www.maynardije.org/columns/dickprince/040720_prince/ (accessed 17 May 2005); Jannette L. Dates, “Public Television,” in *Split Image*, 305 (see intro., n. 2).
- ¹²⁰ Dates, “Public Television,” in *Split Image*, 305.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹²² U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television.*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), 148.

¹²³ Ibid.

CHAPTER 3 – THE SUMMER PROGRAM

¹ Columbia University, “A Brief History of Columbia,” *About Columbia*, n.d., http://www.columbia.edu/about_columbia/history.html (accessed 9 April 2005).

² Ibid.

³ Christopher G. Trump, Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, to Thomas E. Cooney Jr., Ford Foundation, 23 January 1979, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁴ Boylan, *Pulitzer’s School*, 172.

⁵ Knubel, press release, June 30, 1969.

⁶ Edward W. Barrett, Dean, to Jacob E. Simms, Charlotte, N.C., 14 March 1968, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁷ Alfred B. Fitt (General Counsel, Congressional Budget Office), “CBO Testimony,” statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Committee on Education (May 30, 1979) <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=5223&sequence=0>. Students who lived in states with student loan guaranty agencies could obtain loans from private lenders, with the federal government covering 80 percent of the losses. Interest for low-income students – 6 percent or lower – was paid by the government. But not all states joined the program, leading the government to begin backing the loans in non-participating states. That, coupled with a 7-percent interest rate, still failed to draw lenders. In 1969 Congress again provided funds to raise interest rates. Three years later banks persuaded Congress to create the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae), a secondary market for student loans.

⁸ George N. Allen, “Changing Times: The Columbia School of Journalism,” *Washington Journalism Review*, April/May 1979, 40.

⁹ Ibid. Allen reported that the university eventually increased paybacks to 60 percent.

¹⁰ Edward W. Barrett, Dean, Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, to the Ford Foundation, Description of 1968 Summer Program to Train Members of Minority Groups for Television and Radio News Positions, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives; Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, Budget for 1968 Summer Program to Train Members of Minority Groups for Television and Radio News Positions, n.d., Fred Friendly Papers. Salaries for an administrative staff, four Columbia faculty members, two adjunct faculty members and one outside adjunct faculty made up nearly half of the \$121,000 budget. Room and board for each student was \$390, and university overhead was more than \$13,000.

¹¹ Columbia, 1968 Summer Program Report, 9.

¹² Barrett, Ibid.

¹³ Columbia, 1968 Summer Program Report.

¹⁴ Gary Gilson (executive director, Minnesota News Council) in interview with the author, 1 November 2004.

¹⁵ Ibid., 4.

¹⁶ Tom Bettag (executive producer, ABC News *Nightline*) in interview with the author, 29 October 2004.

¹⁷ Columbia, Budget for 1968 Summer Program.

¹⁸ Fred W. Friendly to Gordon Manning, vice president, CBS News, New York, NY, 10 June 1968, Fred Friendly Papers.

¹⁹ Bettag, interview.

²⁰ Fred Friendly to Bill Small, David Brinkley, Roger Mudd, Morton Silverstein, Robert Northshield, John Chancellor, Daniel Schorr, Howard K. Smith, Louis Harris and Frank McGee, Telegram sent via night letter, June 26, 1968 on Summer Program; draft for Fred Friendly letter to Walter Cronkite and other VIP's, Fred Friendly Papers. Night letters were telegrams sent at night, usually at a reduced fee.

²¹ "Operation News Chance," curriculum, n.d., Fred Friendly Papers.

²² R. Friendly, interview.

²³ Bettag, interview.

²⁴ Gilson, interview.

²⁵ Bob Giles (curator, Nieman Foundation at Harvard University), press release, May 17, 2004, <http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/people/2004-05release.html> (accessed 10 April 2005). Nieman Fellows are promising midcareer professionals who spend a year of study at Harvard. Since 1938, about one thousand journalists have participated in the program.

²⁶ Melvin Mencher (professor emeritus, Columbia University), note to author, 10 January 2005.

²⁷ Mencher, interview with the author, 30 March 2004; Ibid.

²⁸ Mencher, Summer Program 1968, Guide to reading assignments for reporting, n.d., Fred Friendly Papers.

²⁹ Mencher, interview.

³⁰ Gilson, interview.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, *1969 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups* (New York: Columbia University, 1969).

³³ Mencher, note.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ R. Friendly, interview.

³⁶ Bettag, interview.

³⁷ R. Friendly, e-mail message to author, 30 March 2005.

³⁸ Bettag, interview.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Columbia, 1968 Summer Program Report.

⁴¹ Gilson, interview.

⁴² Mencher, interview.

⁴³ Fred Friendly to Carl Siskind, News Director, KOGO-TV, San Diego, 28 July 1969. Fred Friendly Papers.

⁴⁴ Gilson, e-mail message to author, 4 April 2005.

⁴⁵ Gilson, interview.

⁴⁶ Alan S. Goldstein, (former NBC News producer), e-mail message to author, 2 April 2005.

⁴⁷ Mencher, e-mail message to author, 1 April 2005.

⁴⁸ Melvin Mencher to Fred Friendly, Proposed Summer Program in Print Journalism Preliminary Report, n.d., 3, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁴⁹ Mencher, interview, 30 March 2004.

⁵⁰ Mencher, e-mail message to author, 29 March 2005.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Mencher, note.

⁵³ Mencher to Friendly, Preliminary Report, 5.

⁵⁴ Henri Wittenburg, "Tenants tell of being evicted; Lindsay blamed;" Andrew St. James, "U.S. urged to use veto on the Mideast," *Print: 1969*, August 15, 1969, 1, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁵⁵ Joel Garcia to John Patterson, memorandum, n.d., Fred Friendly Papers; California Chicano News Media Association, scholarship competition, <http://www.ccnma.org/> (accessed 1 October 2005). Garcia was a producer and reporter for Los Angeles television station KCET when he died in 1977. A scholarship in his honor is awarded annually by the California Chicano News Media Association to Latino students interested in careers in journalism.

