

PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE STUDENT EDITOR
OF THE HAYMAKER

By

E. LYNN SMITH

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1966

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1973

Thesis
1973
5646p
Cap. 2

NOV 16 1973

PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE STUDENT EDITOR
OF THE HAYMAKER

Thesis Approved:

Harry E. Heath, Jr.

Thesis Adviser
Walter J. Ward

D. N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

867487

PREFACE

College newspaper editors across the nation are frequently in conflict with administrators, faculty, and sometimes with other students over articles published in the student press. Such conflict existed at Phillips University at the time of this study. Because research conducted at Oklahoma State University pointed to a method of identifying such conflict, this author sought to undertake a comparative study, the results of which might serve to reduce future conflict at Phillips University.

The study attempted to examine the role of the student editor as seen by administrators, student news staff members, and the editors themselves, in terms of Must-Do, May-Do, and Can't-Do behavior, and in relation to job functions of News decisions, Editorial decisions, and staff Supervisory decisions.

My appreciation is extended to Dr. Walter J. Ward, chairman of graduate studies in mass communication at Oklahoma State University, and to Dr. Harry E. Heath, Jr., director of the School of Journalism and Broadcasting at Oklahoma State University. Both of these men have given valuable guidance and direction to me in the pursuit of this master's degree.

I also am grateful to Miss Kathye Hill, who has typed and retyped this thesis from illegible scratchings and drafts written by the author, and to those individuals at Phillips University who took the time to respond to the questionnaire.

More than to anyone else, however, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my wife Lou Ann, and our two daughters, Lynette and Laura, whose never-failing confidence and encouragement kept this project alive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
The Campus in Ferment	3
Changing Newspaper Patterns	4
Procedures at Phillips and Oklahoma State	8
Role Perception Theory	11
Objectives	13
The Research Tool	14
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
Campus Newspaper Guidelines	17
Periodical Comment and Analysis	19
Examples of Conflict	20
Role Expectations and Behavior	22
III. DESIGN AND ANALYSIS	27
Methodology	27
The Research Instrument	30
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	34
Differences Between Groups	36
Summary	61
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	63
Differences in Perceived Editor's Role	65
Conclusions	70
Recommendations	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
APPENDIX A—QUESTIONNAIRE	75
APPENDIX B—PARTICIPANTS' SCORES ON QUESTIONNAIRE	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Analysis Paradigm Juxtaposing Three Independent Variables and Their Levels of Independence	32
II. Analysis of Variance Paradigm; Mean Agreement Scores for Statements of BEHAVIOR in FUNCTION areas by SOCIAL SYSTEM Groups	37
III. Analysis of Variance F-Ratio Table	38
IV. Mean Scores of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION	39
V. Mean Scores of FUNCTION and SOCIAL SYSTEM	42
VI. Mean Scores of BEHAVIOR and SOCIAL SYSTEM	43
VII. Consensus on Must-Do Behavior for Editor Expected by SOCIAL SYSTEM	45
VIII. Consensus on Can't-Do Behavior Expected to be Avoided by Editor by SOCIAL SYSTEM	49
IX. Consensus on May-Do Behavior for Editor Expected by SOCIAL SYSTEM	52
X. Actual Behavior by the Editor Expected to Cause Conflict .	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what, if any, differences exist in the role perceptions of the editor of the Haymaker, student newspaper at Phillips University, a church-related (Disciples of Christ), private four-year institution, and to compare these data with role perceptions of the editor of the Daily O'Collegian at Oklahoma State University, a large public institution.

The study examined the perceptions of three groups of individuals at Phillips University, each of whom view the role of the student editor from a different position within the university community. Those groups are the university administrators, the student staff members of the student newspaper, and the individuals who, in recent years, have held the position of editor of the student newspaper.

At the time the study was conducted, the student newspaper at Phillips University had been embroiled in an open conflict with at least one principal figure within the university administration and had drawn criticism from a number of other administrative personnel, not the least of whom included the acting president of the university. The university administration was in a state of limbo following the death of its president, who had been in office for some 12 years and had died of a heart attack late in the summer.

The editor, through a series of editorials, criticized the manner in which the Dean of Students handled a violation of university dormitory policy concerning the possession of marijuana. The newspaper took the position that the Dean of Students, acting as the prosecution in the student court to which the case was directed, violated a basic principle of human rights and law by refusing to accept the student court ruling, which found the students guilty and handed down a probationary sentence. In his refusal the Dean of Students appealed the case to another student court, seeking to have the penalty increased to a ruling of expulsion. After the lower court's ruling was upheld by the student appeals court, the Dean appealed again, this time to a joint student-faculty morale and discipline committee, which also upheld the original decision. Again the Dean of Students appealed the decision, this time to the acting president of the university. The acting president also upheld the original ruling.

Throughout the several weeks in which the case was in litigation, the student newspaper offered several editorial opinions concerning the Dean of Students' handling of the case and suggested that the Dean was violating the rights of the defendants by seeking to have the penalty increased after the defendants had been found guilty. The newspaper also suggested that the case should never have been taken to the student court system because possession of marijuana is a violation of state law and it should have been handled by the county or district court. Moreover, the newspaper had obtained information that the university had contacted the county attorney but had been advised that the case would probably not be successfully prosecuted because the Dean of Students had not conducted a legal search when he found the evidence in

the students' room. The newspaper suggested that the Dean of Students had simply gotten himself into an embarrassing situation and was attempting to use the student court in an effort to save face and demonstrate his authority.

It is believed that the student newspaper's editorial position was instrumental in preventing the students from being expelled and that the acting president, without the attention drawn by the editorials, may have supported the Dean of Students.

This incident, then, resulted in an open break between the student newspaper and the university administration and may have involved a basic difference in role perceptions of the editor's responsibilities and authority.

The Campus in Ferment

While this case may be unique in its own way, it serves as an example of the perennial conflict between student newspapers and university administrations, a conflict which has been played out time and again on campuses across the country. The result is a renewal of interest in the student newspaper's role within a university community and, in many cases, drastic changes in the structure of the newspapers that serve those schools.

Sparking these changes are such confrontations as the one described in this chapter. Other conflicts have centered on explicit descriptions of sexual relations, the use of words generally considered to be obscene and profane, and unsubstantiated reports and stories of university actions without regard to professionally accepted standards of responsible reporting.

Student newspapers have drawn criticism not only from the administrators of their schools, but from legislators, alumni, faculty, and even some of their peers in the ranks of the student body,

At some schools the student editor has been removed from office, sometimes along with the faculty adviser. And, while it is impossible to obtain accurate data on the number of such incidents, it is reasonable to assume that many individuals have been given the chance to resign quietly rather than be subjected to formal discipline and termination, actions which might damage their record and inhibit their chances for future employment.

Aside from firing of those in charge of the student newspaper, the most widely used method of dealing with an unruly student press has been for the university to divorce itself from the campus newspaper by withdrawing official support. This support traditionally has taken the form of equipment, buildings, supplies, utilities, and the salaries of university personnel such as faculty advisers. Since 1970, withdrawal of such support has become more common. Education journals such as Chronicles of Higher Education have reported a lively trend in this direction.¹ In some cases administrators and in other cases student editors have sought the separation.

Changing Newspaper Patterns

The courts have played an important role in this development, particularly in relation to publicly supported institutions, by ruling in three landmark decisions that any censorship of a newspaper in a public college or university constitutes interference with press freedom.²

Going even further, a federal court ruled in a case involving North Carolina Central University that the student newspaper could not receive financial support from the university because such support "might compromise the paper's freedom."³

Some colleges, however, have kept out of the student newspaper publishing business and see nothing unusual about an independent student press. The Harvard Crimson and the University of Michigan Daily are two such papers. The Crimson owns its own building and equipment and operates as an independent business enterprise. The Daily is housed in a campus building which was constructed in 1932 with profits accumulated by the paper and the yearbook. It is supported by a \$10 per year subscription fee and the income from advertising.⁴

Two years ago, at the University of Kentucky, the Kentucky Kernel went through a transformation in which it became totally independent. Glenwood L. Creech, president, reportedly is happy with the new arrangement. He said:

When they were getting the student money, the Kernel staff would sell just enough ads to get through the year. Then they'd do as they damn well pleased the rest of the time. There are some who think the paper was more exciting in those days, but my life has been a hell of a lot more pleasant since we made the change. I knew it was a thorn, but I didn't know how big a thorn it was until they pulled it out.⁵

In Florida, the newly independent Flambeau at Florida State University finds itself with a somewhat different financial relationship than the arrangements described earlier.

