Get your MoJo Rising

Learn how to tell stories across multiple platforms

Keys to Communication

In a changing media world, here’s how to work together to stay ahead

>> In the office: Iowa State Daily leaders share how advertising and the newsroom found harmony with each other.

>> Out of the office: Delivering what your readers need can be a boon for them and your advertisers. Learn what those needs are using survey tools at your disposal.

PLUS:
- Multimedia Tips
- Improving Sports Coverage
“Our own website, in our own way”

“TownNews.com allows iowastatedaily.com staff members the flexibility they need to design and operate their website in their own unique way.

“TownNews’s customer service is outstanding. When we call, they answer. And then its support staff works with us to find creative and innovative ways to resolve our website issues.

“They also provide us with the consistency needed to provide a quality product semester after semester even though we operate in a very transitory environment.

“We couldn’t ask for anything more.”

~ Mark Witherspoon
Editorial Adviser to the Iowa State Daily
www.iowastatedaily.com, Ames, IA

You keep the ad inventory … You keep the revenue!

TOWNNews.com
Online solutions. Bottom-line results.
TownNews.com hosts, designs and works with more than 1,500 websites.
Contact Paul Wilson: 800-293-9576 x3027 * pwilson@townnews.com
EDITOR’S CORNER
The coverage of wrongdoing on a college campus can often create controversy in and of itself. But when the East Texan newspaper’s reporting centered around football players and marijuana use, it created more than a buzz. Find out what the student editor learned from the struggle.

Robert Bohler

CONVERGENCE: GET YOUR NEWSROOM MOJO WORKING
Professionals, professors and advisers agree - students need to learn how to tell stories across multiple platforms. Getting them started doesn’t have to be a daunting task, though. Here are some hints to get your Mojo to go.

Jeff Halliday and Aaron Chimbel

CAN’T WE ALL JUST GET ALONG?
Advertising and editorial have a long history of fundamental and philosophical clashes, but the Iowa State Daily’s teams have a relationship many college news operations would envy. The road to amity was a journey, but the destination is one that students on both sides benefit from. Here’s the Daily’s story.

Mark Witherspoon and Annette Forbes

TURN THE STATS AROUND
Using surveys to determine readership or marketing strategies can be a painstaking process, but it doesn’t have to be. Networking with on-campus experts or using free services can put you in touch with your readers, and keep your advertisers coming back for more.

Dr. Kay Colley

GETTING SPORTSWRITERS TO PLAY YOUR GAME
Training for sports writers can be far from basic. Breaking bad habits for self-proclaimed experts is a challenge, but one that can be overcome with the structure of regular beat coverage and constructive critique sessions.

Joe Gisondi

EXAMINING PRECIPITATING FACTORS OF THE WILLINGNESS TO SELF-CENSOR

Refereed Article
Advisers and student editors in this study demonstrate that issues of self-interest, a sense of higher purpose, and fairness come into play when making the choice to self-censor. This article discusses potential impacts on student media newsrooms.

Dr. Vince Filak

SUBMISSIONS TO CMR:
For queries about submissions to College Media Review of popular articles or research articles for our refereed section, please visit our website at http://www.collegemedia.org/SubmitCMR for complete information.

On Deck
THIS FALL

When a nation struggles with the basic necessities of rebuilding, security, and establishment of a solid political infrastructure, an independent student newspaper is not bread and water – but it can be nourishing. Read Daniel Reimold’s account of how The AISU-Voice, the first newspaper of its kind in Iraq, is meeting its extraordinary challenges.
Editor’s corner

College paper reports misdoings on campus. Those close to wrongdoers take dim view of the newspaper. So, dim bulbs steal newspapers to dodge public accountability, becoming wrongdoers themselves. Happens all the time, unfortunately.

But the story coming out of Texas A&M University-Commerce got weird in February and March with a mix of football players, recruits and reports of marijuana use. Then it got more weird when campus ballplayers with a “smash-mouth” approach (as The East Texan called it) toward public discourse snatched the full press run from campus racks — and even pinched them from the police station.

Then comes weirder and weirder.

It turns out head football coach Guy Morriss is also a true believer (Disclaimer: He’s a graduate of my esteemed institution,) and is downright proud about his young charges doing the dirty deed. Tells two campus gendarmes it’s the best team-building exercise ever (no word yet on how they’ll top it next year). Says if stealing is breaking the law, then he ought to the first one out the door in cuffs. There’s no evidence the coach called the signals on the theft, although the athletics director says the team lacks the smarts to pull such a caper on its own. With that, the story went viral, with a gazillion website hits and slightly fewer pundits weighing in.

After much investigation, the college president, who admits to being a recovering journalist, says it’s all a huge misunderstanding. The coach said all those things, yes, but he apparently didn’t really mean any of them. The cops who interviewed Morriss apparently can’t tell a joke from a horseapple, if you buy the presidential spin, and got it all out of context. Meantime, the faculty senate is about as quiet as church mice. Its subsequent meeting is canceled, and the official university stance is all about how the football coach was wrongly perceived. Not much else forthcoming about the importance of free speech and the right to practice it.

Unless you read the student newspaper. There, editor in chief James Bright, whose newspaper covers issues in the city of Commerce as aggressively as it does its campus, keeps digging and, to hear him tell it, pushing, even if not always successfully. Bright, who returns next fall to his TAMC classrooms this year. One is when it gets down to brass tacks, administrations tend to back administrations and not the public’s right to know. Another is that if journalists meet their obligations, readers “will respect you for it,” he says.

* * *

It wouldn’t do to close this column without expressing my deep thanks to former Georgia Southern University media coordinator Kelley Callaway for all her help the past four years in helping pull together this publication. She’s among the best college newspaper editors I’ve been around and, much as it did when she was its EIC, the GSU newspaper received much-merited critical acclaim during her time as adviser. As CMR managing editor the past four years, she helped keep me mindful of the tasks at hand. Her scrutiny and attention to detail enabled the rest of us to produce a magazine and journal we hope has been a stimulating and enjoyable read (they aren’t always the same thing) for you. And I want to express my gratitude to University of Texas-Arlington newspaper adviser Beth Francesco for taking on the managing editor’s role for this last issue. I knew Beth when, as editor of The Shorthorn at the University of Texas-Arlington, she was twice selected as an SPF Working Press staff member. But she didn’t get offered the managing editor’s job because she’s close by. As a former city editor for the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, she’s been proven top notch. But I did already know that. Same for Adam Drew, our visuals editor for the past three years who’s also, but only coincidentally, from UTA. The covers and packages Adam has created with a limited toolkit have been exceptional in both vision and application — simply eye-popping work. It’s unclear at press time whether there will be carryover when the next staff is selected for a two-year term to guide the magazine. However that turns out, we hope the magazine has been as much a pleasure for you as it has been for us.

— Robert Bohler, Editor
Professors, professionals and advisers agree: Students must learn multiplatform skills now to prepare them for later.

by Jeff Halliday

business cards among today’s growing press corps feature lots of different, catchy monikers: mojo (mobile journalists), sojo (solo journalists), backpacker, VJ (video journalists), OMB (One-Man Band), MMJ (multimedia journalists), etc. The jargon and acronyms on media-related message boards is comparable to a string of text messages from teenagers gushing over the latest "Twilight Saga" update.

Words like “writer” or “reporter” no longer encompass the duties journalists carry to meet a growing consumer demand for content immediacy and variety. Television stations are experimenting with reporters who file material solely using cell phones, print reporters are becoming pseudo-bloggers as a way to stay relevant to a web audience, and tech-savvy journalists are using Flip video camcorders to get an instant edge on mainstreamers. The next generation of journalists has to know how to take these writing, editing and reporting skills and carry them across media platforms.

Aaron Chimbel, a five-time Texas Emmy and a national Edward R. Murrow award-winning journalist, worked feverishly to break new ground in multiplatform reporting with his former colleagues at WFAA-TV in Dallas-Fort Worth. It began with a simple realization, Chimbel said. “The biggest shift for us and for anyone in news was to recognize that we were producing news for 5, 6, 10 and 11 o’clock shows,” he said. “But people were no longer consuming news that way.”

Now an assistant professor of professional practice at Texas Christian University, Chimbel said WFAA’s monitoring of its website’s page views changed everything. “Our daily views started at 8 a.m., peaked midday, remained relatively high until 5 p.m., then turned way down as folks went home,” he said. “We needed to find a way to engage those consumers and get their eyes to our nightly news.”
That desire to increase daily page views and expand online content can be found in every newsroom in the country. The Richmond Times-Dispatch made major changes to its infrastructure and philosophy in 2008, news editor Paige Mudd said. “We established our continuous news desk, and the idea was that we would dedicate a small group of people whose priority was solely the website,” she said. “Those reporters would check the wires, update the site, go to any overnight fires, etc.” But shortly after the continuous news desk arrived, Mudd said, it became clear that everyone’s role had changed permanently.

“It’s understood now that you have to call in any major story right away or use your cell phone to e-mail it immediately,” she said. At the Times-Dispatch, the reporter’s traditional tools and responsibilities have both undergone a metamorphosis. “Every reporter now has a digital audio recorder,” Mudd said. “And they’ve been trained to edit. We’ve written it into our people’s annual evaluations that their job is not to just write for the print paper.”

In Charlottesville, Va., WVIR-TV (NBC 29) has dominated its designated market’s ratings battle for decades. But despite that comfortable lead in DMA No. 183, news director Neal Bennett felt attacking the web was a necessity and accordingly shifted his personnel. “One of my tasks was to modernize the station and bring it to the point where our website was a viable option and an extension of our brand,” Bennett said. “That means we meet your demand on TV, online, on your mobile phone, wherever.”

WVIR now dedicates three editors to its web site, which Bennett describes as a “lot for a market our size.” “Our reporters will complete their main story at the end of the day and then write up a separate web version and send it to our web crew,” Bennett said. “They then post it along with additional information and links. During the day, when reporters are in the field, they call in their info, it’s relayed to the newsroom, and producers place it in the shows while our web folks get it on the site. It’s now part of the natural workflow of our newsroom.”

MOJO LEARNING CURVE

WEB-SAVVY GRADS IN DEMAND

While NBC 29 has full-time employees placing content online, Bennett has a growing interest in entry-level reporter candidates who can create and manage web content on their own. “Two years ago, I wasn’t looking for people that knew Flash, but now I look for people that may also have those skills,” he says. It’s important to note that, for Bennett, in the end it still comes down to taking a singular base skill and showcasing it for all consumers. “If you can write for TV, you can write web copy. I give every applicant a writing test, used not as a decider, but as an eliminator,” he said.
gathering when you get back to your desk. The skills we focus on make students very marketable.”