⁵⁶ Fred W. Friendly to Julian Scheer, assistant administrator for public affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 10 April 1969, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁵⁷ Herbert G. Klein, director of communications for the executive branch, The White House, to Fred W. Friendly, 23 April 1969; Fred W. Friendly to Herbert G. Klein, 20 May 1969, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁵⁸ Herbert G. Klein to Fred W. Friendly, 7 June 1969, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁵⁹ Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, 1969 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups Report to the Ford Foundation, October 1970, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁶⁰ Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, 1970 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups Report to the Ford Foundation, October 1971, 6, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁶¹ Proposal, "Broadcast Journalism Training Program for ABC, CBS, NBC, their Affiliates, and for Public Broadcast Stations," November 1970, 4, Fred Friendly Papers.

⁶² John J. McCrory, WNAC-TV, Boston, to Fred Friendly, 3 June 1970, Fred Friendly Papers. McCrory was responding to the rejection of a Boston-area candidate, who later was accepted in the 1974 class.

⁶³ Proposal, "1971 Summer Program in Broadcast Journalism for Members of Minority Groups, Sponsored by the National Broadcasting Company, the CBS Foundation and the Ford Foundation," February 1971, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁶⁴ 1969 Summer Program Report, 3.

⁶⁵ Andrew W. Cordier, president, Columbia University, to MacGeorge Bundy, Ford Foundation, n.d., PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁶⁶ Stuart Dim, "Minorities and Media," letter to the editor, *Columbia Journalism Review*, Winter 1969-70, 63.

⁶⁷ "Request for Grant Action" (RGA), May 12, 1970, p. 3, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁶⁸ Reciepts from donors, June 1970, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁶⁹ Columbia, 1970 Report to Ford Foundation, 4.

⁷⁰ Mencher, interview.

⁷¹ “Request for Grant Action” (RGA), July 11, 1972, p. 1, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁷² Joseph Strickland, assistant to the dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, to Barry Bingham, publisher, *Louisville Courier-Journal*; Strickland, to Vermont Royster, senior vice president the *Wall Street Journal*, 25 March 1971. Fred Friendly Papers.

⁷³ Dr. Everett C. Parker, interview with the author, April 5, 2005; John Milton Wesley, interview with the author, 10 November 2004. Operating under its interim management, Jackson station WLBT would send two of its black reporters to the Summer Program. John Milton Wesley was sponsored in 1972 and Randall Pinkston in 1973.

⁷⁴ Irv Margolis, *RTNDA Bulletin*, February 1970, 7.

⁷⁵ Richard W. Jencks, president, CBS Broadcast Group, to affiliates, 22 March 1971. Fred Friendly Papers.

⁷⁶ Aronson, “Black Journalists,” 7-8.

⁷⁷ Bonner, “Changing the Color of the News,” 214.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Goldstein, interview with the author, 19 January 2005.

⁸⁰ Fred Knubel, Director, Office of Public Information, Columbia University, press release, September 3, 1971, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁸¹ Goldstein, interview. In another incident, Ruth Friendly recalled how a white person used the term “boy” when speaking to Friendly about a black Summer Program graduate; Friendly went away so angry that he subsequently punched a wall, injuring his hand. Friendly, interview.

⁸² “The Class” to Fred Friendly, memorandum, 4 August 1971, Fred Friendly Papers; “Newspaper Officials Reject Bias Findings by EEOC,” *Jet*, vol. 43, (December 14, 1972), 18. The following year, Alexander would represent seven black *Washington Post* employees who filed a complaint against the paper with the EEOC, charging discrimination in assignments and in wages.

⁸³ Goldstein, e-mail message to author, 2 April 2005.

⁸⁴ Gilson, interview.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ Gilson, e-mail message to author, 31 March 2005.

⁸⁷ Mencher, e-mail message to author, 30 March 2005.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ 1970 Summer Program, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, 4, Fred Friendly Papers. The manual advises students that their primary supervisor will be their editor in the program, and contains this exhortation: “Of course you will be competing with other newsmen in the field when you go to work in September, as you will when you are on assignment in New York this summer. So get used to the idea that preparation and aggressiveness pay off. Assert yourself from the very beginning.”

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

⁹¹ F. Friendly, Remarks, 6.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Bonner, “Changing the Color of the News,” 224.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 227-28.

⁹⁵ “Request for Grant Action” (RGA), July 11, 1972.

⁹⁶ Knubel, press release, March 27, 1972, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives; Earl Caldwell, “Ask Me. I Know. I Was the Test Case,” *Bulletin of the American Society of*

Newspaper Editors no. 562 (September 1972): 20. The court ruled 5-4 against Caldwell in what would be known as the “Caldwell case.”

⁹⁷ Earl Caldwell (Scripps Howard endowed professor, Scripps Howard School of Journalism and Mass Communication, Hampton University), interview with the author, 8 April 2004.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² Knubel, press release, 1972, 3.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁰⁴ Caldwell, interview.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ “Who’s Who in the 1972 Summer Program in Journalism for Members of Minority Groups,” Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, 4, Fred Friendly Papers.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Goldstein, e-mail, 2 April 2005.

¹¹⁰ Goldstein, interview.

¹¹¹ Bonner, “Changing the Color of the News,” 228, 244; The Association of Electronic Journalists, <http://www.rtnda.org/asfi/fellowships/minority.shtml> (accessed 1 October 2005). A fellowship honoring Clark is awarded annually to young minority journalists in television or radio news by the Radio-Television News Directors Association & Foundation.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 228-29.

¹¹³ Ibid., 228.

¹¹⁴ Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, Proposal, 1973, The Michele Clark Fellowship Program for Minority Journalists, February 1973, Fred Friendly Papers.

¹¹⁵ “Request for Grant Action” (RGA), July 11, 1973, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

¹¹⁶ Harris, *Minority Employment*, I-7.

¹¹⁷ Harold Howe II to Michell Sviridoff and Fred Friendly, Ford Foundation, 1 June 1973, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ RGA, July 11, 1973, 6.

¹²⁰ Thomas E. Cooney Jr., Ford Foundation, to Maggie Aldrich Vall, New York, 22 March 1973. PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

¹²¹ Memorandum, Bryant Rollins to Fred Friendly, 7 February 1973, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

¹²² “The Image,” *Time*, September 13, 1963, <http://www.time.com/time/archive/preview/0,10987,896932,00.html> (accessed April 2, 2005).