The Flambeau receives some \$22,000 per year from the university and in return provides one page four times each week for the university administration to use as an official bulletin. The remaining pages continue to carry stories and advertisements which follow the editorial

policies of the paper's editor. Even with the \$22,000 guaranteed advertising revenue from the university, the Flambeau still has to make up \$70,000 lost in university support, which used to total \$92,000 per year.

All this means that the Flambeau is in a precarious financial position. The paper's board chairman has estimated that it will require \$200,000 to operate during the 1972-73 school year but projects income of only \$177,000, including income from the university's official bulletins and all other advertising revenue.

In the Florida case the law again played an important part in shaping the future of college journalism. The state's attorney general had ruled that college presidents could neither censor newspapers nor be held liable for damaging statements in them.⁶

In November, 1972, the University of Florida newspaper, the Florida Alligator, found itself in a similar conflict with President Stephen C. O'Connell. Holding the Flambeau up as an example, the University of Florida administration is attempting to force restructuring of the Alligator in a similar way.

From data available on the structure of college newspapers, it is apparent that most administrators and editors who have been through "divorce" proceedings between the school and the paper agree that a one-year or two-year period of transition is the best way to accomplish the goal. By reducing the amount of financial support from the university over a two-year period, the newspaper can adjust its budget and take steps to increase revenue from advertising in a realistic manner. Thus, the newspaper's chances for survival are improved.

At some schools the attempt at independence has not been successful. The University of Tennessee's Daily Beacon became independent, but successive losses caused the university to resume support as well as to pay the paper's overdue bills. North Carolina Central's Campus Echo, mentioned earlier in this chapter as the cause of a Federal Court ruling, is now defunct. It can't pay its bills and the court order prohibits the university from providing funds.⁷

Court activity in campus publications first reached landmark proportions in 1967 in *Dickey v. Alabama Board of Education*. The court prohibited administrative censorship of a student newspaper, ruling that the president of Troy State College (now Troy State University) could not expel a student editor for criticizing the state government.⁸

Three years later, in 1970, another landmark case gave further evidence that the first amendment guarantee of freedom of press could be extended beyond the professional press to include the collegiate press.

In *Antonelli v. Hammond*, a Massachusetts court ruled against Fitchburg State College's attempt to prevent the student paper from publishing a controversial article by Eldridge Cleaver. The court said that the administration of a state university could not censor or prevent publication of an objectionable issue. Such censorship constitutes state interference with freedom of the press, the court said.⁹

It is apparent from this evidence that many college editors see their role in campus newspaper publishing from a somewhat different position than do many administrators. Or, to put it another way, role perception apparently varies when different people look at the editor's job.

Although college newspapers may vary in structure, they serve a primary role of keeping the university community informed; in many instances they also function as an adjunct of the academic program by providing a laboratory for student journalists to hone their writing and editing abilities.

Procedures at Phillips and Oklahoma State

In a study by Susan Huser Carter at Oklahoma State University in 1970-71, the perceived role of the student editor was first explored. The Carter study, after which this study is patterned, reflects the role perceptions of those on a state-supported campus in a university community of some 17,000 students. It seems appropriate to examine the same concepts of role perception on a campus of a substantially differing nature.

Oklahoma State University and Phillips University differ in their constitutional organization, with OSU being a state supported land-grant institution while Phillips University is a private church-related college. In terms of size, the two schools are significantly different, with Phillips numbering under 1,500 students. The academic philosophies of the two schools also are different. Oklahoma State University says it is committed to promoting liberal and practical education on the campus, throughout the state of Oklahoma, and in those areas of the nation and world where its special talents can be put to use.¹⁰ Phillips, on the other hand, says it exists for its students and provides a Christian atmosphere and climate of learning in which the student can grow, mature, and become a young adult responsible for his own decisions.¹¹ Phillips University is a liberal arts institution.

Moreover, the two student newspapers at the respective schools function under a different organizational structure and seek to serve their respective university communities in different ways.

The Daily O'Collegian editor is selected each semester by the Board of Directors of Oklahoma State University Student Publications. The editor serves for one semester.

The Haymaker editor is elected in an all-school election after having been screened and approved for inclusion on the ballot by the Phillips University Committee on Student Publications. The editor serves for one year and may run for re-election. The past three editors were first elected at the end of their sophomore years and each was elected to serve as editor for a subsequent year. Thus, in the past six years the newspaper has had only three editors.

The director of the Oklahoma State University School of Journalism and Broadcasting serves as publisher of the Daily O'Collegian, while at Phillips University the faculty adviser to student publications serves as the publisher of the Haymaker.

Each of the two schools has an eight member board of directors, although at Phillips that body is called the Committee on Student Publications. Board members at Oklahoma State University are appointed by the president of the university from nominees representing the Faculty Council, Student Senate, and the School of Journalism and Broadcasting.

The Committee on Student Publications at Phillips University comprises four students and four faculty-staff personnel. Two of the student members are the editors of the two principal student publications, the Haymaker and The Phillipian (yearbook). Two other student members are appointed by the Student Senate. The four faculty-staff

members include the adviser to student publications, and three other persons appointed by the chairman of the Student and Campus Life Committee, to which the Committee on Student Publications reports.

The primary duty of the OSU board of publications is the selection of newspaper and yearbook editors and approval of publication staffs and budgets. This body also may discharge an editor before his term has been completed.

The primary duty of the Phillips University Committee on Student Publications is the screening of candidates for the editor's job on both the student newspaper and the yearbook and approval of those candidates whose names are placed on the all-school election ballot. The committee also has the power to approve the budgets prepared by the editors and, if it deems necessary, to remove an editor from office.

An additional structure within the Oklahoma State University Daily O'Collegian organization is the Board of Directors of the O'Collegian Publishing Company, a non-profit corporation chartered by the State of Oklahoma. This body includes the university president, chairman of the Board of Student Publications, director of student publications, dean of student affairs, comptroller, director of the School of Journalism and Broadcasting, and the editor of the Daily O'Collegian. This board exists because the O'Collegian Publishing Company owns the equipment and employs the production personnel to publish the student newspaper. Phillips University does not have a corresponding body within its student publications structure because the newspaper is produced by a commercial printer who both sets the type and prints the publication.

The student newspapers differ also in their frequency of publication. The Daily O'Collegian publishes five days a week and the Haymaker

only once. The Daily O'Collegian serves its university community by printing news of campus and local events as well as regional, national, and international news obtained from an Associated Press wire and other news services. The Haymaker does not concern itself with news outside the immediate university community.

Both the Daily O'Collegian and the Haymaker accept advertising for financial support.

Role Perception Theory

Although the two schools and newspapers differ in obvious ways, they—and other institutions and student papers—have many things in common. One is the opportunity for disagreements to occur between the editor and his staff or the editor and the university administration, or any combination of the three groups.

As pointed out by Carter, a difference in perception of the role of student editor by administrators and "budding journalists" could conceivably precipitate a major controversy. And, although guidelines may be developed for the editor and staff writers, this fact does not always mean that the individuals involved agree with the guidelines or the interpretation of them. The result, of course, is a variance in role perception.

In discussing role perception and behavior, Professor David Berlo of Michigan State University uses three classifications of role behavior. They are the things an individual "must" do, the things he "may" do, and the things he "must not" do. Berlo says that every individual views his role in a given situation in one of these classifications, and also views the role of other individuals the same way.

He further states that roles can be viewed in terms of prescriptions, descriptions, and expectations, with conflict occurring when these are not in agreement. For example, if an individual is told what his role is he is given a description of that role, complete with some idea of the expectations others have for him. This is not to say that he will necessarily agree with that role description, but he will at least know what is expected and what might happen if he does not conform to that role. Assuming that he does not like the role description he may choose to take on another role (job) or he may decide to challenge the role by violating its prescription and take whatever consequences befall him.

Another aspect of the role behavior problem deals with what happens when an individual is not given a prescription of his role. In such a case the individual tends to be uncertain about what is expected of him and he may do something that his superiors will not like, even though he does not intend to violate their expectations.

Thus, the variables in this study, as in the Carter study, begin with the variable of BEHAVIOR on the part of the editor, BEHAVIOR is sub-divided into two categories of Must-Do and May-Do. A second variable is the editor's FUNCTION within three classifications of his responsibilities. Those classifications are News, Editorial, and Supervisory duties,

In order to obtain comparable data on role perceptions of individuals at a small private school (Phillips University) and a large publicly supported institution (Oklahoma State University), the participants were drawn from the same positions which form the third variable, SOCIAL SYSTEM.

The study's SOCIAL SYSTEM is comprised of three groups of individuals, each interacting with the others, and each holding expectations about the editor's role. The three groups are classified according to their position within the university structure and include 1) administrators, 2) student staff members, and 3) editors of the student paper.