When he was hired at WFAA, Chimbel became the station’s first mobile journalist and later served as the station’s first-ever online sports editor. Taking things in a new direction in any industry is tough, but Chimbel thinks college students are more receptive to experimenting and there’s no harm in trying. Put it on the students and learn with them. The way they use technology is different; they don’t connect it with the news, but are genuinely interested in drawing them together.” (See page 8 for Chimbel’s “Top 10 Tips for Multimedia” for reinventing news classrooms.)

At NBC 29, Bennett made it clear that advisers or professors who don’t take chances will lose their competitive edge. To survive and to stay relevant, local news must go “hyperlocal,” and to do that, Bennett sees multiplatform reporting by home or bureau-based individual journalists as the clear future in local news.

“The biggest change may come from journalists that rarely, if ever, come to the newsroom - a journalist that sends all of their stuff to the station from home through the web, also using Skype for live shots,” Bennett said. “The key is the more local the content the better. … In local news, you have to give (viewers) a value they’re not getting elsewhere.”

The same can be true for a media program. If a student isn’t getting those skills, he or she may go elsewhere, or worse yet, lose interest all together. To avoid that, Chimbel suggests advisers reach out to news media outlets that are utilizing multiplatform reporting and get to know the kind of equipment they are using and how they are working to meet consumer demands in their market.

Chimbel contends it’s critical for educators to try and convince students the extra work to develop those skills is worth the effort.

“The progressive stations and media outlets, the ones that will be around in five years, recognize that, and that’s where you want to work,” he said. “If you can be the revolutionary person in the newsroom, that’s what you want come layoff time. The more you can do, the more security you have.”

Mudd noted that multiplatform reporting’s impact at newspapers like the Times-Dispatch will also hopefully lead to interest in groundbreaking storytelling, the dearth of which media critics and consumers alike lament.

“I would like us to spend more time and resources on the lasting things online as opposed to video that has short-term shelf value,” Mudd said. “The important investigative and enterprise journalism, that is something that people really want to read. It’s important and people are passionate about it.”

That sort of investigative journalism has changed significantly since the days of Nellie Bly as the number of scandal-chasing, news-making websites grows each day. And though their ethical standards are at times rightfully called to question, multiplatform showcase outlets such as Slate, The Huffington Post and The New York Post (and yes, TMZ & Gawker, too) are often the ones willing to fund hard-hitting, time-consuming reporting. The website traffic for these sites is often the envy of many traditional news powerhouses. Their aggressive approach to journalism is mirrored in their multiplatform business models, and they are succeeding in markets where one-dimensional media has already failed.

As mobile technology continues to converge and compact the way news is gathered, distributed and consumed, the audience’s appetite will evolve at the same rapid pace.

It is both a challenging and exciting time to teach as these new reporting formats are created. It’s clear the media industry isn’t quite certain of its future. However, looking back to the ways of legacy media often leads to missing the opportunities that new media provides.

The key as advisers and educators is to provide students with the opportunity to gain multiplatform reporting skills now. The people hiring now are looking for graduates that are as multi-talented as possible, because they want the highest possible return on their investment. And because there is no learning on the job for the unemployed.

Jeff Halliday
leads the media reporting/writing and broadcast production courses at Longwood University in Farmville, Va. He also serves as lead adviser for The Rotunda, the campus newspaper, and co-advises the campus radio station, WMLU-91.3 FM. He has worked as television sports anchor and reporter and as a radio talk show host. Halliday has earned five professional broadcast awards and was named the West Virginia Associated Press Broadcasters Association’s “Best Sportscaster” in 2005. He holds an M.S. in Broadcast Journalism from Syracuse University’s S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications.
On-screen opportunities: 10 tips for multimedia
by Aaron Chimbel

Change is not a four-letter word, but it sure seems like it sometimes. After the decades-long practice of specialization and devoting resources, time, training and skills to perfecting one medium – be it newspapers, television, radio or magazines – we now, thanks to the Web, have to be able to do everything and train our students to do it all, too.

It’s a seismic change. It’s scary. And no one knows what’s next.

That said, it’s also a great opportunity. This generation of journalists, more than any since Edward R. Murrow was on the radio, has the ability to truly change how news is delivered.

Here are my top 10 tips to get started in multimedia.

1. **CHANGE YOUR FOCUS**
   Be agnostic — at least by platform. The first thing you have to do is to change your focus. It’s essential to no longer look at stories as 15 inches of newsprint or 1:30 in a newscast. What’s best for the story? Ask that question and go from there. Think about what elements will allow you to best engage your audience. We will still have guidelines for specific publications and broadcasts, but good multimedia requires more than simply shoveling what you already have online. The key is to start looking at stories as their own element and figure out how to tell it the best way and with which tools and techniques.

2. **DO THE EASY, LITTLE THINGS**
   Take a still camera on every assignment and take pictures. Take a video camera on important interviews and record. It doesn’t have to be a big production to be useful for your audience. For broadcast folks, rework video stories as text for the Web and post extended interviews online. For print folks, after you take those pictures, put them with some audio from your recorder, and you have an audio slideshow.

3. **PLAY TO YOUR STRENGTHS**
   If you’re producing a newspaper, then you should highlight the great stills your photographers produce in slideshows (you know, all those pics that never see the light of day). If you’re a producing a television broadcast, highlight your video and put up as many raw and extended interviews as possible. Push your students to experiment with what they enjoy. If it’s something they want to do, they’ll be more likely to actually do it and do it well. Use the talent you have and have them think how they would want to learn about a topic. Then let them do it that way.

4. **KEEP IT SIMPLE (STUPID)**
   We’ve all heard the K.I.S.S. saying about keeping things simple. Focus on content and not site building. You want an engaging Web site, but we’re content people. Focus on adding rich multimedia elements to your Web site instead of constructing a complex site on your own.

5. **FIND PARTNERSHIPS**
   Does your campus have a newspaper and TV station and radio station and magazine? There is a lot of content there — and more importantly a lot of specialization that can be combined (or converged, if you’re into the buzz word) to create rich presentations. Work together to get the most out of each story online. Put a detail-rich text story with compelling video and more to make a nice Web package.
Aaron Chimbel

is a five-time Texas Emmy Award-winning journalist and an assistant professor of professional practice at Texas Christian University’s Schieffer School of Journalism. Chimbel worked at WFAA-TV as the “MoJo,” or mobile journalist, and online sports editor and was part of the WFAA team that was awarded a national Edward R. Murrow Award. Chimbel also has worked at KWTX-TV and Texas Cable News, and he is a graduate of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.

6. USE FREE TOOLS

YouTube, Blip, Flickr, coveritlive, wordpress, blogger, Photobucket, Weebly and many more are all free. That means you can upload and host video and slide-shows for free on your free Web site or blog. Money shouldn’t be – and in many cases, isn’t – an issue. Most computers now also come with basic video editing software (iMovie or Movie Maker). Take advantage of these freebies, especially when starting out.

7. BREAK STORIES ONLINE

Don’t wait. You simply can’t wait to break stories and tell your audience about developing stories until your publication or broadcast comes out with its next edition, even if it’s only hours away. You’ll get beat on the story. We live in a media-saturated world. As soon as the story is confirmed, it has to go online. You don’t have to give away everything, but the longer you wait, the more likely someone else is already reporting it and your audience will get the information from that outlet. Web stories are meant to be updated and added to. They’re not published only once. When new info comes in, update your story. When you get pictures, add them. When you get video, add that. Your story should be alive.

8. PROMOTE VIA TRADITIONAL MEDIA

Having a legacy media outlet is a big deal, still. You can reach a large audience in print and through a broadcast. Be sure to let your audience know about all the great content on your Web site. But give specific directions on where to go and what they will find. Nothing is more annoying to your audience than saying “go to our Web site for more.” Say “we have an extended interview with the university president on the tuition hike at ourpaper.com/video.”

9. PROMOTE IN NON-TRADITIONAL MEDIA

Use social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) to tell the world about your work. While it’s great to work hard to produce your video or slideshow or interactive map, it doesn’t really matter how great it is if no one knows about it. After Tweeting, though, be sure to engage with your audience online. Remember, it’s a conversation, not a one-way street.

10. EXPERIMENT

We’re just at the beginning of the Web/multimedia/platform revolution. Your silly idea might just be the next big thing. Always be willing to experiment and learn from what works and what doesn’t. Then try again.
Annette Forbes and I started this journey together about 11 years ago, when I was appointed the first official editorial adviser for the Iowa State Daily. Annette had been promoted to general manager from advertising director a year or two before. She was as passionate about advertising as I was about the newsroom. And it didn’t take long for us to realize we were both pretty good at what we did. So the mutual respect was there almost from the beginning. That’s important. Communication was important as we got to know each other and each other’s goals. Working together — planning together — was imperative if we were going to create as close to a professional environment as possible for the Iowa State Daily student staff.

Consider us a metaphor for a newspaper that went from a warring state of affairs to a peaceful coexistence between its advertising and editorial sides of the newspaper. And that peace — which sometimes is a fragile thing to behold and hold together — also includes all the other departments at the newspaper, from production to public relations to special sections to online.

Eleven years ago, the advertising and editorial departments didn’t respect each other. Eleven years ago, the advertising and editorial departments didn’t talk to each other.

And it was different in other ways 11 years ago. Students were different. They were closer to the stereotype — advertising students were motivated by money and meeting quotas; editorial students were motivated by a need to serve the public by providing information it needed. Advertising students dressed better than editorial students. They had different interests, different ways of being. OK, maybe it hasn’t changed all that much. But as the business model of the newspaper industry implodes at the same time that the economy tanks, the quantity of the quality students is different.

by Mark Witherspoon
But we jump ahead of ourselves. Eleven years ago, advertising and editorial students were a breed apart.

So Annette and I – and the other professionals who worked with students – had our work cut out for us. She was excellent at coming up with great ideas, and I helped implement them. And every year or so, I came up with a good idea of my own. And that’s how we’re doing this article for College Media Review. We brainstormed and came up with some great ideas about how we got the editorial and advertising sides to work together, and how they are working together even more today.

IN THE BEGINNING

So, here’s the story.

Annette and Janette Antisdell, the previous general manager, already had revived a newspaper that was thousands of dollars in the red in the early to mid-1990s. By creating a structure to the advertising department, training the advertising students on a continual basis and holding them accountable to reach their quotas, the Iowa State Daily became a money-making operation for the nonprofit corporation.