¹²³ Charlayne Hunter-Gault (journalist and author, *In My Place*, a personal memoir of the civil rights movement), interview with the author, 15 January 2005.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Bryant Rollins (president, Mountaintop Institute), interview with author, 9 February 2005.

¹²⁹ John L. Dotson Jr. (publisher emeritus, *Akron Beacon-Journal* and co-founder, Robert C. Maynard Institute for Journalism Education), interview with the author, 3 September 2004.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Doan, “No Longer a White Man’s Club.”

¹³³ Rollins, interview.

¹³⁴ Harris, *Minority Employment*, 1-7.

¹³⁵ Goldstein, interview.

¹³⁶ Graduation – Michele Clark Fellows, August 16, 1974, Fred Friendly Papers. Two of the 225 graduates were said to have dropped out in previous years.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Joel Dreyfuss, “Presence Without Power,” *Washington Post*, September 3, 1974, B2.

¹⁴¹ Nathaniel Shepard Jr., “Minority-Journalists’ Program Closes,” *New York Times*, August 17, 1974, 24.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Knubel, press release, June 30, 1969.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 2. The money included special fellowships from the *New York Times*, Time Inc., other publishers, and Columbia’s Urban Center.

¹⁴⁵ Gilson, interview.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Sheppard, “Minority Journalists’ Program Closes.”

¹⁴⁸ Rollins, interview.

¹⁴⁹ Caldwell, interview.

¹⁵⁰ Goldstein, interview. For a discussion of hiring patterns in the U.S. television industry during 26 years of FCC equal employment opportunity regulations, see Dwight E. Brooks, George L. Daniels, and C. Ann Hollifield, “Television in Living Color: Racial Diversity in the Local Commercial Television Industry,” *Howard Journal of Communication* 14 (2003): 123-146.

¹⁵¹ Goldstein, interview.

¹⁵² Boylan, *Pulitzer’s School*, 196.

¹⁵³ John A. Buggs, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to Fred W. Friendly, 11 September 1974, Fred Friendly Papers. See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Window Dressing on the Set* (chap. 1, n. 114).

¹⁵⁴ Fred W. Friendly to John A. Buggs, 1 October 1974, Fred Friendly Papers.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Christopher G. Trump, assistant dean, Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, to Thomas E. Cooney Jr., Program Officer, Ford Foundation, 23 January 1974, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

¹⁵⁷ Fred W. Friendly to John A. Buggs; Edward J. Trayes, “Blacks Triple Enrollment as J-majors in 3 Years,” *Journalism Educator* 26 (Fall 1971), 14-15. Columbia was not alone. A survey of the number of blacks majoring in journalism at 114 colleges showed enrollment tripled from 1968 to 1970.

¹⁵⁸ Allen, “Changing Times,” 43.

¹⁵⁹ Friendly, *The Good Guys*.

¹⁶⁰ Boylan, *Pulitzer’s School*, 196.

¹⁶¹ Allen, “Changing Times,” 43.

- ¹⁶² Fred Friendly Seminars, “About the Seminars.”
- ¹⁶³ Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, Proposal, Michele Clark Fellowship Program for Minority Journalists, January 1974, 6, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives; Knubel, press release, 1971, 2.
- ¹⁶⁴ Kenneth E. Wilson to Fred Friendly, 6 October 1969, Fred Friendly Papers.
- ¹⁶⁵ Rollins, interview.
- ¹⁶⁶ Thornton, “Broadcast News,” 394.
- ¹⁶⁷ Annual reports, the Ford Foundation, IJE, Fred Friendly Papers.
- ¹⁶⁸ Boylan, *Pulitzer’s School*, 196.
- ¹⁶⁹ Jannette L. Dates, “Print News,” in *Split Image*, 371; Memorandum, David M. Davis, Ford Foundation, to Fred W. Friendly, 15 March 1979, *PA680-0673*, Ford Foundation Archives; William A. Hilliard, “One Individual Can Make a Major Difference,” *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, October 1993, 2.
- ¹⁷⁰ “Graduates,” Summer Program enrollees, the Maynard Institute, n.d.
- ¹⁷¹ Dotson, interview.
- ¹⁷² Dori J. Maynard, Maynard Institute, mailing to members, Robert C. Maynard Institute for Journalism Education, 15 December 2004.
- ¹⁷³ Aric Johnson and Kristen Go, “The Maynard Management Experience,” *DateLine AAJA*, 11, no. 3 (Fall 2004), 3.
- ¹⁷⁴ Caldwell, interview.
- ¹⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁶ Mencher, interview.

CHAPTER 4 – LITERATURE REVIEW

¹ Wilson and Gutiérrez, *Race, Multiculturalism*, 5, 19.

² John W.C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski, and William W. Bowman, *The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1976), 11, 198.

³ *Ibid.*, 198, 26, 5. African-Americans were the largest non-white group in the Johnstone study, representing 14.9 percent of the population based on 1967 estimates (198).

⁴ David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), 23.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 168.

⁶ David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996), 11.

⁷ This study devoted a chapter to non-white journalists. By the 1990s Native Americans were reported at 0.6 percent of news people, compared to 0.8 percent in the U.S. population.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 251; David Weaver and others, “Journalists of Color are Slowly Increasing,” *Indiana University School of Journalism American Journalist Survey*, 10 April 2003, http://www.poynter.org/content/content_print.asp?id=28787&custom= (accessed 5 March 2005).

⁹ Edmund B. Lambeth, *Committed Journalism: An Ethic for the Profession* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), 83.

¹⁰ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*, 31.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 200. Categories were collapsed for those who only attended high school, as well as those with post-secondary degrees.

¹² Vernon Stone, “Television Newspeople, Moving On,” *Television and Radio News Research*, (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 2000) <http://www.missouri.edu/~jourvs/tvers.html> (accessed 21 April 2005).