Objectives

As in the Carter study, there were several principal objectives. The Carter study listed these four:

- 1) To determine areas of agreement among the three groups concerning the editor's expected duties, thus indicating mandatory or "must-do" behavior.
- 2) To determine areas of agreement among the three groups concerning unexpected duties for the editor, thus indicating "can't-do" behaviors.
- 3) To determine areas of agreement among the three groups concerning the editor's permitted or "may-do" behavior.
- 4) To determine areas of disagreement among the three groups concerning the editor's actual behavior.

For the purposes of this study, the following objective was added:

- 5) To determine areas of variance between like groups at both Phillips and OSU toward the editors' behavior at the respective schools.

The Research Tool

The survey was conducted through the use of a 48-item research instrument (see Appendix A) virtually identical to that used in the Carter study, in order to form the basis for a valid comparison. The items were designed to test the editor's Must-Do and May-Do behavior, with 24 statements in each category. Within each category, eight items were framed around the FUNCTION of News, eight around Editorial, and eight around Supervisory. The same design procedure was used in the questions testing the May-Do Behavior.

The assigned variable of SOCIAL SYSTEM was controlled by coding the instruments sent to individuals within the three SOCIAL SYSTEMS, Administrators, Editors, and Staff Members. While each respondent could be identified by SOCIAL SYSTEM, no provision was made to isolate individual respondents within each SOCIAL SYSTEM.

FOOTNOTES

¹Teresa L. Ebert, "More Papers Cutting Ties with Colleges--but with Some Misgivings," The Chronicle of Higher Education (November 6, 1972), p. 5.

²Parry D. Sorensen, "One Way to Get Rid of Racy College Papers," The National Observer (January 13, 1973), p. 18.

³Ibid., p. 18.

⁴Ibid., p. 18.

⁵Ibid., p. 18.

⁶Ibid., p. 18.

⁷Ebert, p. 5.

⁸Ibid., p. 5.

⁹Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁰"General Information; The University," Oklahoma State University Graduate Catalog (Stillwater, 1972), p. 43.

¹¹"General Information," Phillips University Undergraduate Catalog (Enid, 1972), p. 4.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature on the subject of role perception and on the function of student newspapers indicates that variances in behavior are expected of the student editor in the three functions of News, Editorial, and Supervision by the various publics with whom his activities and his newspaper interrelate.

In her thesis, Carter investigated seven broad categories of editor- and student-newspaper characteristics. From available literature she compiled descriptions of supervisory structures, statements of guidelines for student newspapers, varying philosophies of content of the press, relationships between the editor and administrators, news values held by student editors, and the function and role of the editor.

Since the Carter study, important literature available on most of these subjects has not been greatly increased. However, the supervision and guidelines areas have undergone change as restructuring of the student press at some institutions of higher learning has moved forward.

This author will not review data readily available in the Carter study. It seems more important at this point to pick up the thread of new literature.

It would seem, too, that the characteristics of newspaper content, relationships between the editor and his administrators, news values, and functions and roles of the editor are ultimately brought into focus

by examining the performance of the student press in relationship to its organizational structure. William J. Small, CBS Washington Bureau manager, in his book Political Power and the Press, points out that an understanding of the structure and organization of an institution (in the case of his book it is the government, but the same rationale may be used in many areas) can often point to such things as values, functions, and roles of individuals within that structure. So it is with the student press. Another point to consider is the fact that each individual perceives things from a vantage point that is unique unto himself. Thus, when one begins to search into the area of role expectations he must remember that, in many instances, perceptions studied will vary widely in terms of the "ox being gored."

Campus Newspaper Guidelines

Guidelines and organizational structure of campus newspapers differ from one school to the next. Their purpose is to give order and continuity to the paper (remembering that editors change frequently), to hold up certain standards of professional and ethical practice, and, not too infrequently, to protect the "best" interests of the administration (as perceived by the administration, which also changes from time to time).

The structure of the Phillips University Haymaker is set by The Constitution of Student Publications of Phillips University, but the paper also is subject to certain informal limits which change with time and practice, and with the personalities of individuals such as the editor, adviser, staff members, and administrative personnel.

Key provisions of the constitution are reprinted below.

Purpose

The Committee shall be accountable to the Student Life Committee of Phillips University for the policies and procedures of student publications, for the approval of their student personnel and for the approval of the budgets of the Haymaker, the Phillipian and such other student publications that this Committee deems advisable.

Authority

The Committee shall have the authority to carry out its activities pursuant to accomplishing its stated purpose. This means that the Committee has the authority to conduct inquiries and investigations into activities related to student publications and to make recommendations to the appropriate persons.

Specific Relationships

Sec. 1. The editors of the Haymaker and the Phillipian are students in a leaning situation and hence, as they develop their abilities, it is desirable that supervision and guidance by faculty and/or staff be provided. The Journalism Department shall provide the supervision for the Haymaker and the Phillipian by appointing an adviser who will be a member of the journalism faculty. Editors are entrusted with the responsibility of managing and operating their publications under the direction of the adviser. Every opportunity should be given to the editor and the other contributing students to express their individuality within the framework of the accepted traditions of excellence relative to their particular publication. The Committee seeks to develop policies that allow these editors and other student participants to grow and to develop their talents, and that insure that these publications appropriately serve the total university community.

Sec. 2. The adviser to student publications is, in fact, an adviser. The adviser's role is one of encouraging editors to seek and maintain high standards of journalism and to exercise discretion and good taste in the editorial policies and business management of the respective publications. The adviser should not act as censor to any publication. If the adviser so desires, he should, however, have prior access to any and all articles, editorials, photographs, and/or other material intended for use in the publications to which he is adviser. In the event of disagreement between the adviser and student editor, the issue may be brought before this Committee and its decision will be binding on all parties concerned.

Sec. 3. The student editors shall have authority to determine policies for their respective publications, subject to any limitations placed thereon by this Committee. With this authority the editors also assume the responsibility for their actions and the responsibility to have their publication produced and distributed at regularly announced intervals. It is the desire of this Committee that the editors work in harmony with the publications adviser, keeping the adviser fully informed of all matters pertaining to both editorial content and fiscal conditions of their publication.

The organization of the student newspaper at Phillips University is something of a blend between the traditional form of total university control and the emerging form of total independence.

The theory that variances in role perception do exist between editors and administrators is supported by the emerging pattern of independent campus newspapers across the nation. Usually this is the result of a conflict between the administration and the campus paper which both sides think may best be resolved by divorcing the paper from the institution (a sure indication that the administration does not see the campus editor's role as does the editor, and that the editor does not see the administration's role as does the administration).

Periodical Comment and Analysis

William E. Porter, in an article published in Saturday Review says

... most well known campus dailies have no connection at all with the school or department of journalism (for example, the Daily Illini, Wisconsin's Daily Cardinal, the Michigan Daily, the Columbia Spectator, and the Stanford Daily). Some are still published by the journalism unit, but even in most of these it is not necessary to be a journalism major to be on the paper.

Jeff Greenfield, former editor-in-chief of the University of Wisconsin Daily Cardinal, says there are "two distinct and contradictory schools of thought" in the college press. One is content to be an

adjunct of the university's public relations department, accepting its policies and programs and "speaking out only on issues of the narrowest concern." The second is activist, "publishing independent reporting and commentary about educational and broader concerns."³

Whether the conflict between editors and administrators be one of news values, ethics, philosophies or some other subjective matter, the fact is that ultimately the issue comes to a boil when the editor actually publishes (or perhaps threatens to publish) something that the administration does not want made known. In that respect, and in the final analysis, it comes down to content.

The history of college journalism is riddled with examples of conflict between the editor and the administration, the result, in the author's opinion, of variances in role perception between the principals involved.

Often at issue is the concept of freedom of the press balanced against its exercise of responsibility.

Few, if any, administrators oppose a free student press in the abstract. What is undeniably true is that several times every year student editors are suspended or fired, and papers are confiscated and destroyed for comment which administrators have attacked as 'irresponsible' or an 'abuse of freedom' or 'a violation of the canons of good taste.'⁴

Examples of Conflict

Some of the most touchy issues a campus newspaper deals with are local or statewide politics, fiscal matters having to do with the management of the school, and such social topics as those having to do with sex.

The Oakland Observer, after conducting a survey on sex, found itself in trouble with the school's chancellor, who demanded that the story be withdrawn. The editor refused and was fired. The paper was confiscated. The chancellor said his action was justified because "the students refused to take [it] seriously ... they treated this as a joke."⁵

Because of its involvement in campus politics, the Notre Dame Scholastic incurred the wrath of the administration. The Scholastic, in an editorial, stated that President Hesburg should be made chancellor and that a layman should be made president. Suddenly the Scholastic's moderator (adviser) took a more active interest in the publication. He began to advise with more regularity, using a policy directive defining the "prudent extent" of comment as authority for his actions. "A short time later the school announced that three of the editors had resigned ... to the surprise of the editors."⁶

Administrators are not the only source of conflict with the school paper. Some editors find they can arouse the anger of students, too.