The new advertising structure included an organizational flow chart that showed who reported to whom, job descriptions and job responsibilities that helped students focus on what they needed to do to succeed, rules that held students accountable, training that ensured that they succeeded in meeting their quotas, a quota system that paid an increasing amount of commission to those who were the most successful, paperwork that greased the flow of the system and deadlines that became the ultimate authority. This turned the advertising department around, and the Daily started making money.

By the time I arrived, it was a $1.6 million annual operation.

But the editorial side needed a little help. The structure looked very little like a newsroom operation. My first task was to help students understand a newsroom that included a copy and design desk might ease the load on section editors, who not only assigned and edited reporters’ stories but wrote their own stories from a beat they covered, then designed and copy edited their own pages. It actually started with the editor, who at the time spent much of her time designing and editing Page 1 every day.

Soon we created a newsroom structure and organization that looked very much like any professional medium-size newspaper. The editor still spent much of the time managing the newspaper’s departments, from the Publication Board through the three people hired by the board – the general manager, the editorial adviser and the editor in chief. I made sure to introduce Annette and the rest of the professionals to the newsroom staff and explain what each of them did. In other words, we started incorporating the big picture into our training so our student leaders would not graduate without an understanding of how a newspaper – all of the newspaper – worked. We wanted every student, no good story ideas and covered the campus much better, photographers who worked with those reporters, and a production desk in which designers designed pages and copy editors edited and wrote headlines and cutlines.

In other words, by 2001, we had a basic structure in place that looked very much like any professional newspaper with a circulation of 25,000 to 75,000. Both Annette’s and my first goal was to create an environment in which our students were not surprised when they moved on to internships and jobs in the newspaper industry because the Daily was structured very much like professional newspapers.

And along with that organization came the structure that helped students understand where they fit into the operation. The editorial side of the newspaper had an organizational flow chart, job descriptions and job responsibilities, training at the first of each semester, deadlines and student leaders who became the ultimate authority.

But none of the student leaders – on either side – could see the big picture yet.

Any advertising rep who came over to the editorial side to provide a story idea was rebuffed because the news side didn’t trust the advertising side. They accused them of trying to break the wall between the advertising side and the editorial side. Working at different times during the day, both the editorial and advertising students talked about how hard they worked compared to the other side. There was little, if any, communication between the departments and no mutual respect, much less appreciation and understanding of what the students on “the other side” did or how hard they worked.

THE CHANGE

Then Mother Nature gave us a little boost. Our Arts and Entertainment editor started dating our student Advertising Manager. Their romance, which has since led to a very happy marriage and three wonderful children, birthed the basic ingredients of a healthy organization – mutual respect, trust and understanding that leads to communication and planning. But for these infant traits to grow, they would need careful nurturing by advisors and student leaders.

Our training – both on the advertising and editorial side – expanded the organizational flow chart to include all of the newspaper’s departments, from the Publication Board through the three people hired by the board – the general manager, the editorial adviser and the editor in chief. I made sure to introduce Annette and the rest of the professionals to the newsroom staff and explain what each of them did. In other words, we started incorporating the big picture into our training so our student leaders would not graduate without an understanding of how a newspaper – all of the newspaper – worked.

We wanted every student, no
matter what department he or she worked in, to understand what the other students did, why they did what they did, how they did what they did and how hard they worked to succeed at what they did.

And through this training, a little mutual respect and understanding grew.

Training has grown into a continual exercise in all the departments. Training is included in almost all the staff meetings and comes from advisers, students and professionals from nearby newspapers. Our students also attend national, regional and state conventions and conferences on various subjects that help them reach out to their peers at other universities and colleges. And a wonderful state of bonding occurs among the students from different departments who attend these conventions and conferences together.

One of Annette’s best ideas was the weekly management meetings in which the leadership in each department – advisers and student leaders – come together to discuss what’s happening in each department that affects the other departments. More than anything else, these weekly meetings have created an understanding and respect among the departments. It has created a team concept in which decisions are not made by one person, but by all through a consensual process.

Often, this process is not pretty. Debates and arguments can get heated. But because the meetings have created the understanding that we’re all in this together, we always work through the heat to come to a consensus about how we want to proceed. The respect our advisers and student leaders hold for each other has become stronger than the need to get our own way. We understand each other in the context of the big picture, and our decisions are based on what is best for the newspaper, not what’s best for the individual.

Another weekly meeting has been added in recent years to deal with the 22 special sections we do each year, and we use the same weekly process to come to mutual decisions about what our special sections will be. And the quality of those special sections has improved considerably.

It is imperative our student leaders go back to their departments and share their newfound understanding and respect. The success of this endeavor is seen in weekly newsroom staff meetings when our editor in chief explains to his staff the whys and wherefores of a decision or how an advertising campaign will help the newspaper. In addition, student leaders are responsible for ensuring their departments understand the structure of the newspaper and how their department fits into the overall picture. To do this, each department has its own manual that includes ethics, legal issues, professional demeanor, how-tos on certain subjects and other departmental guidelines.

All-Daily meetings also help that understanding and big-picture outlook. All-Daily meetings are called several times a year to discuss an overarching issue and to brainstorm out a particularly all-inclusive special section that needs more heads than just one department to figure out a thematic approach, a special cover and story ideas to include in the section.

And while all-Daily meetings are for business, fun and frivolity prevail at the traditional fall, holiday and spring galas in which students dress in formal attire and play, play, play, and then play some more. Those three festivities are the traditional all-Daily get-togethers. But that doesn’t keep impromptu gatherings from occurring, such as monthly potluck lunches and barbecues that happen to spring up when someone needs a gathering. All these all-Daily events help students get to know students from other departments better, and that helps the understanding and respect that binds the students together.

And the latest, greatest idea to help our students understand each other’s role in this newspaper also helps them understand the historic changes that are going on in our industry today.

And go ahead and say it, because we all said it, too. You’re adding another meeting. Well, yes we did. Actually we added two meetings. But these meetings are producing changes in our newspaper that we only talked about before.

We call it our Think Tank meetings. It includes both student leaders and others who have an interest in figuring out what the Iowa State Daily of the future is going to look like. We meet once a week as a large group of about 20 students from all the departments in the Daily. We talk about short-term goals and long-term goals that will help us become a news organization that will survive in the new world of newspapering.

Those goals are discussed in three subcommittees – the content, sales and structure committees – which are designated to figure out what content we’re going to need, how we’re going to monetize that content and what is the organizational structure going to look like in the future. These subcommittees all make weekly reports to the large Think Tank committee, and we spend time trying to figure out what our future is going to look like. So our students not only understand where they fit into the big picture of the newspaper today, but maybe where they are going to fit into the newspaper of tomorrow.

What we’ve discussed so far doesn’t take into account the many hours both Annette and I spend discussing topics of every sort with our student leaders – me with the editor in chief and his editors and she with her advertising managers.

But what we both anticipate each year is that magical moment – for me, it’s almost always in mid- to late February – when the editor in chief and student advertising managers really take charge. This year the magic happened sooner than usual. We were in a meeting with him and his section editors in second week of Febru-
ary, and the magic happened. I saw him transform, shedding the last of his timidity, into the leader that I always know they can become. He took charge of the meeting, and I saw it. It was visceral. And I knew, it was his newspaper now. It was time for me to get on with helping the candidates for next year’s editor in chief complete their applications. That is my favorite moment of every year.

And by his newspaper, I mean he understands the whole. He understands his part in that whole and he understands the importance of the other students in that whole.

This magic moment didn’t happen those first few years. Now it happens each year. And it happens on both the editorial and advertising side of the Iowa State Daily.

Annette and I haven’t really talked about it all that much. We just know it happens each year for both of us. That’s because we understand each other. We also understand that not many jobs come with so much fun and with so much satisfaction.

And it doesn’t get much better than that.

Advisers’ Toolkit for the New Era of News (and Ads)

The overall success of news operations depends more and more on cooperative efforts between the newsroom and advertising sides of publications. It’s imperative all departments understand the structure of the newspaper and how they fit into the overall picture. When the EIC or advertising manager can explain to his or her staff how a decision from one side of the paper will benefit the other side as well, a consensual process can result in decisions based not on what is best for the individuals but what’s best for the publication.

Here’s a mix of some traditional and not-so-traditional measures that can boost the effectiveness of your news organization.

- Open communication among the top professional staff: It starts at the top, where advisers have to work together. News organizations no longer can remain healthy amid ongoing turf wars.
- Transparency in all facets of the organization: Who reports to whom should be clear to all, and that structure – and the accompanying job descriptions – should be clear to everyone on all sides of the news organization.
- An organizational structure that reflects professional models across the board: Work will go more smoothly and student journalists will be better prepared for a smooth transition to internships.
- Continual training across all fronts: Your staff will be better prepared, and the bonding experience, particular when it involves news and ad staffs, is added value in your investment. Training comes in many forms — at the beginning of the semester, through workshops and conferences, and, ultimately, the face to face contact you have with students each day.
- The dreaded “M” word: Meetings are essential. They allow those in other departments to interact with each other, fostering discussion on issues facing all staffs. To make meetings meaningful for students, be sure they have a clear, defined purpose, and pass out agendas beforehand.

Mark Witherspoon, the editorial adviser to the Iowa State Daily, has been either a journalist or a journalism instructor for 35 years. A former president of College Media Advisers, Witherspoon has worked with CMA and the First Amendment Center to establish programs to teach advisers how to become free speech advocates. In his 22 years of advising, he also has worked at Texas Christian University and Southern Methodist University. Witherspoon worked at the Wichita Falls Record News and Fort Worth Star-Telegram as a reporter and editor.

Annette Forbes has been the general manager of the Iowa State Daily, the university newspaper at Iowa State University, since 1999 and began working there as its advertising director in 1995. She is the treasurer for College Media Advisers, and her professional newspaper career includes stints in community journalism as a sales representative, sales manager and publisher of the Nevada Journal. She served on the editorial board of the Ames Tribune and has been very active in the Iowa Newspaper Association.
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- Readership and marketing surveys prove effective — and cheap — when using local resources

Say the word “survey” to journalists or aspiring journalists (or advisers for that matter) and watch the reaction. Confused looks often are followed by sweaty palms and the standard reply: “I’m not a math person.”

Even surly editors, administrators, angry sources and uncooperative technology provide fewer hurdles than the world of statistics, which may be why readership surveys or marketing surveys have been mentioned on at least three occasions on the College Media Advisers listserv since December 2009. Despite the fear and confusion associated with survey research, many student media outlets employ marketing and/or readership surveys to help them reach college students as readers, viewers and consumers of advertising.