- ¹³ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*, 99-100.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 203. Total communication majors accounted for 27.5 percent of Johnstone's respondents.
- ¹⁵ Harris, *Minority Employment*, I-7.
- ¹⁶ Weaver and Wilhoit, *The American Journalist*, 99.
- ¹⁷ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*, 49, 53.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 65.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰ Michael L. Hilt and Jeremy H. Lipschultz, "Comparing Views of Broadcasters and Student Interns about Career Preparation," *Feedback* 40, no. 4 (Fall 1999): 17.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² Fred Bales, "Newspaper Editors' Evaluations of Professional Programs," *Journalism Educator* 47 (Autumn 1992): 44.
- ²³ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*, 238.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*
- ²⁶ *Ibid.* Johnstone suggested two explanations for the broadcast findings: relatively high incomes for young journalists and fewer chances to advance for older ones.
- ²⁷ Philip Janson and Jack K. Martin, "Job Satisfaction and Age: A Test of Two Views," *Social Forces* 60, 4 (June 1982): 1097-98.
- ²⁸ Sharon Bramlett-Solomon, "Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Black Journalists," *Journalism Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 708. Satisfaction levels measured at journalism conventions may not be generalizable to other journalists, as those sent to conventions by employers could also be the most contented.

²⁹ Newspaper Association of America, *Preserving Talent Part II*, summarized findings, 2-3 (Vienna, VA: Newspaper Association of America, 2002) <http://www.naa.org/artpage.cfm?AID=6201&SID=88> (accessed 5 March 2005).

³⁰ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*, 133.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 237. Johnstone's statistics included personnel at radio stations and weekly newspapers, who typically earned less than in other sectors of the news media.

³² Social Security Administration, *National Average Wage Indexing Series, 1951-2003*, "National Average Wage Index," 19 October 2004, <http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/COLA/AWI.html> (accessed 17 May 2005).

³³ Gans, *Democracy and the News*, 49-51.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 50.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

³⁶ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, 222. Bases were weighted. Johnstone identified three categories of news organizations. Those with fewer than twenty-five employees had 1,855 respondents; those with twenty-six to 100 employees had 1,045 respondents and those with more than 100 employees had 1,184 respondents.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Weaver and Wilhoit, *The American Journalist*, 76.

³⁹ Gaye Tuchman, "Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected," *American Journal of Sociology* 79, no. 1 (1973): 120. <http://www.jstor.org>.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Herbert J. Gans, *Deciding What's News* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2004), 194.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 348.

⁴³ John H. McManus, “The First Stage of News Production: Learning What’s Happening,” in *Social Meanings of News*, ed. Daniel A. Berkowitz (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997), 292, 295.

⁴⁴ Harris, *Minority Employment*, 1-7. The survey sampled 1,038 daily newspapers, or 59 percent of the national total. The data include forty-seven journalists from Honolulu papers, at which whites are minorities, as well as thirty-nine journalists at Spanish-language sections of papers in the South and Southwest.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ellis Cose, *The Quiet Crisis: Minority Journalists and Newsroom Opportunity*, Executive Summary, in *Minorities Research* (San Francisco: Associated Press Managing Editors, Minority Research Committee, October 1985).

⁴⁷ Lee B. Becker, Jeffrey W. Fruit and Susan L. Caudill, *The Training and Hiring of Journalists* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987), 157.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 133. Jobs included work in broadcasting, print, advertising, public relations and other jobs outside media.

⁴⁹ Edward C. Pease, “Still the Invisible People: Job Satisfaction of Minority Journalists at U.S. Daily Papers” (PhD diss., Ohio University, 1991), 330.

⁵⁰ Cose, *Quiet Crisis*.

⁵¹ Pease, “Still the Invisible People,” 111.

⁵² Ibid., 100.

⁵³ Weaver and Wilhoit, *American Journalist in the 1990s*, 12.

⁵⁴ David H. Weaver, e-mail message to author, June 6, 2005. The 12.7 years for minority journalists came from the American Journalist Survey main random sample combined with samples from the four main minority journalism associations, while the 16.7 years for non-Hispanic whites came from the main random sample.

⁵⁵ Barbara Jill Feldman, “Journalism Career Paths and Experiential Learning,” *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 50, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 23, 26.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 26.

⁵⁹ Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, 144-45, 152.

⁶⁰ Lee B. Becker, Idowu A. Sobowale and Robin E. Cobbey, "Reporters and their Professional and Organizational Commitment," *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (Winter 1979): 753-56.

⁶¹ Ibid., 757, 763.

⁶² Weaver and Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People*, 99, 101

⁶³ Ibid., 99.

⁶⁴ Pease, "Still the Invisible People," 80, 95, 139.

⁶⁵ MORI Research, *APME Newsroom Diversity Study*, (Minneapolis, MN: MORI Research, 1996). The study sampled 531 newspaper journalists.

⁶⁶ Lawrence T. McGill, *What Research Tells Us about Retaining Newspaper Journalists of Color: A Meta-analysis of 13 Studies Conducted from 1989 to 2000* (Reston, VA: American Society of Newspaper Editors, September 4, 2001), <http://www.asne.org/index.cfm?id=1477> (accessed 26 Jan 2005).

⁶⁷ Alexis Tan, "Why Asian American Journalists Leave Journalism and Why They Stay," paper presented to the national convention of the Asian American Journalists Association, New York, NY, August 23, 1990.

⁶⁸ Ted Pease and J. Frazier Smith, *The Newsroom Barometer: Job Satisfaction and the Impact of Racial Diversity at U.S. Daily Newspapers*, The Ohio Journalism Monograph Series, no. 1: July 1991 (Ohio University: Bush Research Center of the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism), 15.

⁶⁹ California Chicano News Media Association and the Center for the Integration and Improvement of Journalism, "Latinos in California's News Media: A Status Report" (paper, California Chicano News Media Association State Conference, September 21, 1990).

⁷⁰ McGill, *What Research Tells Us*; Tan, “Why Asian American Journalists Leave,” 2. The portion of this study aimed at former journalists had a response rate of 79 percent, but was sent to only forty persons, thirty of whom responded.

⁷¹ Ibid. Tan found that former journalists had more opportunities to leave “because of graduate degrees in fields other than journalism or mass communications.”

⁷² Tan, “Why Asian American Journalists Leave;” National Association of Black Journalists, *Halting the Exodus*, 1989, *Muted Voices*, 1994; International Women’s Media Foundation, *Present Without Power*, 1999; in McGill, *What Research Tells Us*.

⁷³ Cose, *Quiet Crisis*.

⁷⁴ *Preserving Talent II*, 2, 3.

⁷⁵ McGill, “What Research Tells Us,” 17.