The student council suspended funds to the Daily Pennsylvanian [in 1962] after a series of disputes over editorial policy. Attempts to fire editors have been made several times at UCLA.⁷

At Phillips University the same possibility exists. The Haymaker is funded from student fees which are turned over by the university to the Student Senate. The Student Senate, in turn, allocates these funds to numerous campus organizations, including the student newspaper and the yearbook. It is conceivable that the student government could withhold funds from the publications because a portion of a proposed Student Bill of Rights which would have prevented censure of the campus press by

any means, including financial, was rejected by the university's Board of Trustees.

Some campus papers are finding that the only way to be free of university control (either explicit or implied) is to operate without any financial assistance from the university. Three such campus papers include those at Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Here in the Southwest, the University of Texas' Daily Texan has long been an example of independence. It has resisted periodic attempts of the administration and the University of Texas Board of Regents to gain control.

A classic case occurred in 1966 when a member of the Board of Regents became upset over the paper's editorial policy. He called for a panel of professional Texas newspaper editors to review the campus paper's editorial integrity.

Editor Kaye Northcott and her staff held their own, and to their antagonist's embarrassment the Texas newspapermen made it abundantly clear they would have no sympathy with any attempts to censor one of America's best campus dailies. 8

Role Expectations and Behavior

Additional literature of a more scientific nature, representing inquiry conducted by social researchers and communication theorists, indicates that behavior will vary with the role function and with the expectations and role descriptions held by the individual whose behavior is examined and by those who examine his behavior.

Conflicting expectations of behavior may lead to conflict between individuals. Berlo says there is need to clarify role descriptions when expectations clash. He points out that individuals predict the

behavior of others on the basis of expectations. When expectations are in conflict, communication breaks down.

Carter pointed out that expectations in behavior do vary between the student editor, the administration, and the student staff, in some combinations of BEHAVIOR (May-Do and Must-Do), and role (FUNCTION in terms of News, Editorial, or Supervisory). The principal objective of the Carter study was "to determine how university administrators and news staff members of the Daily O'Collegian expected the editor to behave in relation to the editor's expectations concerning his behavior."⁹

Objectives and findings of the Carter study included:

Objective No. 1. The first objective of this study was to determine areas of agreement concerning the editor's expected duties, thus indicating mandatory or Must-Do BEHAVIOR.

In his News FUNCTION, the editor is expected to consult with the faculty adviser on libel, assign reporters to cover off-campus news of special interest to the university community, present all pertinent views on controversial issues, and print names of those charged with criminal acts.

In his Editorial FUNCTION, the editor is expected to confine opinion to the editorial page, edit and print letters to the editor, and interpret campus events through editorials. General approval was indicated for the editor to accept sole responsibility for publication of all editorial and opinion content.

As a Supervisor, the editor is expected to cooperate with the circulation and advertising departments in planning special editions to increase advertising revenue. He is expected to dismiss irresponsible staff members, hold periodic staff meetings, and prevent the staff from using the newspaper for personal publicity. He is expected to approve controversial material before publication and deal directly with newspaper critics.

Objective No. 2. The second objective of this study was to discover areas of agreement concerning unexpected duties for the editor or Can't-Do BEHAVIOR.

In his News FUNCTION, the editor is not expected to prevent bad news about the university from being published.

In his Editorial FUNCTION, the editor is not expected to submit his editorials to the publisher prior to publication.

As a Supervisor, the editor is not expected to determine the number of pages of individual issues of the paper.

Objective No. 3. The third objective was to determine areas of agreement concerning the editor's permitted or May-Do BEHAVIOR.

In his News FUNCTION, the editor may feel free to determine if a topic is suitable for a news story, print in-depth news stories on local social and political issues, and report meetings of any group whose decisions affect the university community. He may refuse to reveal his news sources, print unsolicited business material, or stories previously printed in other newspapers. He may feel free to cut story length when space is limited.

In his Editorial FUNCTION, the editor may feel free to select topics for editorials including promoting students' interests on controversial issues, criticizing administration policies, and endorsing student political candidates. He may write editorials related to off-campus social and political issues. He may feel free to print letters from off-campus.

In his Supervisory FUNCTION, the editor may feel free to extend the deadline for a late news story. He should feel free to appoint students without journalism training to his paid staff and to allow staff members to work for off-campus newspapers. He should feel free to select any syndicated features within his allotted budget. He may become friends with student government leaders. He should feel free to seek out background briefings on any news subject. He may accept or reject advice from the faculty adviser.

Objective No. 4. The fourth objective of this study was to determine areas of disagreement concerning the editor's actual behavior.

Disagreement existed over whether the editor solely should be responsible for News content. Specific items include whether the editor should withdraw news stories when advised to do so by the faculty adviser or publisher. Disagreement existed over whether the editor should feel free to allow obscene language in news stories.

In his Editorial FUNCTION, disagreement existed concerning the editor submitting his editorials to the faculty adviser prior to publication. Whether the editor should feel free to endorse off-campus politicians, allow obscene language, and consider the university's image in editorials were all areas of disagreement.

In his Supervisory FUNCTION, disagreement existed over whether the editor should make up the budget from his allotted funds and whether he alone should appoint his news staff.

In summary, conflicting expectations existed over whether the editor or the faculty adviser and publisher are ultimately responsible for the news content, editorials, budget, and appointment of the staff. In other words, the editor is free to assign news stories on most any subject, but disagreement existed over whether the publisher or faculty adviser may withdraw the story prior to publication. Similarly, the editor should feel free to write editorials on any topic he judges suitable, but disagreement existed over whether they should be approved by the faculty adviser prior to publication. Who is ultimately responsible for planning the news-editorial budget and staff selections were other areas of disagreement.¹⁰

The literature thus far developed by research indicates that variances in role perception and expectation lead to conflict between individuals who have an interest in a common event, activity, or institution.

As the Carter study, after which this study is patterned, was conducted at a large public university, the author believes it important to expand upon Carter's basic concept and apply it to a small, private university. The purpose is to determine whether similarities in role perception and expectation exist between individuals at a state supported university and individuals at a private, church-related university.

FOOTNOTES

¹Constitution of the Committee on Student Publications of Phillips University (March, 1970).

²William E. Porter, "Radicalism and the Young Journalist," Saturday Review (Dec. 11, 1971), p. 65.

³Jeff Greenfield, "College Newspapers in Search of Their Own Voice," Harper's (May, 1966), p. 87.

⁴Ibid., p. 89.

⁵Ibid., p. 90.

⁶Ibid., p. 90.

⁷Ibid., p. 91.

⁸Ibid., p. 92.

⁹Susan Huser Carter, "Perceived Role of the Student Editor of the Daily O'Collegian," (unpub. Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970), p. 81.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 81-84.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

In paralleling the Carter study at Oklahoma State University, this study analyzed the way three groups look at the role of the editor of the Haymaker at Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma. It then compared the reactions and perceptions of individuals at Oklahoma State University to those of individuals at Phillips University to determine what, if any, similarities exist among individuals whose professional and student orientations lie with public education, at OSU, and with private education, at Phillips University.

As with the Carter study, it was expected that each member of the three groups—administrators, editors, and student news staff members—expects the editor to behave in certain ways as he or she goes about the job of editing the campus newspaper. Further, it was expected that the three groups of individuals would have different views and differing sets of expectations of the editor's role in some situations. However, it was also expected that, in some situations, the individuals would reflect a similarity of role expectations.

Methodology

To assure consistency in this study, it was decided to follow Carter's research design and methodology. A 48-item instrument was used to measure the expectations of each individual in the three groups. In

each item, the respondent was asked to indicate his degree of approval of behavior describing some activity or responsibility of the student editor.

Twenty-four of the 48 items were framed around BEHAVIOR of a Must-Do nature and 24 were framed around BEHAVIOR of a May-Do nature. Within each of the two broad BEHAVIOR categories, eight items dealt with the FUNCTION of News, eight with Editorial, and eight with Supervisory responsibilities of the student editor.

As in the Carter study,

... the editor's BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION were two manipulated variables. Members of the three groups whose positions interact with that of editor were regarded as role partners in the editor's SOCIAL SYSTEM. Each person's position in the SOCIAL SYSTEM was the assigned independent variable.¹

An explanation of the variables and definitions follows:

The editor's BEHAVIOR consists of all the activities related to that position and the carrying out of the editor's duties. BEHAVIOR is divided into three categories which are Must-Do, Can't-Do, and May-Do.