Student newspapers approach the readership and/or marketing survey from a variety of perspectives. Some organizations do it themselves, employing techniques that go from statistically valid random sampling to the haphazard administration that can result in a fun exercise in statistics with little valid data. Even the use of the term “readership survey” seems to cause some confusion.

While many people use the terms readership survey and marketing survey synonymously, the two survey types have two distinct goals.

“We conduct readership surveys every four or five years, budget permitting,” said Lloyd Goodman, director of student publications at the University of Texas at Arlington, in an e-mail response to a query on the College Newspaper Business and Advertising Managers listserv. “In addition to what people are reading, we try to find out who is reading. In addition to questions about what people are reading and not reading, we list different kinds of articles and ask which ones would be more likely to entice them to read the paper or read it more often.”

Goodman said this type of readership survey allows UTA’s student newspaper, The Shorthorn, to target particular majors or locations on campus when marketing the student newspaper, including efforts such as staff members handing out copies of the newspaper as students go by. “Our last two surveys (2003, 2007), found very little that students said they didn’t like about The Shorthorn, which made it difficult to use the survey results as motivation to ‘fix’ things,” Goodman said.

This year, The Shorthorn administered a marketing survey, which is separate from the readership survey, and the results of the marketing survey are used to help sell advertising, providing The Shorthorn with student spending habits and use of advertising. In conjunction with the Division of Student Affairs, The Shorthorn used the company Student Voice, which works with student affairs divisions in colleges throughout the nation. In the past, the staff used a bid process for the marketing survey and settled on the company Newton and Associates, located in Norman, Okla. The University of Pittsburgh has used Morpace, in Farmington Hills, Mich., and in the past, Ohio State has used Saperstein and Associates in Columbus, Ohio. But the cost to hire a third-party vendor for a marketing survey can be prohibitive.

“When we did a survey with a third-party survey company, we put that out for bids every time we did it, every four years,” Goodman said. “They usually cost us $8,000 to $10,000. That was $8,000 to $10,000 we didn’t have this year, so if we weren’t doing it internally, we would not be able to do a survey.”

1. What best describes your status during the Spring 2010 semester?
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior

2. How far do you drive to campus (one way)?
   - 5 miles or less
   - 6-10 miles
   - 11-15 miles
   - 20+ miles
Boise State University also has done third-party surveys in the past, but The Arbiter’s most recent marketing survey was done with help from the university in an online format.

“One of the things that we did is have somebody else write up the questions, and once we did that, we basically used those questions and have just modified them,” said Brad Arendt, director of student media at Boise State. “We’ve been pretty successful at finding other people at the university, if we needed to change questions, to review the survey.”

Arendt said that in modifying existing questions, he keeps the end results in mind and tries to keep bias out.

“You know you’re doing the survey yourself, putting it up online and with the university,” he said. “There are people who may look at it and say it’s not independent, but nobody has ever come up and said, ‘Well, you did that survey on your own, and so I’m not sure that’s a valid survey.’ You know, we’ve always tried our best to make it as unbiased as we could without influencing the survey, knowing that it’s not as good as hiring an independent, outside firm and having them doing it.”

In the past, Boise State also has used standard survey methods to gauge readership likes and dislikes. More recently, Arendt said Google Analytics has become the preferred tool, particularly when reviewing readership trends online.

“Before, the only way we had to review readership information was anecdotal preferences of friends and professors and classmates,” Arendt said. “Whereas now, we’re reading actual online readership data. We know it doesn’t exactly hold true to the print side, but it gives the students a better real-time gauge, and they’ve been able to make adjustments a little bit quicker. That’s been one thing that we’re used to doing instead of the old survey method. Now, I’m not sure we would necessarily go back to that model.”

While online statistics provide more real-time data, at institutions where print is still king, using online data to gauge readership or marketing information can be troublesome. At Appalachian State University, only 3 percent of the campus community gets its news at The Appalachian Online.

“In marketing, this whole question of online, as far as newspaper goes, is going to become more and more important,” said David Freeman, director of student publications at Appalachian State since 1991. “Our problem right now is staying in front of the curve on how news is delivered. We need to build the numbers where the advertiser wants to be (online), so we need to figure out how to get our students there.”

As far as gauging all readership, The Appalachian hasn’t used third-party vendors, but Freeman has used a combination of unscientific intercept surveys (tables outside of the student union building, the library, etc.) and more scientific surveys through marketing classes.

“We’ve also, from time to time, gotten some of the marketing classes in the business school to do something for us in terms of just a class project,” Freeman said. “We’re doing one right now, but we haven’t gotten the results back. We haven’t done it in about six or seven years.”

While using a class project to get a marketing and/or readership survey completed may seem like a cheap or free solution, the validity and usefulness of survey results from class projects can vary. UTAs Goodman has used classes for surveys in the past with mixed results. One class was made up of undergraduate students, and the other was a graduate research class.

“The graduate research class, we really had high hopes for,” Goodman said. “They contract out to businesses and things like that. They had never done anything vaguely media-related before, so it threw them for a loop.”

Goodman remains optimistic about using a class project to gather marketing or readership data for student media.

“I love the idea of giving students the chance to get this experience,” he said. “It’s the same thing we do here — we give students the chance to get experience in media.”

While working with students in a class project can be challenging, the biggest problem at Appalachian State has been demand.

“There’s such a demand for it because it’s a free thing that we can’t get it done every year,” Freeman said. “We just have to get in line for when your year comes up every four or five years, and so that’s the whole hindrance for us. In terms of professors overseeing — making sure the students are asking the right questions or that we’ve asked them to ask the right questions - they’re pretty good at that. That’s why we have to work with the professor and the students, to make sure that they come up with questions that are appropriate for us instead of just ques-

3. How many times per week do you read the campus newspaper?

- 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 - Never

4. How many times per week do you visit the newspaper’s website?

- 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1 - Never
When he was looking to redesign The Lantern, general manager for The Lantern for more than a year, has taken advantage of much of what Ohio State University has to offer in terms of integrating research into class projects.

"Coming here from the private sector, I cannot believe the amount of resources that are available," Milliken said. "I did three studies last year — one with a communication class, where we actually went out and looked at distribution at 50 locations at (9 a.m.), then at noon and at (4 p.m.) so I could see when I was running out of papers at locations and how to get a better sense of what was actually happening with the distribution.

"Then there was a separate marketing class that actually put together a study and made groups of students where they had to present it. There were actually eight different marketing proposals." When he was looking to redesign The Lantern, Milliken looked no further than the industrial design department, finding six options created by students as a class project. The new design was rolled out in fall 2009.

"This year, we're in the process of finishing off, this quarter, another research study with a communication class," Milliken said. "It's specifically trying to look at who actually reads the publication online. We've done a lot and will continue to do that."

Student advertising managers also have sought faculty members to work with in marketing and readership surveys. At Wichita State University, Michael McCann, a senior marketing and management major and advertising manager for The Sunflower News, saw a market research survey as a must for fall 2009.

During the summer, he contacted Dr. Dean Headley, an associate professor who teaches marketing research classes at Wichita State. His discussions with Headley resulted in all marketing classes undertaking The Sunflower's project in the fall.

"This was the first time ever it was done this way," McCann said. "I went to Dean Headley during the summer, and the more we met, the more he said, 'We teach market research. This would be a great project for our class.' We worked with him, and we worked with the class to get exactly what we wanted to know."

McCann's status as a marketing student and upcoming member of the class may have helped to convince Headley of The Sunflower News' project, but it was McCann who made the most of the situation.

"When I originally started with Dean Headley, it was asking, 'Which questions should I ask,'" McCann said. "And then it was, 'What do you really want to know?' That's how this evolved. The whole business school was kind of in on it, because he teaches four classes, and all four of the classes were doing this. Pretty much the entire business school was either involved in it or knew about it, which really kind of got people talking about the paper in general. So it kind of snowballed into more than I ever thought it would be."

From the marketing research survey, McCann developed a marketing campaign, working to improve the return rate on the survey. The marketing campaign mushroomed into a promotional campaign and a push to get The Sunflower News into the community.

"This has really become more than we ever thought it would down here," McCann said. "We had become completely complacent. I expected more, so I kind of came at it from the standpoint of I'm going to use this as tool (marketing research survey) to expand my revenue and expand the whole. It was almost like rebranding the paper in the whole city. I was going to Borders and Barnes and Noble and asking, 'Can I have my paper here, and by the way do you want to advertise?' I used it as a whole awareness of the paper. We are tailoring our advertising now."

While the market research survey was more sales focused, the survey also focused on editorial issues such as quality and content. And the marketing of the marketing survey itself created buzz on campus and, McCann says, increased readership. But the proof of the survey's value as a revenue-generating tool is in the numbers.

"Last I checked, we're up 16 percent overall in revenue over the past year's," McCann said. "In this economy, I'm dancing on the tables. What we've picked up is actually university and locals, who have seen the paper (as) more active, and people are more aware of the paper now."

Following the marketing campaign and the marketing research survey online, McCann said The Sunflower News will begin to create an overall marketing campaign to promote the newspaper, using the data collected by students in a class project.

"Now that we have the survey results, we have a game plan, and we're attacking it more," he said.
Three good reasons exist to conduct readership or marketing surveys, according to Arlene Fink and Jacqueline Kosecoff in their book, *How to Conduct Surveys: A Step-by-Step Guide*:

- “A policy needs to be set or a program must be planned;
- You want to evaluate the effectiveness of programs to change people’s knowledge, attitudes, health or welfare;
- You are a researcher and a survey is used to assist you.”

So readership surveys that help determine what your readers are reading or would like to read fall into Fink and Kosecoff’s reason No. 2 for conducting a survey. Marketing surveys that test the effectiveness of advertising or help your advertising staff market your student media to potential advertisers also are among reasons to do survey research.

Now that you know you need to do survey research, how to do it? If you’ve never done either of these types of surveys, or if you’d like to get some tips on how to do survey research, read on:

**Tips on How to Conduct a Readership or Marketing Survey**

**John Milliken, general manager, The Lantern, The Ohio State University:**

“(To get professors to use the student media as a class project) you just have to talk to professors and lecturers and talk it up. Ask. I don’t know of any other way to do it without asking. It seems to be very popular, at least here on this campus, direct application of knowledge into a practical, day-to-day business application.”