⁷⁶ Stone, “Television Newspeople.” Stone’s national survey was supported by the Freedom Forum.

⁷⁷ Robert L. Craig, “Summer Programs in Journalism for Members of Minority Groups at Graduate School of Journalism/Columbia University,” 30 September 1970, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁷⁸ Strickland, letter (see chap. 2, n. 71).

⁷⁹ Davis, memo.

CHAPTER 6 - METHOD

¹ Patrice Relensford, “Calling all Columbia Minority Journalist Trainees,” *Unity News*, 7 August 2004.

² “Have You Seen Them?” Hispanic Link Weekly Report, Corporate classifieds, 22 November 2004 and 13 December 2004, http://www.hispaniclink.org/images/Fed_Opps_November_8.pdf and http://www.hispaniclink.org/weeklyreport/images/classifieds_1.pdf (accessed 28 February 2005).

³ Richard Prince, "Columbia Summer Program Graduates Sought," Richard Prince's Journalism, 15 November 2004. http://www.maynardije.org/columns/dickprince/041115_prince/ (accessed 16 November 2004).

⁴ Narrative report to the Ford Foundation, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University, "1970 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups," October 1971, 5, PA680-0673, Ford Foundation Archives.

⁵ Ancestry.com database, Social Security Death Index, <http://ancestry.com/search/rectype/default.aspx?rt=34> (accessed Winter 2005).

⁶ Christopher Dunbar Jr., Dalia Rodriguez, and Laurence Parker, "Race, Subjectivity and the Interview Process," in *Handbook of Interview Research*, eds. Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002), 287.

⁷ Summer Program participants, communications with the author, n.d.

⁸ Jerald G. Bachman and Patrick M. O'Malley, "Yea-Saying, Nay-Saying and Going to Extremes: Black-White Differences in Response Styles," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (Summer 1984): 491. <http://www.jstor.org/>.

⁹ Keyton, *Communication Research*, 178-79.

CHAPTER 7 - RESULTS

¹ Bill Deiz, interview with the author, 9 November 2004.

² Owen Wilkerson, interview with the author, 12 October 2004.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Claude Matthews, interview with the author, 11 October 2004.

⁵ Helen Blue, interview with the author, 14 October 2004.

⁶ Francine Cheeks, interview with the author, 26 August 2004. Cheeks is director of the Communications Department at the American Friends Service Committee, an international Quaker peace and social justice organization founded in 1917.

⁷ Bob Nicholas (corporate president, Nicholas Earth Printing), interview with the author, 10 December 2004.

⁸ Blue, interview.

⁹ Alan Peters (researcher, *Chicago Tribune*), interview with the author, 2 December 2004.

¹⁰ Gloria Rojas, interview with the author, 12 November 2004.

¹¹ Nicholas, interview.

¹² Blue, interview.

¹³ Summer Program participant, interview with the author, 30 November 2004.

¹⁴ Sherman Jackson, interview with the author, 17 November 2004.

¹⁵ Will Wright, interview with the author, 2 December 2004.

¹⁶ Maureen Bunyan, interview with the author, 12 November 2004.

¹⁷ Wesley, interview (see chap. 2, n. 72).

¹⁸ Sandra C. Dillard, "One Final Review: It's Been a Terrific Show," Theater, *Denver Post*, sec. AE, I-05, September 2, 2001.

¹⁹ Louis Morton, interview with the author, 17 January 2005.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Harvey Clark Jr., interview with the author, 16 December 2004.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Wright, interview.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Isabel Bahamonde, e-mail message to author, 11 February 2005.

³⁰ Blue, interview.

³¹ Ben Wong, interview with the author, 13 December 2004.

³² Matthews, interview.

³³ José Santiago, interview with the author, 1 December 2004.

³⁴ Bunyan, interview.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ysabel Duron, interview with the author, 1 November, 2004.

³⁷ Hilda Tula Gourdin, interview with the author, 8 January 2005.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Randall Pinkston, interview with the author, 19 November 2004.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Interviews with Summer Program participants, winter 2004-2005.

⁴² Clark, interview.

⁴³ Christopher Chow, e-mail message to author, 15 September 2005.

⁴⁴ Christopher Chow, interview with the author, 29 September 2004.

- ⁴⁵ Ibid.; Chow, e-mail.
- ⁴⁶ Osker Spicer, interview with the author, 5 October 2004.
- ⁴⁷ Bob Reid, interview with the author, 4 December 2004.
- ⁴⁸ Reid, note to author, 9 September 2005.
- ⁴⁹ Mervin R. Aubespain, interview with the author, 7 October 2004.
- ⁵⁰ Rojas, interview.
- ⁵¹ Royal Kennedy Rodgers, interview with the author, 7 December 2004.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Ianthia Hall-Smith, interview with the author, 9 December 2004.
- ⁵⁴ Jacqueline Casselberry King, interview with the author, 30 November 2004.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶ Karl Nurse, interview with the author, 19 November 2004.
- ⁵⁷ Nurse, e-mail message to author, 12 September 2005.
- ⁵⁸ Ana Thorne, interview with the author, 6 December 2004.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ⁶⁰ Joe Olvera, interview with the author, 5 October 2004.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Kevin Dilworth, interview with the author, 16 September 2004.
- ⁶⁴ Dilworth, e-mail message to author, 12 September 2005.

⁶⁵ Dilworth, interview.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Dilworth, e-mail message to author, 13 September 2005.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Dean Toji, interview with the author, 4 January 2005.

⁷⁰ Nicholas, interview.

⁷¹ Karlynn Carrinton, interview with the author, 16 December 2004.

⁷² John Raye, interview with the author, 27 October 2004.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Raye, note to author, 5 September 2005.

⁷⁵ Santiago, interview.

⁷⁶ David Early, interview with the author, 9 November 2004.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Johnathan Rodgers, interview with the author, 23 November 2004.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Don Savage, interview with the author, 2 December 2004.

⁸² Wesley, interview.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Nurse, interview.

⁸⁶ Deiz, interview.

⁸⁷ Aubespin, interview.

⁸⁸ Rosa Eréndira Morales, interview with the author, 9 January 2005.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Vern Smith, interview with the author, 19 October 2004.