According to Carter's definitions, "... the Must-Do responsibilities go with the role of editor and are independent of the person occupying the position of student editor."²

Item No. 1 is framed around a Must-Do concept. It states: "The editor should consult with the faculty adviser on any news story which the editor thinks may be libelous."

Can't-Do responsibilities, or behaviors, also go with the role of editor and are independent of the person who occupies that role. In this research the Can't-Do variable is generated from responses which are recorded on the "highly disapprove" end of the Must-Do statements.

May-Do BEHAVIORS are not dependent upon the role, but are matters of choice by the editor. In these instances he may do as he wishes. For example, Item 38 states: "The editor should feel free to endorse candidates for student political office."

The editor's FUNCTION is a subdivision of areas of responsibility which, according to the Carter study, were identified as News, Editorial, and Supervisory.

In his News FUNCTION the editor's duties are related to factual, straight news reporting. This concept was tested with items such as No. 6 which states: "The editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, etc."

In his Editorial FUNCTION the editor's duties are related to non-news pieces such as editorials, columns, cartoons, letters to the editor, and the like. An example of such a concept in the research instrument is reflected in Item 14: "The editor should edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, conciseness, and accuracy before publication."

In his Supervisory FUNCTION the editor's duties are related to his activities as a manager dealing with supervision of the staff and general management of the publication. An example of such a concept is Item 21: "The editor should hold periodic staff meetings to discuss contents of the paper, receive staff suggestions, and critique the newspaper."

The SOCIAL SYSTEM variable consists of the positions of individuals who are either superordinate or subordinate to the editor or who have held the position of editor. The positions of the SOCIAL SYSTEM used in

both the Carter study and in this study are Administrators, Editors, and Student News Staff members.

Administrators are those persons whose official roles within the university structure place them in a position to exert supervisory control over the editor. An example is the adviser to student publications.

Editors are those students who have held the position of editor of the Haymaker, or who are presently in such a position.

Student News Staff are those individuals who work for the student newspaper and are under the supervision of the editor.

The Research Instrument

As already mentioned, the same testing instrument used in the Carter study was employed in this study. Each item represented a combination of one type of BEHAVIOR in one type of FUNCTION.

Individuals responding to the instrument were asked to indicate their degree of approval of each statement by marking on a bi-polar scale ranging from "highly approve" to "highly disapprove." The scale consisted of seven positions, with "highly approve" scored seven and "highly disapprove" scored one. A sample statement and scoring scale appear below:

The editor should provide a forum on the editorial page for exchange of comment and criticism, even if it is contrary to the newspaper's point of view. Example: Letters to the Editor space.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

The research instrument was sent to twelve administrators, three editors, and thirteen news staff members. The administrators included

the acting president of the university, and all deans and individuals with titles of "director" of the various university administrative departments and agencies. The editors included the present editor and two others who were his immediate predecessors. The news staff members included every student who was a member of the student newspaper staff during the fall semester of 1972. These students had been members of the staff for periods ranging from one semester to five semesters.

All questionnaires were marked according to the social system category of the individual respondent. No further attempt was made to identify specific respondents within each group and none of the instruments was returned with a signature affixed. All individuals contacted responded fully.

As in the Carter study, a factorial analysis of variance was applied to the data to isolate differences and interactions in approval between the previously described variables.

According to Carter:

Variations of the factorial analysis are more appropriate for a design such as this, dealing [as it does] with subjects from distinctly different populations. Such tests isolate and explain more sources of variance.³

The analysis paradigm is shown in Table I. In the actual analysis, each cell in Table I comprised the respondent group's mean approval of the combination of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION.

The mean scores recorded in each of the 18 cells were compared to mean scores obtained in the Carter study and provide the basis for determining (within this study) levels of probability of differences between BEHAVIORS, FUNCTIONS, and SOCIAL SYSTEMS as well as interaction between and among the three main variables. The comparison of this

FOOTNOTES

¹Susan Huser Carter, "Perceived Role of the Student Editor of the Daily O'Collegian," (unpub. Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970), p. 37.

²Ibid., p. 37.

³Ibid., pp. 40-41.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The purpose of this study was two-fold: first, to determine how university administrators and student news staff members of the Phillips University Haymaker expect the student newspaper editor to behave in relation to the editor's expectations concerning his behavior, and second, to compare the attitudes and expectations of responses at Phillips University (a private church-related institution) to attitudes and expectations of their counterparts at Oklahoma State University (a publicly supported institution).

To accomplish this purpose the study was patterned after a master's thesis by Susan Huser Carter in 1970. The data gathered at Phillips University were analyzed to determine expectations and areas of agreement and disagreement within the Phillips University populations sampled. Then similarities and/or differences between respondents in the Phillips study and respondents in Carter's Oklahoma State University study were determined.

The data were gathered by use of a 48-item instrument used both by this author and Carter. Each statement described a hypothetical behavior for the student editor and required that the respondent record his degree of approval of the statement along a seven-point continuum from "highly approve" to "highly disapprove." Each statement concerned one of the levels of each of the two independent variables: BEHAVIOR and

FUNCTION. Levels for BEHAVIOR were Must-Do and May-Do while levels for FUNCTION were News, Editorial, and Supervisory. Twenty-four statements were used in each of the two BEHAVIOR levels. Within each of the two BEHAVIOR levels were three groups of eight statements, each framed around one of the FUNCTION levels. Thus, each statement tested one BEHAVIOR level and one FUNCTION level.

Except for minor changes such as substituting the name Phillips University for Oklahoma State University, or the Haymaker for the Daily O'Collegian, the instrument used in this study was identical to that used by Carter. The changes were made in order that respondents at Phillips University would have a more realistic frame of reference to the student editor's role.

Participants in both studies were selected because their positions within their universities' social systems were directly related to the editor's position. They constituted three distinct groups: administrators, student editors, and student staff members. Administrators were those individuals who held a superordinate position to that of the editor. The editor group included those who had held the position of editor and the individual who held the position at the time the instrument was administered. The student staff members were those students who worked on the student newspaper and who were supervised by the editor.

Scores obtained from the research instrument were subjected to analysis of variance to isolate and identify differences between the levels of the variables and interactions between the variables.

Differences Between Groups

Mean agreement scores for each level of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION by each of the three SOCIAL SYSTEM groups appear in Table II, page 37. For purposes of comparison the table shows both the scores obtained in this study and those obtained in the Carter study.

Results of the analysis of variance test appear in Table III, page 38. This table shows that the probability levels of differences observed between the variables were significant beyond chance expectations. Again, for purposes of comparison the table shows both the scores obtained in this study and those obtained in the Carter study.

Carter discovered significant differences in expectations for the Must-Do and May-Do levels of BEHAVIOR by the three groups in the editor's SOCIAL SYSTEM at Oklahoma State University. The same expectations were found to exist within the populations sampled at Phillips University. As shown in Table III, page 38, the F-ratios for BEHAVIOR levels in both studies (Carter 24.84 and this study 14.84)* were high enough to confirm that the probability of such differences would occur by chance less than one time in 100.

Mean scores for Must-Do and May-Do BEHAVIOR in terms of FUNCTION in both this survey and in the Carter study indicate some meaningful differences in the respondents' perceived expectations of the editor's BEHAVIOR. Those scores for both surveys appear in Table IV, page 39.

*F-ratios in this study consistently emerge as about one-half the ratio in each category of the Carter study. This is because the population sampled in this study was almost exactly one-half the size of the Carter population.

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PARADIGM: MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES* FOR STATEMENTS OF BEHAVIOR
IN FUNCTION AREAS BY SOCIAL SYSTEM GROUPS

	<u>BEHAVIOR</u>						MEANS
	<u>FUNCTION</u>						
	News	Editorial	Supervisory	News	Editorial	Supervisory	
<u>SOCIAL SYSTEM</u>							
Administrators	(5.23) 4.86	(5.13) 4.94	(5.60) 4.98	(5.16) 4.82	(5.12) 4.79	(4.89) 4.97	(5.19) 4.89
Editors	(4.74) 4.41	(4.76) 4.58	(6.31) 6.25	(6.48) 6.58	(6.74) 5.95	(6.31) 6.66	(5.89) 5.74
News Staff	(4.61) 4.61	(4.70) 4.38	(5.60) 5.61	(5.57) 5.66	(5.63) 5.46	(5.72) 5.31	(5.30) 5.17
Means	(4.89) 4.63	(4.89) 4.63	(5.72) 5.61	(5.55) 5.68	(5.61) 5.40	(5.48) 5.65	Grand Mean (5.35) 5.27

* Scores in brackets are from the Carter study. Scores without brackets are from this author's study.

TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-RATIO TABLE*

Source	df	S.S	M.S.	F-Ratio	
Between Behavior (Must-Do and May-Do)	(1) 1	(11.43) 6.53	(11.43) 6.53	(24.84) 14.84	(.01) .01
Between Function (News, Editorial, Supervisory)	(2) 2	(9.47) 5.57	(4.73) 2.76	(10.28) 6.50	(.01) .01
Between Social System (Administrators, Editors, Staff)	(2) 2	(19.57) 10.74	(9.78) 5.37	(21.26) 12.20	(.01) .01
Interaction: Behavior X Function	(2) 2	(15.53) 8.33	(7.76) 4.16	(16.86) 9.68	(.01) .01
Interaction: Behavior X Social System	(2) 2	(26.38) 8.61	(13.19) 4.30	(28.67) 9.77	(.01) .01
Interaction: Function X Social System	(4) 4	(4.26) 3.41	(1.06) .85	(2.30) 1.93	(ns) ns
Interaction: Behavior X Function X Social System	(4) 4	(3.33) 2.05	(.83) .51	(1.80) 1.15	(ns) ns
Within Error Variance	(300) 150	(140.72) 66.32	(.46) .44		

*Scores in brackets are from the Carter study. Scores without brackets are from this author's study.

TABLE IV
MEAN SCORES OF BEHAVIOR AND FUNCTION*

	BEHAVIOR		Means
	Must-Do	May-Do	
News	4.70 (4.89)	5.40 (5.55)	5.05 (5.22)
Editorial	4.65 (4.89)	5.23 (5.61)	4.94 (5.25)
Supervisory	5.42 (5.72)	5.32 (5.48)	5.37 (5.60)
Means	4.92 (5.17)	5.32 (5.54)	5.12 (5.35)

*Scores in brackets are from the Carter study. Scores without brackets are from this author's study.

Moreover, a comparison of mean scores in the Carter study and in this study indicates some significant differences between respondents in the two studies. The respondents at OSU and the respondents at Phillips differed significantly as to degree of agreement in both Must-Do and May-Do expectations. For example, OSU respondents in the Carter study held a mean agreement score of 5.17 for Must-Do BEHAVIOR in all three FUNCTIONS. The Phillips respondents held a mean agreement score of 4.92. In May-Do BEHAVIOR the OSU respondents 5.54, while the Phillips respondents scored 5.32. Thus, while respondents at both universities generally "leaned" in the same direction, they also reflected some variance in the degree to which they agreed with each other.

In testing for differences in expectations for the editor's role in his three types of FUNCTION, both this study and the Carter study revealed F-ratios which were significant at the .01 level. Carter's study showed an F-ratio of 10.28 and this study obtained an F-ratio of 6.50 (see Table III, page 38).

As shown in Table IV, page 39, the FUNCTION levels and their mean scores for this study were News 5.05, Editorial 4.94, and Supervisory 5.37. Carter's mean scores were 5.22 for News, 5.25 for Editorial, and 5.60 for Supervisory.

As in the Carter study, the respondents at Phillips University most highly approved the editor's FUNCTION as a supervisor. Although the Phillips respondents did not approve with as much enthusiasm as did the OSU respondents, indicating a more cautious attitude at Phillips University, the general expectations at both institutions are similar.

For example, Carter found that at OSU the respondents did not significantly distinguish between the editor's News and Editorial FUNCTIONS (mean scores of 5.22 and 5.25). That same trend was apparent in this study. Phillips respondents perceived News and Editorial FUNCTIONS with mean scores of 5.05 for News and 4.94 for Editorial.

The Carter study showed significant interaction among the levels of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION as rated by members of the editor's SOCIAL SYSTEM. This study, again, reflected the same pattern at Phillips University, though not with the same strength in the mean scores. Table III, page 38, shows that the F-ratio for interaction of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION was 16.86 in the Carter study and 9.68 in this study. Both were significant beyond the .01 level. A comparison of the means (Table III) shows that in both studies the higher scores of Supervisory

FUNCTION were the result of interaction with Must-Do BEHAVIOR, which pulled the FUNCTION mean up. Both studies also showed that the May-Do means of News and Editorial FUNCTIONS were higher than the Must-Do means of the same FUNCTIONS.

Therefore, in both studies, the interaction of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION resulted in significant effects on the respondents' degree of approval.

Differences Between SOCIAL SYSTEM Groups and BEHAVIOR

Again, the findings in this study parallel Carter with a significant difference in expectations for the editor's role emerging among the three groups of the editor's SOCIAL SYSTEM. Carter's F-ratio for "Between Social Systems" was 21.26 while the F-ratio in the same category for this study was 12.20. Both are significant at the .01 level and may be seen in Table III, page 38.

Mean approval scores for the three levels of SOCIAL SYSTEM appear in Table V, page 42.

In both studies the Editors assigned greater importance to their function than did either of the other groups. This is reflected in the Editors' means of 5.89 in the OSU study and 5.74 in the PU study, which compare to Administrators' scores of 5.19 (OSU) and 4.90 (PU) and Staff scores of 5.30 (OSU) and 5.18 (PU). Tests between the means in the Phillips study confirmed the significance of the Carter findings. Both studies found that the Editors' mean agreement scores were significantly greater than either of the other two groups. Likewise, there was no

significant difference between the Staff scores and the Administrators' scores in either study.

TABLE V
MEAN SCORES OF FUNCTION AND SOCIAL SYSTEM*

SOCIAL SYSTEM	FUNCTION			
	News	Editorial	Supervisory	Means
Administrators	(5.19) 4.84	(5.12) 4.87	(5.25) 4.98	(5.19) 4.90
Editors	(5.61) 5.50	(5.75) 5.27	(6.31) 6.46	(5.89) 5.74
Staff	(5.09) 5.14	(5.16) 4.92	(5.66) 5.47	(5.30) 5.18
Means	(5.22) 5.05	(5.25) 4.94	(5.60) 5.37	(5.35) 5.12

* Scores in brackets are from the Carter study. Scores without brackets are from this author's study.

The interactive effect of BEHAVIOR and SOCIAL SYSTEM was significant at the .01 level in both studies. However, the Carter F-ratio of 28.67, which was the highest F-ratio obtained in that study, is considerably stronger than the F-ratio of 9.77 obtained in this study. Two other F-ratios obtained in this study are higher than the interaction ratio for BEHAVIOR and SOCIAL SYSTEM.

Mean scores of BEHAVIOR and SOCIAL SYSTEM, Table VI, show that the Administrators approve Must-Do BEHAVIOR more strongly than May-Do, while the Editor and Staff groups approve May-Do BEHAVIOR more strongly than Must-Do. This result is consistent in both studies and indicates that the Editors and Staff members approve the editor's decision-making role more highly than do the Administrators.

TABLE VI
MEAN SCORES OF BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL SYSTEM*

SOCIAL SYSTEM	BEHAVIOR		
	Must-Do	May-Do	Means
Administrators	(5.32)	(5.06)	(5.19)
	4.93	4.86	4.90
Editors	(5.27)	(6.51)	(5.89)
	5.08	6.40	5.74
Staff	(4.97)	(5.64)	(5.30)
	4.87	5.48	5.18
Means	(5.17)	(5.54)	(5.35)
	4.92	5.32	5.12

* Scores in brackets are from the Carter study. Scores without brackets are from this author's study.

An examination of the data on an item-by-item basis for the areas of FUNCTION reveal four additional findings: (1) a consensus on Must-Do

BEHAVIOR, (2) a consensus on Must-Not-Do BEHAVIOR, (3) a consensus on May-Do BEHAVIOR, and (4) the respondents' views on Actual BEHAVIOR,

Consensus: Must-Do BEHAVIOR

Table VII, pages 45 and 46, lists items which are rated 4.0 and higher by the three groups responding. A rating of 4.0 or higher means the respondents placed that BEHAVIOR in the Must-Do category of role expectations.

Some variation in responses was observed between the Carter study and this study. It is in this section of the analysis that those variations can be isolated on an item-by-item basis.

In both studies, Items 1, 2, and 3 were approved by all three groups, indicating that they expected the editor to behave in the direction of the statement. A variation occurred, however, in response to Item 6, which was a consensus response by the individuals in the Carter study but did not achieve consensus status from individuals at Phillips University.

Consensus on Items 1, 2, and 3 indicates that respondents at both Oklahoma State and Phillips expect the editor to consult with the faculty adviser on articles that may be libelous; cover off-campus news of interest to the university community; and present pertinent views on all sides of controversial issues.