**Brad Arendt, director of student media at Boise State University:**

“When we first approached the university with doing an online survey, we only did one survey where they called by phone, and that was really expensive and it took a lot of hoops for us to get through. For the online, the university was telling us you’re not going to get any response, and it’s going to be slow. Don’t expect a lot of stuff. What we had always considered our ace in the hole is that we had things to give away. So we would do advertising trades to give away $50 at the bookstore, or a semester’s worth of books was one of the prizes that we had, and so these were things available for people that completed the survey.

When our online survey was completed, the university was surprised by the readership, or by the completion percentage, because it was more than double - it was almost triple what any department had had with an online survey at that point. We also did a lot more as far as marketing the survey. We also put ads in the paper, follow-up e-mails; we put up posters around campus, sidewalk chalk and we had the prizes. You can get some valuable information.”

**David Freeman, director of student publications at Appalachian State University:**

“It’s kind of like reporting — 95 percent of the work comes before you ever go ask the first question. If you’re not asking the right questions to the people that you want to reach, then the survey’s kind of useless. So the most important thing that I would recommend is just working as hard as you can so that the list of questions is what you want. It’s getting at the information that you want to get that will be different for everybody, so there’s no generic marketing tool out there for everybody. You have to figure out how to make it your own.”

**Lloyd Goodman, director of student publications at the University of Texas at Arlington:**

“There are people here on campus doing really nifty surveys using things like Survey Monkey (surveymonkey.com). For me, going into this originally, I guess eight years ago was the first time we did the first one. The hardest part the first time around was drafting the questions and knowing what information was wanted and how to get that information. Now that we’ve paid a company to do that twice, this year we just updated the survey, dropped some things, added some things. If we had to do it ourselves, I would probably be depending on something like Survey Monkey because there just seems to be a lot of tools out there.”

**Michael McCann, student advertising manager, The Sunflower, Wichita State University**

“Just write down a list—what it is specifically you’d want to know. Narrow that down to like 20 questions. What do want to know; who has that information, and how are you going to get it? Those are the three key things you want to realize. Who has that information? The people who read your newspaper. How am I going to get that information from them? My best suggestion would be e-mails and listservs.”
When you feel overwhelmed, get some professional help. Aside from paying a third-party vendor to conduct research, there are several departments on every campus that have faculty members who understand survey research. Try these departments for help: communications, marketing, statistics, psychology and math.

**Answer the three most important questions to any research project.**

What do you want to know? Who has that information? How can I get it?

**Pre-test your questionnaire.**

The best way to insure a good survey response is by getting a small group of people to test drive your questionnaire. It’s easier to make adjustments then than to get all of your data back and realize that no one understood question No. 3.

**Offer incentives for completing your questionnaire.**

Answer the question ‘What will I get out of taking this survey?’ with something valuable. People are more likely to complete a survey if they get something in return.

**Market your survey.**

Don’t forget to let everyone know you’re doing a readership/marketing survey. Put advertisements in the newspaper, online or in whatever medium you have access to. Send out fliers on campus. Send out campuswide e-mails. Whatever you can do to attract attention.

**Seek professional help.**

Go back to the professionals after you collect your data. Unless you’re confident in your ability to enter data in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences or Statistical Analysis Software, you might want to seek the help of statistics folks on campus, or at least hire a statistician to help you enter data and perform correlations. One or both of these should be available from your college, as both programs are used by faculty members for survey research. Check with your IT department to see if a site license may be available.

**GO IT ALONE?**

If you want to tackle a survey on your own, you can find information about conducting surveys in most elementary statistics textbooks.

A good how-to guide is Arlene Fink and Jacqueline Koscoff’s “How to Conduct Surveys: A Step-by-Step Guide.”

For information on creating good interview and survey questions, check out these websites:

- [owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/559/06/](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/559/06/)
- [www.leeds.ac.uk/iss/documentation/top/top2.pdf](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/iss/documentation/top/top2.pdf)

For information on determining sample sizes, check out these websites:

- [www.stat.uiowa.edu/techrep/tr303.pdf](http://www.stat.uiowa.edu/techrep/tr303.pdf)
- [greatbrook.com/survey_sample_selection.htm](http://greatbrook.com/survey_sample_selection.htm)
- or find a sample size calculator at [www.wimmerdomicnick.com](http://www.wimmerdomicnick.com).

You can also find .pdf documents and how-to videos at SurveyMonkey.com or SurveyShare.com.

While SurveyMonkey offers free accounts, you will need to purchase a professional subscription to enable you to get the number of responses you will need to conduct a readership or marketing survey. You can purchase a subscription on a month-to-month basis, quarterly or yearly. A one-year subscription offers unlimited responses for $200, which should give you plenty of time to conduct a readership and marketing survey.

**DR. KAY L. COLLEY**

serves as faculty liaison and student media director at Texas Wesleyan University, where she is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication and teaches journalism and public relations courses. Her professional background includes stints in public relations, magazines, daily newspapers and weekly newspapers. She has advised the student newspapers at the University of North Texas and Blinn College.
QUESTIONS ON QUALITY:
These questions were done in a Likert-scale or semantic differential style: "What would you like to see more coverage of in The Sunflower?"

Readers were given the options and asked to mark their preferences: Campus news, opinions, editorials, entertainment, Greek life, features, national news, entertainment, sports, comics and puzzles, financial tips, horoscopes, weather, local news, human interest pieces, employment opportunities, student issues, campus events, family-oriented news/articles and world news.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS
The following are some of the questions The Sunflower asked in its readership survey. Says McMann, "Looking at the some of the key areas (writing quality, layout/design, availability, photography and story topic selection) and what certain groups of readers rated the quality as, gives us a better idea of what The Sunflower might need improvement on and what they are doing an excellent job at. This also will help with what groups The Sunflower might need to focus on more to gain more readers."

Using coupons
When asked the question (Q38) "Do you frequently use the coupons found in The Sunflower," 689 responded and almost 29 percent stated they do frequently use coupons in The Sunflower. However when asked the question (Q39) "I would like to see more coupons in The Sunflower," 617 responded. Nearly ¾ of them, or 72.4 percent, said they would like to see more coupons in the paper.
Even with some sports journalism experience, advisers are forced to “unteach” numerous lessons students learn while watching a thousand-plus hours of TV broadcasts, highlights and debates where jargon, opinion and soft questions rule.

Throw in some inflammatory sports radio yell-fests, and you’ve got a substantial wall to knock down.

Unfortunately, most student reporters who are sports fans do not know how to separate their inner fan from their outer journalist. Most have read far less about their respective sports than they should, meaning they have few models for their own coverage.

As a result, advisers must develop training before sending student reporters to the field.

Creating a checklist that outlines key elements required for all sports stories can let students know that citing key players, stats and game results is just a small part of sports journalism. In addition, students need to know each sport’s rules, philosophies and strategies.

Training might mean all sports writers need to shadow a current reporter and observe how to properly cover a beat. Maybe it means sitting them down for a full analysis of their opening stories, dissecting them in a sort of X-ray writing approach. Or, offering a sports journalism course in the department.

Either way, students need training before covering their first stories. And they need constant reminders early and often so bad approaches do not become regular habits.

Checklists do help, and they should include several topics, such as how to develop a beat. For example, they should first introduce themselves to the sports information director and the coach. Then they can set up a meeting to informally discuss the team for background (not for a story). And then they can hang out at practices to familiarize themselves with players, assistant coaches and practice procedures. The list can go on from there.

Advisers can get disgusted when kids fail in their initial efforts, sometimes miserably. On deadline, inexperienced writers can become so flustered that they forget to include basic information like the final score or players’ names, instead using uniform numbers to indicate someone in a story.

Without training, students can’t be expected to succeed when they hit the fields.

**THE ALTERNATIVE GAME PLAN**

Most students are not prepared to cover sports, and that’s why I revamped my sports writing class several years ago to include practical hands-on experiences. My students cover a local high school beat for a Web site, much like the blogs used by most college newspapers.

Why the preps? Well, print media employ far more people to cover preps, or high schools, than they do to cover colleges, a point that disturbs many student journalists more accustomed to bigger time athletics.
On a prep beat, reporters have to take notes during games, chase down coaches walking off fields and tabulate stats before filing a story on deadline. No stats sheets are distributed between quarters, and press conferences are not scheduled after games. If students can cover the prep beat, you can cover any beat.

And these students approach my class more like student publication reporters.

Like many professors, I was guilty of offering far too many in-class exercises and lecturing way too much about sports. In these earlier classes, I used a three-step approach to introduce students to individual sports – a lecture about individual sports rules, a discussion with a coach on campus, and a hands-on assignment, where the team would cover a game on campus en masse.

That worked okay. But not great.

Some students still made big mistakes. They would fail to talk with anyone on the opposing team and write stories that didn’t address key plays. In addition, shy students would fold in behind classmates and act more like stenographers than reporters, content to copy comments based upon others’ questions.

In other words, students were not acting like reporters. And much of that was my fault.

Two years ago, my approach to this class changed rather dramatically. I took a four-step approach: prepare-watch-ask-write. Most of all, I started to emphasize hands-on beat reporting. Students now learn the essentials of sports reporting by covering a beat for a blog on local high school sports. By the second class, students are assigned to cover both varsity and junior varsity beats for the local high school, usually pairing with someone else in class to cover a single team. Students then introduce themselves to coaches, observe practices, attend games and chat with players to find and develop their own story ideas. For many, that is their favorite part of reporting.

Students also practice other multimedia approaches by adding audio clips, photos and slide shows. They post these, along with their stories, directly to the blog site, inserting at least three links, adding tag lines, writing headlines and clicking the correct categories. Ultimately, though, I have final approval on all content, much like a publisher or news editor does.

**ASSESSING STUDENT WORK**

I no longer grade assignments. What’s the value of an assignment in which a student can do the minimum work and still pass? Instead, students now are evaluated on their ability to cover games, to find news at practices and to cultivate contacts. That’s precisely what sports writers do for student publications.
To ensure they practice what I preach, students must fulfill specific criteria to earn points for game stories, previews, profiles and features. In game stories, for example, students are required to do all of the following to earn the full 10 points:

- include comments from the local team’s players and coaches;
- address key plays or trends in game;
- include at least one comment from an opposing player or coach;
- include at least three relevant links;
- include a box score;
- write at least 400 words;
- post the story online by end of the night; and
- Tweet at least twice from each game, typically at halftime and after the conclusion.

If even one of these elements is missing from a story, no points are awarded. That means students may have to report on an additional game. Professional editors do not allow “C-level” work in their publications, so why should we accept this in our classrooms? Effort is rewarded.