⁹¹ Tanna Beebe Chattin, interview with the author, 6 October 2004.

⁹² Chattin, letter to the author, 11 September 2005.

⁹³ Ardie Ivie Jr., interview with the author, 30 September 2004.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

CHAPTER 8 – DISCUSSION AND FUTURE STUDY

¹ Weaver, e-mail.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, George N. "Changing Times: The Columbia School of Journalism." *Washington Journalism Review*, April/May 1979, 40-45.
- American Society of Newspaper Editors. "News Staffs Shrinking While Minority Presence Grows." News Release, April 15, 2005. <http://www.asne.org/index.cfm?ID=5648> (accessed May 17, 2005).
- Ancestry.com Database. Social Security Death Index.
<http://ancestry.com/search/rectype/default.aspx?rt=34>.
- Aronson, James. "Black Journalists: Why the Dearth?" *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors* no. 558 (March 1972): 5-10.
- Astor, Gerald. *Minorities and the Media*. New York: Ford Foundation, November 1974.
- Audit Bureau of Circulations. "The Top 150 Daily Newspapers." From FAS-FAX ending September 30, 2004. <http://www.accessabc.com/reader/top150.htm> (accessed January 21, 2005).
- Bachman, Jerald G. and Patrick M. O'Malley. "Yea-Saying, Nay-Saying and Going to Extremes: Black-White Differences in Response Styles." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (Summer 1984): 491-509. <http://www.jstor.org/>.
- Bales, Fred. "Newspaper Editors' Evaluations of Professional Programs." *Journalism Educator* 47 (Autumn 1992): 40-45.
- Becker, Lee B., Jeffrey W. Fruit, and Susan L. Caudill. *The Training and Hiring of Journalists*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987.
- Becker, Lee B., Idowu A. Sobowale, and Robin E. Cobbey. "Reporters and their Professional and Organizational Commitment." *Journalism Quarterly* 56 (Winter 1979): 753-56.
- Bird, Kai. *The Color of Truth: McGeorge Bundy and William Bundy: Brothers in Arms*. New York: Touchstone, 1998.
- Bonner, Alice. "Changing the Color of the News: Robert Maynard and the Desegregation of American Newspapers." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1999.
- . "Norman Isaacs' Idealistic Quest." *American Editor*. December 1, 1998.
<http://www.asne.org/kiosk/editor/98.dec/bonner2.htm> (accessed April 25, 2005).
- Boylan, James. *Pulitzer's School: Columbia University's School of Journalism, 1903-2003*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

- Bramlett-Solomon, Sharon. "Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Black Journalists." *Journalism Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 703-712.
- Brandon, Wanda M. "Journalism Learning Experiences and Newspaper Job Success." PhD diss., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1997.
- Brennen, Bonnie. "Toward a History of Labor and News Work: The Use of Oral Sources in Journalism History." *Journal of American History*, September 1996, 571-579.
<http://www.jstor.org/>.
- Broadcasting*. "CBS examines its ranks," *Broadcasting*, November 27, 1972, 26.
- . "Nationwide Comparative Employment Report," November 27, 1972, 31.
- . "Parker Assails Hiring Practices at TV Stations." November 27, 1972, 26-31.
- . "Spanish-Americans Want Piece of Action." April 13, 1970. 35.
- . "Talent Unions Want More Minority-Group Newsmen." March 29, 1971, 100.
- . "Telestatus," March 3, 1969, 70-71.
- . "The Struggle Over Broadcast Access." September 20, 1971, 32, 35.
- Brooks, Dwight E., George L. Daniels, and C. Ann Hollifield. "Television in Living Color: Racial Diversity in the Local Commercial Television Industry." *Howard Journal of Communication* 14 (2003): 123-146.
- CBS News. "Mississippi and the Black Vote – 1962." *The Civil Rights Movement: Primary Sources*. VHS. Princeton, NJ: Films for the Humanities and Sciences, 2000.
- Caldwell, Earl. "Ask Me. I Know. I Was the Test Case," *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors* no. 562 (September 1972): 20.
- California Chicano News Media Association. "Scholarship Competition." <http://www.ccnma.org/> (accessed 1 October 2005).
- California Chicano News Media Association and the Center for the Integration and Improvement of Journalism. "Latinos in California's News Media: A Status Report." Paper, California Chicano News Media Association state conference, September 21, 1990.
- Califano, Joseph A. Jr. *The Triumph and Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.
- Chisholm, Shirley. "The White Press: Racist and Sexist." *Black Scholar*, September 1973, 20-22.
- Classen, Steven D. *Watching Jim Crow: The Struggles Over Mississippi TV, 1955-1969*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

- Clay, William L. *Just Permanent Interests: Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1991*. New York: Amistad Press, 1992.
- Columbia Journalism Review*. "Journalism and the Kerner Report." Fall 1968, 42.
- Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. *1969 Summer Program in Broadcast and Print Journalism for Members of Minority Groups*. New York: Columbia University, 1969.
- Columbia University. "A Brief History of Columbia." *About Columbia*, n.d., http://www.columbia.edu/about_columbia/history.html.
- Commission on Freedom of the Press. *A Free and Responsible Press*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- Cose, Ellis. "The Quiet Crisis: Minority Journalists and Newsroom Opportunity." In *Minorities Research*. San Francisco: Associated Press Managing Editors, Minority Research Committee, October 1985.
- Curtis, J. Montgomery. "Monty on Minorities." *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 613 (March 1978): 6-8.
- Dates, Jannette L. and William Barlow, eds. *Split Image: African-Americans in the Mass Media*. Washington: Howard University Press, 1990.
- Dates, Jannette L., "Print News." In Dates and Barlow, *Split Image*, 343-387.
- Dedman, Bill and Stephen K. Doig. "Newsroom Diversity Has Passed its Peak at Most Newspapers, 1990-2005 Study Showed." Report Summary, June 1, 2005. John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. <http://powerreporting.com/knight/> (accessed September 15, 2005).
- Demo, Lori. "The Shameful Delay: Newspapers' Recruitment of Minorities Employees, 1968-1978." Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication History Division, New Orleans, August 1999. <http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9909E&L=aejmc&P=R32349&m=1393> (accessed March 16, 2004).
- de Uriarte, Mercedes Lynn. *Diversity Disconnects: From Class Room to News Room*. With Cristina Bodinger-de Uriarte and José Benavides. Report. Austin, TX: University of Texas, 2003. <http://journalism.utexas.edu/faculty/deuriarte/diversity.html> (accessed March 5, 2005).
- Dim, Stuart. "Minorities and Media." Letter to the Editor. *Columbia Journalism Review*. Winter 1969-70.
- Doan, Richard K. "No Longer a White Man's Club." *TV Guide*. December 4, 1971.