Item 6, which states that the editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, and the like, achieved consensus as Must-Do from the Oklahoma State respondents, but failed among respondents at Phillips with both the Administrator and Editor

TABLE VII
 CONSENSUS ON MUST-DO BEHAVIOR FOR EDITOR
 EXPECTED BY SOCIAL SYSTEM*

Item	Description
	<u>News Function</u>
(1)	1. The editor should consult with the faculty adviser on any news story which the editor thinks may be libelous.
(2)	2. The editor should assign a reporter to cover off-campus news of special interest to the university community. Example: Meetings of the state legislature when the budget is set for higher education, Stillwater city commission meetings,
(3)	3. The editor should take special care to be sure that all pertinent views are presented in news stories on controversial issues, particularly in areas where opinions of the general student body are involved. Example: Disruption of library services by black students.
(6)	The editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, etc.
	<u>Editorial Function</u>
(9)	9. The editor should make sure that opinion is confined to the editorial page in opinion columns and editorials.
(10)	10. The editor should provide a forum on the editorial page for exchange of comment and criticism, even if it is contrary to the newspaper's point of view. Example: Letters to the Editor space.
(11)	11. The editor should accept sole responsibility for publication of all editorial and opinion content.
(14)	The editor should edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, conciseness, and accuracy before publication.
(15)	15. The editor should attempt through editorials or opinion columns to interpret campus events for the university community and set them in perspective from all information available to him. Example: Funding for the new parking facility or the Valerie Colvin Physical Education Center or Student Senate action.

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item	Description
<u>Supervisory Function</u>	
(18)	18. The editor should cooperate with the circulation and advertising departments in planning special editions to increase advertising revenue.
(19)	19. The editor should, with board of publications approval, dismiss staff members who, in his opinion, are irresponsible or do unsatisfactory work.
(21)	21. The editor should hold periodic staff meetings to discuss contents of the paper, receive staff suggestions, and critique the newspaper.
(22)	22. The editor should be on hand to approve all articles, letters, or other material proposed for publication which involve public controversy before they are published.
(23)	23. The editor should deal directly with all persons concerning newspaper criticism himself rather than asking the adviser to serve as a "buffer" or mediator.
(24)	24. The editor should make sure members of the news staff do not take advantage of the newspaper for their own personal publicity. Example: Photographs or feature stories about individuals on staff.

* Item numbers in brackets are from the Carter study. Item numbers without brackets are from this author's study.

groups going against it. Only the student Staff at Phillips indicated a Must-Do response on that item. The mean scores were Administrators 3.58, Editors 3.66, and Staff 5.38.

Item 6 is particularly important at Phillips University. Just prior to the survey, the editor of the Haymaker had, in fact, printed the names of four students charged with possession of marijuana. That action brought to public attention the first efforts of a student court at Phillips University to assume jurisdiction in such matters and touched off a controversy that swirled from October, 1972, to April, 1973, on the Phillips campus. The editor of the Haymaker was the only Editor respondent to score Item 6 as Must-Do. The two previous editors scored Item 6 at levels of two and four.

A similar variation occurred in the consensus responses for Must-Do BEHAVIOR in the editor's editorial FUNCTION. The OSU respondents in Carter's study approved Items 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15. Phillips University respondents approved the same items with the exception of Item 14, which failed to achieve consensus when the Administrators and Staff respondents lined up with mean scores of 3.66 and 3.07 against the Editors' mean scores of 4.00. Item 14 stated that the editor should edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, conciseness, and accuracy before publication.

In substantiating findings in the Carter study, the Phillips University respondents paralleled their counterparts at state-owned OSU by indicating approval of separating news from editorial opinion (Item 9), offering space for opposing opinions in the form of letters to the editor (Item 10), requiring the student editor to be responsible for all

editorial and opinion content (Item 11) and using editorials or opinion columns to interpret campus events (Item 13).

The consensus for Must-Do BEHAVIOR in the Supervisory FUNCTION in this study matched exactly the findings in the Carter study. Responding groups in both studies agreed, without exception, in their approval of Items 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 24. This suggests that groups at a private school may agree more readily with groups at a public school over the editor's Supervisory BEHAVIOR than they do over his News and Editorial BEHAVIOR. Another way of putting it is that the groups are more inclined to favor having the editor make administrative decisions than policy decisions.

In approving Supervisory FUNCTIONS the respondents agreed that the editor should cooperate with the circulation and advertising departments in planning special editions to increase advertising revenue (Item 18). They also favor having the editor "police" his staff and dismiss those who do unsatisfactory work (Item 19), and periodically consult with his staff for suggestions and critique purposes (Item 21).

Approval of Supervisory FUNCTIONS also included the editor's being on hand to approve publication of controversial articles (Item 22) and to deal directly with those who criticize the newspaper rather than asking the adviser to serve as a buffer (Item 23).

Finally, all groups agreed that the editor should work to prevent his staff members from using the newspaper for their own personal publicity.

Can't-Do BEHAVIOR

Items which were rated on the disapproval end of the continuum, 1.0 to 3.99, indicate Can't-Do BEHAVIOR. Those items appear in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII*

CONSENSUS ON CAN'T-DO BEHAVIOR EXPECTED TO BE
AVOIDED BY EDITOR BY SOCIAL SYSTEM

Item	Description
<u>News Function</u>	
(5) 5.	When the editor thinks a news story gives the reader a bad image of the university, he should prevent it from being published.
<u>Editorial Function</u>	
(13) 13.	The editor should submit his editorials to the publisher for approval before publication.
14.	The editor should edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, conciseness, and accuracy before publication.
<u>Supervisory Function</u>	
(44)	The editor should feel free to determine the number of pages in each issue of the paper regardless of the amount of advertising sold.

* Item numbers in brackets are from the Carter study. Item numbers without brackets represent responses from this author's study.

In the News FUNCTION category, Item 5 emerged as the single Can't-Do consensus in all three groups at Phillips University as well as the corresponding groups at Oklahoma State University. Disapproval of that item means the editor is expected to print all the news, even that which might embarrass the university.

Two items in this study emerged as Can't-Do BEHAVIOR in the Editorial FUNCTION, and are a deviation from the Carter results. Carter found that Item 13 was the only Editorial FUNCTION on which all respondents indicated disagreement with the statement. This author's study indicated a consensus of disapproval for Item 13, but added Item 14 as well. Disapproval of Item 13 means that the editor is not expected to submit his editorials to the administration for approval prior to publication. Item 14, which was disapproved by the Phillips University respondents, means that the Haymaker editor is not expected to edit letters to the editor prior to publication.

Phillips respondents failed to reach consensus on any Can't-Do BEHAVIOR item in the Supervisory FUNCTION. However, Carter found that her respondents to Item 44 in this category did achieve consensus. Her respondents believed the editor should not feel free to determine the number of pages in each issue, regardless of the amount of advertising sold. Apparently, then, the respondents at Phillips University are not as interested in the fiscal policies of the student newspaper as are the OSU respondents. In fact, the Phillips respondents achieved consensus on Item 44 as May-Do BEHAVIOR. That behavior is discussed in the following section.

Consensus: May-Do BEHAVIOR

Consensus on May-Do BEHAVIOR is obtained when mean scores ranging from 4.0 to 7.0 are observed on identical items by all three groups.

In the first category of News FUNCTION, the consensus in this study again paralleled the Carter study at Oklahoma State University. In both, Items 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, and 32 emerged as consensus items. (See Table IX, pages 52 and 53.)

The consensus on May-Do BEHAVIOR for the Editorial FUNCTION resulted in a minor variation between the two studies. With that exception the respondents in both studies were consistent in their support of Editorial FUNCTIONS. Agreement among all groups was achieved in Items 33, 34, 35, 37, and 40.

The one exception to editorial privilege came from Staff respondents at Phillips University, whose mean score of 3.07 on Item 38 did not achieve consensus status as defined in this study. That statement deals with the editor's right to endorse candidates for student political office, a practice that the Phillips University Staff would not support. This author can only surmise that the reason for such a response is that Phillips is relatively small, and personal friendships cross many lines within the close-knit student body. The Staff may have been somewhat hesitant to identify with a student newspaper that would endorse, or more likely fail to endorse, their friends who were running for office. Too, a minor incident surfaced during the all-school elections for student body president last year when the editor of the Haymaker did endorse a slate of candidates in an editorial that appeared a few days before the election. Several students, including one candidate who was

TABLE IX*
 CONSENSUS ON MAY-DO BEHAVIOR FOR EDITOR
 EXPECTED BY SOCIAL SYSTEM

Item	Description
<u>News Function</u>	
(25) 25.	The editor should feel free to refuse to reveal his sources for a news story.
(26) 26.	The editor should feel free to assign reporters to write in-depth, interpretative news stories on social and political issues on campus such as drugs, the pill, racial problems, etc.
(27) 27.	The editor should feel free to report meetings of any group whose decisions would affect members of the university community.
(29) 29.	The editor should feel free to determine whether a particular topic is suitable for a news story.
(30) 30.	The editor should feel free to determine whether to print unsolicited material which is not carried as paid advertising. Example: Local business announcements.
(31) 31.	When a news story has previously been printed in the local community newspaper or other state paper, the editor should feel free to refuse to publish it in the student newspaper.
(32) 32.	When space is limited, the editor should feel free to cut the length of a major sports story in order to print news about intellectual activities such as conferences on drugs or sex education.
<u>Editorial Function</u>	
(33) 33.	The editor should feel free to print letters to the editor from persons outside the university community.
(34) 34.	The editor should feel free to criticize present administration policies or policy changes in editorials, but he is obligated to base his criticism on complete and accurate information available to him.
(35) 35.	The editor should feel free to use his own judgment in selecting topics for editorials.