While I do not grade these assignments, I print and critique every one just as I do for our student publication. As advisers, we all know the value in offering tips and suggestions in this manner. You may want to develop a checklist that includes some of these elements as a reminder on how to cover game stories.

At your publication, you may want to create a blog that offers information on all sports beats, especially if you have a smaller staff. Perhaps you can create a blog called BulldogBeat.wordpress.com or BUsports.wordpress.com.

Larger staffs may want to develop blogs for individual sports as well, such as “BulldogHoops” or “BCfootball.”

Either way, make sure students post to these sites regularly, or readers will seek information elsewhere, like from the university athletics site.

**BIGGEST PROBLEMS**

Students work harder on the blog posts than they do for regular class assignments, knowing stories will be read by the local community. Plus, they understand these posts can be used as clips for internships and jobs.

Still, students struggle. Leads, of course, are the biggest challenge.

When we start, I get leads that are more general, which usually reveal either poor reporting or an inability to find the most compelling angle.

As a result, students publish leads that could have been written after reading a schedule: The Charleston varsity basketball team faced off against Robinson High School for the second time this season.

In some cases, I rewrite leads to illustrate options, frequently showing shorter sentences work better than the following one, which delays the main idea and rolls on for 37 words:

> When Terrika Price knocked in a short jumper halfway through the fourth quarter to give the Trojans their first lead since the opening bucket, the relieved look upon assistant coach Jeff Holloway’s face told the story perfectly.

Previously, I had pointed out in class that leads really should not extend more than about 20 words. But students won’t always learn these lessons until they make mistakes in their own writing. I reduced the original lead above into a series of considerably shorter sentences, shown below.
After this was printed, I suggested the following revision:

Jeff Holloway’s face told the story perfectly. Relief.

After Terrika Price made a jumper, the assistant coach exhaled and smiled. With a 10-point lead, he knew the Trojans would break their five-game losing streak.

I’ll also rewrite sentences to make them more active.

Original: Charleston High School opened the second quarter scoring with a five-yard touchdown run by Mario Johnson to tie it up at 14.

Revision: Mario Johnson ran five yards up the middle to score and make it 14-14 at the start of the second quarter.

By rewriting parts of sentences, student journalists can see how to improve stories in the future.

INTERVIEWING, COMMENTARY CHALLENGE STUDENTS

At first, students clutch any quote they can gather, relying too heavily on comments made by coaches or athletes. In critiques, we can point out that a comment like the following is not enough to show, or illustrate, an idea:

“Our defense created offense for us in the fourth quarter,” said Coach Jeff Miller.

The reporter must dig further, asking additional questions and describing how the defense sparked scoring in the game.

Commentary also can be a problem, especially for students acting more like fans. Journalists can lose their objectivity, or sense of fairness, when they both report and comment on the same beat like a sports team. To prevent confusion, I do not allow reporters to publish columns about their respective beats.

Yet, students sometimes slip in commentary in their game stories, like the following:

“Unfortunately, the Trojans were not able to continue their momentum.”

This was not so unfortunate for the other team, I point out.

Language also can be a problem, especially for students educated more from SportsCenter and TV broadcasts than from newspaper and magazine coverage. Clichés and jargon fill stories. Games “come down to the wire,” players score four points “right off the bat,” free-throw lines are “charity stripes,” players are unstoppable “in the paint,” and so on.

Finally, the blog enables them to work out some basic grammar and style problems, most especially that schools like Charleston High are an “it,” while nicknames like Trojans require “their.”

EVEN SHY WRITERS IMPROVE

There are also successes.

By their second and third game stories, students write more insight-ful and analytical stories, noting when teams go on 11-2 runs to erase six-point deficits, that wrestlers have difficulty finishing off moves for pins, and when football teams convert 11 of 15 third downs. By the end of the past semester, one previously timid reporter explained how a 3-5-3 defensive alignment put pressure on the opposing team’s quar-

terback. This writer had spent extra time chatting with coaches and writing additional stories.

Plus, he learned how to cultivate sources, how to structure stories and how to assess stories. By working harder than the others, he learned he could be a very good sports reporter. Successful beat writers are defined by their hustle.

Reporting a regular beat enabled him to become a better journalist.

Not long before this article was written, another student who also writes for the college newspaper told me he had been selected by the National Sports Journalism Center to cover this year’s Final Four. And he was excited because he had found an angle not covered by any beat writers on West Virginia’s basketball team after searching through a competitor’s archives, something online beat writers, like those in this class, do on a regular basis.

Here’s another thought for advisers at college publications.

With advertising declining and news print increasing, print publications are decreasing in size. That means less room and fewer stories for sports sections. At some larger schools, competition for these sports staffs is already stiff. Why not use a sports blog to develop younger, less experienced writers? Have these writers post stories to a publication blog devoted to specific sports or have contribute to a general online section.

As they write, critique their stories either in weekly meetings or by assessing them in Microsoft Word’s “Track Changes” sent to the respective writer. In time, they will improve their reporting and writing skills enough to snag a sports position on staff.

But even if they don’t, these students will learn a great deal more about the profession while contributing content to your news operation.

That’s a victory for everybody involved.

Joe Gisondi

is an adviser at Eastern Illinois University, is the author of the Field Guide To Covering Sports, which is available through CQ Press and Amazon. He covered sports and worked as a sports copy editor for more than 20 years at several newspapers in Florida. Now, he writes freelance and teaches sports writing and other journalism classes at EIU. You can get more sports writing suggestions at his website: http://sportsfieldguide.com.
Self-interest, the common good and a sense of purpose: Examining precipitating factors of the willingness to self-censor

Dr. Vincent F. Filak
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

ABSTRACT

A study of college media editors and advisers (n=196) revealed self-interest and a sense of higher purpose predicted the participants’ ratings on the willingness to self-censor scale. Furthermore, a sense of fairness to an important other significantly correlated with self-censorship ratings. While no significant differences existed between the student editors and advisers in regard to these variables, significant differences between those at public and private institutions were revealed through a post-hoc analysis. Implications for student media are discussed.

Recent work in the area of self-censorship has indicated that the willingness to self-censor is an intrinsic, measurable trait (Hayes, Glynn & Shanahan, 2005 a, b). In addition, the willingness to self-censor has been found to functionally limit public discourse, political debate and social interaction. In the realm of journalism, self-censorship was shown to predict the relative comfort that high school (Filak, Reinardy & Maksl, 2009) and college media advisers (Filak & Reinardy, 2008) felt in regard to the publication of stories on controversial topics.

What is not clear, however, is if any particular precipitating factors exist in regard to this trait. In other words, what attitudinal or situational measures will make an individual more or less likely to self-censor? Given the prior work on how self-censorship has predicted diminished comfort levels with certain material, understanding what will likely trigger self-censoring behavior is important. In understanding what specific threats, values or viewpoints can lead to a self-censoring trigger, individuals can address the issues on a cognitive level, as opposed to through a spontaneous reaction.

A quick examination of the literature in the field reveals three potential areas that are rife with possible triggers. At a biological level, work as early as Darwin’s (1872/2003) has shown that fear of harm and desire to improve one’s own position in regard to others are among our basest needs. The study of self-interest and its driving force within humans has demonstrated that self-interest is among the strongest innate drives in the human psyche. Thus, self-preservation would likely provide an impetus for those in student media to self-censor in the wake of being threatened.

However, self-interest often finds itself at odds with cooperative environments and equitable conditions. This dichotomy leads to a struggle for people who are attempting to balance what they want with their own sense of what is fair for others. Research has demonstrated that individuals feel social tension when they are allowed to benefit at the expense of others, especially important others (Loseman et al., 2009). To that end, the desire to produce content that might lead to the punishment of an editor or an adviser would be a valid approach if only self-interest were involved. That said, rather than an editor deciding to publish something that might get an adviser fired, the editor might seek a greater sense of collective protection and a desire to avoid benefit inequity, thus engaging in self-censorship.

Beyond these two individually based needs, work in the area of career theory has indicated that a deep sense of purpose can supersede an individual’s needs. This type of behavior is often referred to as vocational work and tends to attach itself to people who engage in devotions to religious orders, such as the priesthood (Scott, 2007). However, recent research in this area (Wrzesniewski, 2002) has revealed that individuals who see a greater purpose behind even secular work are more likely to attach higher levels of value to their actions and thus be willing to sacrifice their own desires for work-based outcomes.

So to what degree do these three potential predictors lead to or prevent self-censoring behavior? This work seeks to answer that question and address two other previously unstudied issues: do advisers and student editors differ in regard to self-censorship ratings and do these groups differ in regard to their ratings of the precipitating factors?
Understanding the answers to these questions will provide a more complete view as to how self-censorship germinates within a collegiate newsroom. In addition, the results could help further explain the degree of commitment to themselves and others held by advisers and student editors.

LITERATURE REVIEW
To better establish the theoretical basis for this study, we will briefly review the concept of self-censorship, including the recent developments regarding the willingness to self-censor (WTSC). Then, we will examine each of the psychological paradigms (self-interest, fairness, vocational commitment) in turn, outlining the relative value of each in regard to this study.

WILLINGNESS TO SELF-CENSOR

The concept of self-censorship owes its 20th-century roots to the conformity work of Asch (1951) and the spiral of silence work of Noelle Neumann (1974, 1989). While both of these groundbreaking authors have provided valuable research in these areas, neither of their models was able to withstand rigorous testing in a broad array of studies. While various components of each theory often worked, the complete causal model, especially in the case of the spiral of silence, failed on the whole (Gonzenbach, King & Jablonski, 1999; Moy, Domke & Stamm, 2001; Salmon & Neuwirth, 1990).

In an attempt to better explain the phenomenon in which some individuals recede socially when their opinion is challenged or conflict may occur, Hayes and his colleagues (Hayes, Glynn & Shanahan, 2005 a, b) created and validated the willingness to self-censor scale. In their early work, they found that individuals who rated higher on their scale were less likely to express their opinions in a climate that was not conducive to accepting those opinions. Follow up studies supported the initial results, as Hayes, Uldall and Glynn (2007) found that a hostile climate more greatly effects those with higher self-censorship ratings and Hayes, Scheufele and Hugie (2006) found that self-censors are less likely to participate in publically observable political behavior.

In transitioning this work to the area of student media, our research has found a strong link between high school newspaper advisers' comfort with covering controversial topics and their ratings on the WTSC scale (Filak & Miller, 2007). In this study, the scale was predictive even when controlling for the participants' ratings of how they thought their principals would react to the topic. A follow up study found that the scale was predictive, even when controlling for specific situational factors, such as job enjoyment (Filak, Reinardy & Maksy, 2009).