- Douglas, Pamela. "Black Television: Avenues of Power." *Black Scholar*. September 1973, 23-31.
- Dunbar Jr., Christopher, Dalia Rodriguez, and Laurence Parker. "Race, Subjectivity and the Interview Process." In *Handbook of Interview Research*. Edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein, 279-298. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.
- Editor & Publisher. "Editors Seek Negro Candidates for Jobs." *Editor & Publisher*, September 23, 1967, 22.
- . *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook*. New York: Editor & Publisher, 1969.
- . *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook*. New York: Editor & Publisher, 1970.
- Feldman, Barbara Jill. "Journalism Career Paths and Experiential Learning." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 50, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 23-29.
- Ford Foundation Archives. Grant 0680-0673 to Columbia University. Ford Foundation. New York.
- Fitt, Alfred B. (General Counsel, Congressional Budget Office). "CBO Testimony." Statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Committee on Education (May 30, 1979).
<http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=5223&sequence=0> (accessed September 8, 2005).
- Friendly, Fred. *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control*. New York: Random House, 1967.
- . *The Good Guys, the Bad Guys, and the First Amendment: Free Speech vs. Fairness in Broadcasting*. New York: Random House, 1975.
- Fred Friendly Papers. Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University.
- Fred Friendly Seminars. "About the Seminars: Who was Fred Friendly?"
<http://fredfriendly.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=about.who> (accessed 9 April 2005).
- Gans, Herbert J. *Deciding What's News*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2004.
- . *Democracy and the News*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Garland, Phyl. "Staying with the Black Press: Problems and Rewards." In *Perspectives of the Black Press: 1974*. Edited by Henry G. La Brie III, 167-182. Kennebunkport, ME: Mercer House Press, 1974.
- Gilbert, Ben. "Race Coverage." *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 515 (January 1968): 1-2.

- Giles, Bob. Nieman Foundation at Harvard University. Press Release, May 17, 2004, <http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/people/2004-05release.html> (accessed 10 April 2005).
- Harris, Jay. T. *Minority Employment in Daily Newspapers*. Evanston, IL: Frank E. Gannett Urban Journalism Center, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, 1978.
- Hatcher, Richard G. "Mass Media and the Black Community." *Black Scholar*, September 1973, 2-10.
- Hilliard, William A. "One Individual Can Make a Major Difference." *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*. October 1993, 2.
- Hilt, Michael L. and Jeremy H. Lipschultz. "Comparing Views of Broadcasters and Student Interns about Career Preparation." *Feedback* 40, no. 4 (Fall 1999): 14-19.
- Hispanic Link. "Have You Seen Them?" *Hispanic Link Weekly Report*. Corporate classifieds. November 22, 2004 and December 13, 2004. http://www.hispaniclink.org/images/Fed_Opps_November_8.pdf and http://www.hispaniclink.org/weeklyreport/images/classifieds_1.pdf.
- Horwitz, Robert. "Broadcast Reform Revisited: The Rev. Everett C. Parker and the Standing Case." *Communication Review* 2, no. 3 (1998): 311-348.
- Janson, Philip, and Jack K. Martin. "Job Satisfaction and Age: A Test of Two Views." *Social Forces*, 60, 4 (June 1982): 1089-1102.
- Jet*. "Newspaper Officials Reject Bias Findings by EEOC." Vol. 43 (December 14, 1972): 18.
- Johnson, Aric, and Kristen Go. "The Maynard Management Experience." *DateLine AAJA* 11, no. 3 (Fall 2004): 3.
- The Johnson Presidential Press Conferences, Vol. 2. New York: Earl M. Coleman Enterprises, 1978.
- Johnstone, John W.C., Edward J. Slawski, and William W. Bowman. *The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1976).
- Kendrick, Alexander. *Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 348-49.
- Kerner Report on the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1968.
- Keyton, Joann. *Communication Research: Asking Questions, Finding Answers* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001).

- King, James B. "Minorities: From now till 2000 A.D." *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors* no. 615 (May/June 1978): 10-11.
- Klein, Woody. "News Media and Race Relations: A Self-Portrait." *Columbia Journalism Review*. Fall 1968, 42-49.
- Kotz, Nick. "The Minority Struggle for a Place in the Newsroom." *Columbia Journalism Review*. March/April, 1979. 23-31.
- Lambeth, Edmund B. *Committed Journalism: An Ethic for the Profession* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986).
- Leab, Daniel J. "See it Now: A Legend Reassessed." In *American History, American Television*. Edited by John E. O'Connor, 1-32. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983.
- Lincoln University. "Lincoln Journalism." <http://www.lincolnu.edu/pages/620.asp> (accessed September 7, 2005).
- MORI Research, *APME Newsroom Diversity Study*. Minneapolis, MN: MORI Research, September 1996.
- MacDonald, J. Fred. *Blacks and White TV: African Americans in Television Since 1948*. 2nd. (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1992), 100-101.
- Margolis, Irv. "Minorities: Why the Dearth?" *RTNDA Bulletin*, February 1970, 7.
- Martindale, Carolyn. *The White Press and Black America*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Maynard, Dori J. Mailing to members of the Robert C. Maynard Institute for Journalism Education. December 15, 2004.
- Maynard Institute, "Graduates," Summer Program enrollees, n.d.
- McGill, Lawrence T. *What Research Tells us about Retaining Newspaper Journalists of Color: A Meta-analysis of 13 Studies Conducted from 1989 to 2000*. Reston, VA: American Society of Newspaper Editors, September 4, 2001.
<http://www.asne.org/index.cfm?id=1477> (accessed January 26, 2005).
- McKnight, Felix. "Downplay their Stupidity." *Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, no. 515 (January 1968): 3-4.
- McManus, John H. "The First Stage of News Production: Learning What's Happening," in *Social Meanings of News*. Edited by Daniel A. Berkowitz, 286-300. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997).
- Mills, Kay. *Changing Channels: The Civil Rights Case that Transformed Television*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2004.