As far as college media is concerned, advisers have expressed lower levels of concern when it comes to publishing material on controversial topics than their high school counterparts. However, no significant differences were found between the groups in regard to their self-censorship ratings, further codifying the notion that this is an intrinsic, as opposed to situational trait (BLIND CITE, 2009). However, a study of college media advisers did reveal the predictive power of the WTSC scale was relative to the level of controversy the adviser associated with that topic. That study (Filak & Reinardy, 2008) revealed that when advisers felt their lowest levels of comfort with regard to specific topics, the WTSC scale was a valid predictor of those outcomes. However, when the advisers' ratings fell into the area of either “comfortable” or “very comfortable,” the WTSC was not a significant predictor. In other words, it takes some degree of discomfort for self-censorship to become an issue.

SELF-INTEREST AND FAIRNESS

Darwinism, while initially a biological rationalization for the advancement of species, has become a broader tool for those seeking to rationalize human behavior. To quote Helen Fisher, a Rutgers University anthropologist, “Darwinian thinking is a little bit like gravity,” Fisher says. “It has infused everything” (Wright, 2009). A recent phenomenon in psychology, known in some circles as evolutionary psychology (Buss, 2009), has used some of the tenets of Darwinism to explain the struggle for existence as a cognitive function. In other words, rather than the fight for survival as a function of biology (food, shelter, warmth), psychologists see survival as part of other aspects of self-interest (mate connections, social conflict, human nature). While a great deal of debate has occurred among psychologists regarding the validity of this theoretical approach (Miele, 2005), they tend to agree that self-interest is a driving force among humans.

Self-interest is defined as anything valued by the individual. That can range from money and power to identity and security (Montada, 1998). The desire for individuals to protect themselves from negative outcomes while maximizing benefits to themselves has been viewed as the dominant form of motivation in regard to social interactions (Abell, 1991).

Work-place interactions have shown strong levels of self-interest and inequity. For example, de Cremer and van Dijk (2005) used a resource-allocation examination to determine whether leaders of an organization would demonstrate higher levels of self-interest or collective magnanimity. In their experiment, the authors found group leaders took more of a resource and were less likely to follow an equal division rule than their followers. The authors concluded that the decisions the leaders made to allocate more resources to themselves included an innate sense of self-interest and feelings of entitlement.

Perry (1993) also found that individuals who were overpaid avoided strategies that would cause them to lose that advantage and instead rationalized the outcomes through self-protective analysis. Additionally, van den Bos et al. (2006) found that individuals could much more easily grasp and appreciate the concept of advantageous inequity while the concept of fairness required additional cognitive effort. The authors wrote how this explained why fairness and equality were less likely to occur in situations in which cognitive processing was limited or a primal need was engaged.

Given those findings, the issue of threat becomes even more impor-
tant in regard to self-interest. Loseman et al. (2009) found that when participants in their study were placed in a situation of self-threat, they were less likely to be concerned with the issue of fairness and more likely to react positively to an arrangement in which they received an advantage that was clearly inequitable. Thus, when threatened, concerns of fairness appear to dissipate and the individual will do what is best for him or her. Threat has also been shown to provide an impetus for conformity and compliance (Renkema, Stapel & Van Yperen, 2008), thus making it a key issue in understanding human reaction to situations involving self-interest.

However, researchers have also noted that the issue of fairness has served as a mitigating factor when it comes to a decision-making process. Equity theory (Adams, 1965) has long been used to explain that people, while motivated by self-interest, have a sense of what is fair and seek to attain that fairness. Although intuitively people are primed to see situations in which they maximize their own outcomes, equity theory posits that individuals feel guilt when they receive more than what is afforded to other. Similarly, they are more likely to feel guilt when others are punished while they avoid reprimand.

For example, in a study of conflicting needs regarding transportation infrastructure, Muller, Kals and Maes (2008) found that cooperation among the individuals could best be explained through a justice hypothesis. While self-interest was a component of cooperation among the participants, the issue of how to most fairly resolve the conflict was the prominent contributor to the desire to cooperate.

In addition, when individuals feel uncertain, the aspect of fairness becomes exceptionally important to people. A study by van den Bos and Miedema (2000) found that participants in two experimental studies that threat (in this case, mortality salience) led to people more greatly valuing the fairness heuristic. In short, people tended to value the importance of fairness when they felt uncertain and threatened, and thus were more relieved when they felt fairness was being served.

A student-media-based example might shed some light on this phenomenon. In January 2007, editors and staff members of the Gramblinite, the student newspaper at Grambling State University, agreed to shut down the student newspaper after the school’s president questioned the quality of the paper. Provost Robert Dixon noted in a memorandum to adviser Wanda Peters that the paper needed a higher level of “quality assurance” before it was to return to publication. In addition, Dixon told editor in chief Darryl Smith that the paper ran nothing but negative stories, thus leading in part to the suspension of publication. What was outlined for these students was clearly a case of prior restraint by the administration.

However, rather than fight, the students agreed to the suspension, primarily due to their concern that Peters would be fired if they didn’t acquiesce (Taylor, 2007a). In this example, the students protected the adviser, to the detriment of their own rights to publish material they felt to be important. In doing so, they saw the potential harm for the adviser as being something for which they were willing to subjugate their needs to secure the safety of the adviser. Thus the issue of self-interest (publishing the paper) was mitigated by the issue of fairness (our adviser will pay a penalty for our actions), leading to the cessation of the paper.

Vocations and Callings

While the concept of a “calling” or “vocation” has often seen its roots in religious orders, recent work has attempted to add meaning to other secular occupations. Scott (2007) noted the transition from viewing jobs as mere vehicles for garnering a wage to something deeper and more meaningful can have a religious bent to it. However, in discussing the concept of the entrepreneurial self, she argues that individuals have been known to subjugate their own needs to that of a career in a similar vocational fashion.

Although outsiders might argue with the idea of journalism having a similarity in pull to those who are drawn to religious servitude, journalists themselves have been known to view their work with a religious fervor, citing a sense of predestination for their purpose. Wanjiho Kabukuru, an African journalist wrote in 2006 that upon his exposure to the New African magazine, he felt a strong pull toward journalism that he described as a transformative experience. In his article “It’s no longer a job, it’s a calling,” Kabukuru outlined his desire be an NA journalist and the struggles he went through to be a member of the staff. For Kabukuru, journalism was a lot more than a career.

Closer to home, Beth Macy, a reporter in Roanoke, Va., has also published a series of articles that discuss the concept of journalism as a vocation. In one article, she noted:

“It’s our job to convince the editors we work with that these stories will move our readers as well. It’s our job to convince our subjects that we’re in it for the long haul -- whether it means planting ourselves in the middle of a living room floor so we can make eye contact with a battered African refugee, or joining a group of migrant guest workers in the predawn as they set out on a four-day journey home to Mexico. It is our job to nurture our inner tugs and goose bumps, and to know without a doubt: These are my stories, the stories I was born to tell.”

(Emphasis in the original; Macy, 2008, p. 50).

In a follow-up story, Macy interviewed dozens of newspaper journalists to ascertain why they remained in the field amid massive cutbacks and layoffs. For those who decided to remain, a common theme emerged: the inherent value of their work that goes beyond a paycheck (Macy, 2009). One of the journalists she interviewed noted that he loved journalism and that there was value to his craft beyond the work he created. While many of Macy’s journalists didn’t use the words “vocation” or “calling,” they did view the profession as more than a job. They also felt it was important to push forward, despite setbacks and criticism from those who failed to believe in their career choice.

For journalists, the sense that there is a greater good being served has led to a stronger sense of attachment to the field. Beam (2006) found that journalists are more satisfied with their jobs if they perceive the organization to be about more than making a profit. The more the
journalists felt strong values were being served, the better they rated their job satisfaction.

Clearly, journalists often see the field as something apart from other career endeavors. Many of them have a sense that they were meant to do this work or at the very least that it has a higher chance of contributing to a common good than other careers. To that end, the question of to what degree a level of devotion to this ideal will impact their willingness to self-censor is important to this study.

Thus, we posed the following hypothesis and research questions:

H1: Self-interest, other-interest and vocational calling would independently predict an individual’s willingness to self-censor ratings.

RQ1: Do any significant differences existed between advisers and editors in regard to the self-interest, other-interest and vocational-calling variables?

RQ2: Do any significant differences existed between advisers and editors in regard to the willingness to self-censor?

**METHOD**

**Sample**

We conducted a nationwide survey of college media advisers and editors through a mass email. We obtained a list of advisers through the College Media Advisers’ home office and sent each adviser a personalized email request to complete a survey. Participants were then asked to forward a second link to their editors, which assured us a collective pool in which both the advisers and editors would be from the same group of schools. A follow-up email was sent to the participants after two weeks, thanking those who responded to the survey and asking those who had not participated to consider taking part in our study.

The original list contained 704 names, which included editorial advisers, advertising advisers, former advisers, journalism educators and other friends of student press. Upon clearing the list of non-media advisers, we retained a total of 683 names. Of that remaining group, we had 64 emails bounce back as undeliverable. In addition, we had an additional 47 individuals respond to the message, noting they did not feel they were within the target population of the survey, most of whom stated they had either resigned or retired from advising. This left us with a sample of 573 possible participants. Of that remainder, we received a total of 138 participants, or a 24 percent response rate. Traditionally, surveys of this kind received a response rate of about 15 to 17 percent (Kovacs, 1991). Of those advisers who responded, we received a total pass-along return of 60 editors, of which only two were incomplete. Thus, we had a complete sample of 196 participants (editor n= 58, adviser n= 138).

We asked the advisers to rate a series of items on Likert-like scales, ranging from 1 to 7 with, 1 being the least positive response and 7 being the most positive. While the survey assessed several issues pertaining to the advisers’ jobs and their media outlets, we will only outline the items used for this study in our method.

Advisers were asked to complete the Willingness to Self-Censor scale (Hayes, Glynn and Shanahan, 2005a, 2005b). As we have with previous studies, we shifted the measure to a 7-point scale to maintain congruency throughout the survey. However, the structure of the measure remained the same: higher scores indicate a greater willingness to self-censor. The eight-item index reveals the degree to which the participant will withhold an opinion from others when the individual believes the opinion might cause disagreement (e.g. “When I disagree with others, I’d rather go along with them than argue about it”). Two of the eight items require a reversing of the scale. When we reversed these items, we conducted a Cronbach’s alpha test and the score was acceptable (alpha = .84). We then created a variable from the items by summing them and dividing the score by the number of items in the scale.

We asked participants to rate a series of four items meant to ascertain to what level of concern they had regarding self-interest and fairness. While fairness could attach itself to a variety of issues, we believed the interest of protecting an “important other” would be the easiest way we could measure this concept. Based on the symbiotic relationship of editors and advisers, we viewed the editor to be the adviser’s “important other” and the adviser to serve in that role for the editor.

The self-interest scale contained two items and spoke to the degree to which an individual feared their actions might yield harmful outcomes for them (e.g. “Certain stories can’t be covered by the media outlet or else I could be in trouble”). The other-interest scale also contained two items and spoke to the degree to which that individual feared harmful outcomes for the “important other” (e.g. “I fear reprisals will happen to my editor when certain types of material are covered in the media outlet I advise”). In both cases, the scales met acceptable alpha levels (self-interest = .72; other-interest = .89).

In addition, we asked participants to rate a series of eight items that were used to assess to what degree they believed journalism to be a vocational calling (e.g. “Journalism defines who I am”). Of these eight items, two required a reversal of their scales. Upon reversing those items, a Cronbach’s alpha revealed an acceptable level of reliability (alpha= .86), thus allowing us to combine the items into a single variable.

We gathered demographic information from the participants including the state in which they live, age, gender, years spent in the current school, years spent as an adviser, years spent in the current position and years spent teaching. We also asked if they taught at a public or private institution and if they had any professional journalism training.

The editor’s version was similar to the adviser’s version in regard to the WTSC and vocational scales. The self-interest items remained the same, but the other-interest scale asked them to assess potential harm as it related to the adviser. In addition, we collected age, gender, year in school, professional journalism training and whether they were an editor at a public or private institution.
RESULTS

Descriptive statistics

An examination of the data at the mean level revealed some interesting outcomes. In terms of the willingness to self-censor, the participants resisted the process on the whole (M= 3.06, SD= 1.06) with advisers showing a greater reticence to self-censor (M=3.00, SD= 1.02) than editors (M= 3.20, SD= 1.15).

In terms of the issue of protecting the interest of one’s self and the important others, the participants demonstrated a greater sense of fear for each other (other-interest M= 2.42, SD= 1.58) than for themselves (M= 2.31, SD= 1.50). Individually, the editors were more fearful than the advisers both in terms of self-interest (editor M= 2.57, SD= 1.71; adviser M= 2.20, SD= 1.39) and other-interest (editor M= 2.81, SD= 1.84; adviser M= 2.27, SD= 1.44). Taken as a whole, these data suggest that the participants were not extremely concerned with what might happen to them if something controversial were to appear in their media outlet.

As far as the vocational aspects of journalism, the participants rated the items that comprised this variable very high (M= 5.63, SD= 0.93), with advisers (M= 5.71, SD 0.85) showing stronger agreement than their editors (M= 5.44, SD= 1.08). Thus, the participants seemed to view journalism as important beyond its ability to provide a steady paycheck.

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis one stated that self-interest, other-interest and vocational calling would independently predict an individual’s willingness to self-censor ratings. To test this hypothesis, we first conducted a correlation matrix, including the key demographics we gathered from both groups as well as the independent variable we wished to examine. None of the demographics significantly correlated with the WTSC variable and thus none were retained for future analysis.

We then conducted a correlation matrix to assess to whether the three independent variables correlated with the WTSC variable. An examination of the matrix revealed that all three significantly correlated with the dependent variable (self-interest r = .27; other-interest r = .25; vocation r = -.20). In the case of the first two variables, the results clearly indicated that fear of harming one’s own status or the status of an important other attached themselves to a desire to self-censor. In regard to the vocational variable, the outcome indicated an inverse relationship, with an increased value of the importance of journalism correlating with a decreased willingness to self-censor.

To further test this assumption, we conducted a regression analysis in which the WTSC variable served as the DV and the three others as IVs. The regression was predictive (R square=.10), with one significant predictor (vocational calling beta = -.14, p < .05) and one marginal predictor (self-interest beta = .17, p = .069). Other-interest was not predictive (beta = .10, p > .2). In extracting the other-interest variable and rerunning the regression, both vocational calling (beta = -.15, p < .05) and self-interest (beta = .24; p < .01) were significant predictors. Hypothesis one was partially supported.

Research question one asked if any significant differences existed between advisers and editors in regard to the self-interest and other-interest variables. To examine this question, we conducted a correlation matrix to assess whether any demographic variables might covary with our dependent variables. Age and whether the individual was at a public or private institution significantly correlated with the DVs and thus were retained for future analyses.

We then conducted a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), in which we used self-interest, other-interest and vocational calling as the DVs, the adviser/editor variable as our IV and age and public versus private as our covariates. The use of a MANCOVA allows us to examine differences between groups while minimizing the risk of inflating the region of error (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An examination of the of the Wilks’ Lambda revealed no significant difference existed (F= .14, p > .5). Thus, we did not further examine the individual ANCOVAs for differences.

Research question two asked whether any significant differences existed between advisers and editors in regard to the willingness to self-censor. The earlier correlation matrix revealed no potential covariates, so we used a simple one-way ANOVA to examine any differences between the groups. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences between the groups (F = 1.4, p > .2).

Post-hoc Analysis

In the examination of the data, one covariate repeatedly emerged: whether the participant was at a public or private institution. This demarcation between public and private appeared to be a reflection of the differences in how the law applies at these types of institutions.

Given these initial outcomes, we sought to better understand whether significant differences existed between the editors and advisers who served at public and private institutions in regard to our four key variables. Since these interests emerged through the process of analyses, we decided to treat the examination as a post-hoc analysis and thus we made no predictions as to the outcomes.

To examine our data, we conducted a MANCOVA, using the WTSC, self-interest, other-interest and vocational-calling variables as our DVs and the public/private variable as our IV. We also retained age, as it was a key covariate based on our earlier correlation matrices.

The outcome of the MANCOVA was significant (Wilks’ Lambda F= 6.03, p < .001), thus indicating at least some of the DVs contained significant differences. In looking at the individual ANCOVAs, both self-interest (F= 16.01, p < .001) and other-interest (F= 21.54, p < .001) showed significant differences with the participants at public institutions showing higher levels of concern in both cases than their colleagues at the public institutions (self-interest: private M= 2.91, public M= 2.00; other-interest: private M= 3.15, public M= 2.06).

In terms of the vocational calling variable, the findings were marginally significant (F= 3.52, p = .062) with the public institution participants showing higher agreement that journalism is more than a job (M= 5.73) than their private school colleagues (M= 5.44). Interesting-
ly, no significant differences existed between the two groups in regard to their willingness to self-censor (F= 1.79, p > .1).

**DISCUSSION**

Self-censorship is a difficult concept to codify, primarily because its permutations are based directly on the individual engaging in the behavior. While many of the tools of administrative censorship can be easily spotted, such as punishing an adviser under the guise of sloppy journalism or the ever-popular “standards” argument, self-censorship lends itself to none of those outward signs. Instead it can be couched in the simplest of decisions, such as encouraging a student to find a “better” story as opposed to one that might cause controversy, or asking if the student “are you sure you’ve got your facts right?” In some cases, the self-censor doesn’t even grasp what he or she is doing and thus the cycle continues.

However, what can be more easily grasped are the precipitating factors that attach themselves to self-censorship. We have attempted to identify several of them in this piece and have yielded some interesting results. While both student editors and advisers here were more concerned with what might happen to the other if something controversial were to be published, it was self-interest that was the more direct predictor of the willingness to self-censor. In the case of this sample, the participant’s level of concern for their own well being significantly correlated and marginally predicted self-censoring behavior. That said, those individuals who held journalism in high esteem, viewing it as a calling, were less likely to self-censor than those who viewed it as akin to any other employment field.

In both cases, this provides specific relief for those interested in halting self-censorship among advisers and editors. First and foremost, imbuing advisers and editors with a strong sense of the value of journalism and of their work at student media outlets will likely improve their views on the vocational aspect of journalism. While media advisers can lure students to the student newspaper or Web site with a promise of clips for their portfolio, once these students arrive, it is important to transition them toward that deeper understanding of the journalistic code. This has the potential to make them less likely to fold under undue pressure from administrators when times get tough.

In addition, seeking out individuals who see the benefit of the whole as more important than the benefits to themselves will likely help mitigate the atmosphere of self-censorship. Over the years a number of vantage points have emerged as to how to best view the editorship of a college media outlet. Perhaps the best one as it would relate to this study is that of a museum curator or an art house host: The pieces are not yours, you display them to allow the greatest benefit to the public and when your time is over, you turn over the keys to someone else who will do something else. Your job isn’t ownership, but rather the use of other people’s talents to benefit the public. Those editors who seek only self-interest will likely also act as self-censors, thus avoiding important issues that might cause waves.

Interestingly, the differences between the adviser ratings and the student editor ratings of the key variables in this study were not significantly different. The research question regarding self-interest and other interest allowed for possible outcomes on either end, but no differences emerged. One could hypothesize that editors should fear more, as they have less experience with the concerns at hand and have been trained to obey authority figures. On the other hand, advisers have mortgages, cars and other responsibilities and thus the risks of loss are higher for them. Additionally, the lack of a significant outcome for the vocational scale was quizzical. One could argue that students have a passion for a topic and have yet to have that crushed out of them or that advisers have dedicated more of their lives to the field and thus should have a stronger connection to it. In either case, it made for a surprising set of outcomes that begs for further study.

This study is limited both in terms of scope and sample size. A larger sample of student editors might have allowed for both an editor/adviser linking of responses and a stronger set of results. While the correlations were strong, the regressions’ results were weakened by the smaller sample of editors. That said, the results fit both the theoretical models outlined above and follow logically from our data pattern.

Future studies should seek to examine a full model, walking the data for both advisers and editors through the precipitates through the controversial topics. This would allow for a robust finding and a valuable model for advisers and editors alike. Additionally, more work should be done to assess the public/private divide at college media outlets. The post-hoc test revealed strong findings regarding higher levels of concern at private universities regarding punishment for both one’s self and important others. Not only should research examine the causes for concern and the tangible outcomes, but also the degree to which these concerns are founded in reality. An analysis of hard data regarding punitive measures at the public and private level could be of interest to student media groups.

Finally, research should also continue to focus on student editors, as they are not only among the most vulnerable (administrators literally hold the students’ futures in their hands) but also the most directly responsible for editorial decisions at the majority of these media outlets. Continuing on this path should be a primary concern for researchers interested in this topic.
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