- Najjar, Orayb. "ASNE Efforts Increase Minorities in Newsrooms." *Newspaper Research Journal* 16, no. 4 (Fall 1995): 126-140.
- Newspaper Association of America. *Preserving Talent Part II. "Summarized Findings."* Vienna, VA: Newspaper Association of America, 2002.
<http://www.naa.org/artpage.cfm?AID=6201&SID=88> (accessed March 5, 2005).
- Nielsen Media Research. Local Universe Estimates. 2004.
<http://www.nielsenmedia.com/DMA.html> (accessed January 21, 2005).
- Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. FCC, 359 F.2d: 994-1009 (U.S. App. 1966).
- . 425 F.2d: 543-551 (U.S. App. 1969).
- Pease, Edward C. "Still the Invisible People: Job Satisfaction of Minority Journalists at U.S. Daily Papers." PhD diss., Ohio University, 1991.
- Pease, Ted & J. Frazier Smith. "The Newsroom Barometer: Job Satisfaction and the Impact of Racial Diversity at U.S. Daily Newspapers." Ohio Journalism Monograph Series no. 1 (Ohio University, July 1991).
- Prince, Richard. "Columbia Summer Program Graduates Sought." Richard Prince's Journalisms, November 15, 2004.
http://www.maynardije.org/columns/dickprince/041115_prince/.
- . "Veteran Broadcaster, 71, Opened Howard U School," Richard Prince's Journalisms. July 20, 2004. http://www.maynardije.org/columns/dickprince/040720_prince/.
- Roberts, Churchill. "The Presentation of Blacks in Television Network Newscasts." *Journalism Quarterly* 52 (Spring 1975): 50-55.
- Scripps Howard Foundation. "Scripps Howard Foundation, Hampton University Open New School of Journalism and Communications." News Release, September 9, 2002.
<http://www.scripps.com/foundation/news/newsrelease/02sept09.html> (accessed September 7, 2005).
- Sobel, Lester A. *New York and the Urban Dilemma*. New York: Facts on File, 1976.
- Social Security Administration. "National Average Wage Index." *National Average Wage Indexing Series, 1951-2003*. <http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/COLA/AWI.html> (accessed October 19, 2004).
- Sperber, A.M. "Murrow: His Life and Times" (New York: Freundlich Books, 1986), 320.

- Styles, Teresa Jo. "Perspectives of Minorities and Women in Network News Public Affairs Broadcasting: CBS Reports 1977-1982." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1998.
- Stone, Vernon. Television and Radio News Research. "Television Newspeople, Moving On." (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 2000).
<http://www.missouri.edu/~jourvs/tvers.html> (accessed April 21, 2005).
- Stone, Vernon. "Women Gain, Minorities Lose in TV News." In *Facing Difference: Race, Gender and Mass Media*. Edited by Shirley Biagi and Marilyn Kern-Foxworth, 143-147. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1997.
- Tan, Alexis. "Why Asian American Journalists Leave Journalism and Why They Stay." Paper presented to the national convention of the Asian American Journalists Association, New York, August 23, 1990.
- Thornton, Lee. "Broadcast News." In Dates and Barlow, *Split Image*, 389-418.
- Time. "The Image." September 13, 1963.
<http://www.time.com/time/archive/preview/0,10987,896932,00.html> (accessed April 2, 2005).
- Trayes, Edward. "Still Few Blacks on Dailies, but 50% More in J-Schools, Recent Surveys Indicate." *Journalism Quarterly* 47 (Summer 1970): 356-60.
- . "Blacks Triple Enrollment as J-majors in 3 Years." *Journalism Educator* 26 (Fall 1971): 14-15.
- Tuchman, Gaye. "Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected." *American Journal of Sociology* 79, no.1 (1973): 110-131. <http://www.jstor.org/>.
- Watson, Mary Ann. "Eleanor Intervenes." *Television Quarterly* 32, no. 2-3 (2001): 50-55.
- Weaver, David, Randal Beam, Bonnie Brownlee, Paul S. Voakes, & G. Cleveland Wilhoit. "Journalists of Color are Slowly Increasing," *Indiana University School of Journalism American Journalist Survey*, 10 April 2003.
http://www.poynter.org/content/content_print.asp?id=28787&custom= (accessed 5 March 2005).
- Weaver David H. and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.
- , *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Wilson, Clint C. II and Félix Gutiérrez. *Race, Multiculturalism and the Media: From Mass to Class Communication*. 2nd. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

- Witcover, Jules. "Washington's White Press Corps." *Columbia Journalism Review*, Winter 1969-70, 46-48.
- Wolseley, Roland E. *The Black Press, U.S.A.* 2nd. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1990.
- Wood, Bill. "Black Women in Television News." *Essence*. July 1972. 30-31, 58.
- Wood, Jennifer F. "House Negro versus Field Negro." In *Say it Loud! African-American Audiences, Media & Identity*. Edited by Robin R. Means-Coleman, 95-114. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

VITA

MARY ALICE BASCONI

Personal Data: Date of Birth: September 12, 1956
Place of Birth: Jackson, Mississippi

Education: Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas;
Journalism, B.A., 1978
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
Professional Communication, M.A., 2006

Professional

Experience: Reporter, South Florida *Sun-Sentinel*, 1978 – 1983
Reporter, *Johnson City Press*; Johnson City, Tennessee, 1984 - 1986
Contributor, *Now & Then* Magazine; Center for Appalachian Studies and
Services, East Tennessee State University, 1988
Correspondent, *Business Journal of Upper East Tennessee/Southwest Virginia*;
Blountville, Tennessee, 1988 - 1993
Correspondent and columnist, *The East Tennessee Catholic*; Knoxville,
Tennessee, 1994 - 1998
Columnist, “Compañeros” (a bilingual column on Hispanic issues) *Johnson City
Press*; Johnson City, Tennessee, 2004 – 2005

Honors:

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society

Memberships:

National Association of Hispanic Journalists
Society of Professional Journalists