TABLE IX (Continued)

Item	Description
(37)	37. The editor should feel free to write editorials promoting students' interests on controversial issues. Example: Tuition increase or dormitory closing hours.
(38)	The editor should feel free to endorse candidates for student political offices.
(40)	40. The editor should feel free to write editorials related to the city, state, or national social and political problems when they affect members of the university community. Example: Military draft lottery, voting age, open housing.
<u>Supervisory Function</u>	
(41)	41. The editor should feel free to appoint students without journalism training to his paid staff.
(42)	42. The editor should feel free to select and order any syndicated features he desires, such as cartoons or columns, within his allotted budget.
(43)	43. The editor should feel free to become friends with student government leaders, but he should be strictly objective in reporting their activities.
	44. The editor should feel free to determine the number of pages in each issue of the paper regardless of the amount of advertising sold.
(45)	45. The editor should feel free to aggressively seek out background briefings or off-the-record information on any subject from any news source in the university community. This information would not be for publication but would enable the editor to better understand the situation.
(46)	46. The editor should feel free to allow a member of the news staff to accept employment as campus reporter for a state newspaper.
(47)	The editor should feel free to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser.
(48)	48. The editor should feel free to extend the deadline in order to include a late-breaking news event.

* Item numbers in brackets are from the Carter study. Item numbers outside of brackets are from this author's study.

not endorsed, wrote letters to the editor in which they complained that such endorsement was not a fair use of the editorial power of the student newspaper. Those responses may reflect an earlier finding in both this and the Carter study that many individuals are not able to separate an editorial from a news story.

On the other hand, many respondents may have felt that a newspaper supported by student-fee assessments differs basically from a commercial newspaper in which subscribers may withdraw their support by cancelling their subscriptions. There is no "cancellation" in a student-fee supported newspaper. Thus, some publication boards argue that editorial support should not be given to any political candidate.

Approval of May-Do BEHAVIOR for the FUNCTION of Supervisory responsibilities resulted in yet another variation in the two studies. Respondents in both studies were consistent in their approval of six items, Nos. 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, and 48. Phillips respondents, however, added their approval to Item 44 and disapproved Item 47, which was approved by the OSU groups.

Consensus reached by both studies points out the common belief that the editor should have freedom to appoint whomever he wishes to work on his staff (Item 41) and may become friends with student government leaders so long as he remains objective in reporting their activities (Item 43).

The financial responsibilities which achieved consensus included the editor's right to buy whatever syndicated material he wants so long as he stays within his budget (Item 42), the freedom to allow a member of his staff to accept outside employment from a state newspaper (Item 46), and the freedom to extend his deadlines for late-breaking news

(Item 48). Such an extension might result in overtime costs or extra expenses in obtaining the story.

Further support of the editor's freedom to make decisions outside strict financial boundaries come from the Phillips consensus on Item 44, i.e., power to determine the number of pages in each issue without regard to advertising volume. This is, in fact, a prerogative exercised occasionally by the editor of the Haymaker who, when he believes it necessary, will add additional pages to have enough space for stories he believes are important. However, it also is the policy of the Haymaker not to have a deficit at the end of the year. Thus, the editor will have an occasional issue that loses money but will make it up with a later issue that carries an exceptionally high percentage of advertising.

Another variation between the two studies appears in the responses to Item 47. The three groups in the Carter study reached consensus on Item 47, agreeing that the editor should feel free to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser. At Phillips, the Administrator group disagreed (mean score 3.08). Both the Editor and Staff groups at Phillips indicated their approval with mean scores of 7.00 and 5.45, respectively.

These differences indicate to this author a problem area, especially between the editors and the administration.

Respondents' Views on Actual BEHAVIOR

A principal objective of both this study and the Carter study was to locate and identify potential areas of conflict among the SOCIAL SYSTEM groups. This was accomplished by examining each group's mean

scores and locating items to which one or two groups agreed while one or two groups disagreed. (See Table X, pages 57 and 58.)

The similarity of groups responding to the two surveys is again apparent with the three groups in the Oklahoma State study matching up exactly with the three groups in the Phillips study, except for three items (one in each FUNCTION) which appear to be additional areas of conflict at Phillips University.

In the News FUNCTION, areas of disagreement which were consistent in both studies included Items 4, 7, 8, and 28. However, an examination of the mean scores of each item by the responding groups indicates that the corresponding groups from each school did not always line up the same way.

For instance, in Item 4 (The editor should be solely responsible for publication of all news content.), the Administrators and Editors in both studies were consistent. Administrators disagreed and Editors agreed. The principal variance between respondents on this item occurred with the two student Staffs. The OSU staff agreed (4.36), while the PU staff disagreed (3.76).

Item 8 reflects the same group alignments. The two groups of Administrators agreed with the statement, "The editor should withdraw news stories from the paper if the faculty adviser advises him to do so." The two groups of Editors disagreed. Again, it was the two groups of student Staff members who went in opposite directions. The OSU staffers lined up with their editor (3.54) and the Phillips staffers lined up with their administration (4.15).

Another conflict which emerged in the News FUNCTION responses at Phillips University involved Item 6, which states that the editor should

TABLE X
ACTUAL BEHAVIOR BY THE EDITOR EXPECTED TO CAUSE CONFLICT

Item	Description	Mean Scores			
		A	E	S	
<u>News Function</u>					
4.	The editor should be solely responsible for publication of all news content.	3.54 3.09	4.77 6.33	4.36 3.76	(OSU) (PU)
6.	The editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, etc.	3.58	3.66	5.38	(PU)
7.	The editor should withdraw news stories from the paper before publication if the publisher advises him to do so.	5.63 5.25	3.22 1.33	3.27 2.23	(OSU) (PU)
8.	The editor should withdraw news stories from the paper before publication if the faculty adviser advises him to do so.	5.40 5.08	3.00 2.00	3.54 4.15	(OSU) (PU)
28.	The editor should feel free to use his own judgment on whether to allow obscene language in news and feature stories.	2.90 2.75	5.55 6.33	4.68 5.15	(OSU) (PU)
<u>Editorial Function</u>					
12.	The editor should submit his editorials to the faculty adviser for approval before publication.	4.09 4.25	1.88 1.00	2.40 1.84	(OSU) (PU)
16.	Since the student newspaper has an off-campus public, the editor should keep in mind the impression of the university he is creating when writing editorials.	4.40 6.58	2.94 2.66	4.81 4.23	(OSU) (PU)
36.	The editor should use his own judgment on whether to allow obscene language in editorials and opinion columns.	3.09 2.91	6.11 7.00	5.40 5.61	(OSU) (PU)

TABLE X (Continued)

Item	Description	Mean Scores			
		A	E	S	
38.	The editor should feel free to endorse candidates for student political offices.	4.08	4.00	3.07	(PU)
39.	The editor should feel free to endorse city, state, or national political candidates.	3.40 3.66	6.33 4.00	3.86 4.15	(OSU) (PU)
<u>Supervisory Function</u>					
17.	The editor, alone, should make up the budget setting salaries for staff, money for photographs, syndicated columns, and other expenses within his allotted funds.	3.36 2.41	5.77 4.66	4.63 3.76	(OSU) (PU)
20.	The editor, alone, should determine his news organization and appoint all members of the news staff.	3.86 3.16	6.44 6.00	4.90 4.30	(OSU) (PU)
47.	The editor should feel free to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser.	3.08	7.00	5.46	(PU)

print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, and the like. The Phillips Administrators and Editors disagreed with the statement (Administrators 3.58 and Editors 3.66) while the student Staff members were strong (5.38) in their desire to see the names published.

In the Editorial FUNCTION, areas of disagreement which were consistent in both studies included Items 12, 16, 36, and 39. An additional item of conflict emerged in the Phillips study regarding the editor's endorsement of candidates for student political office.

In Items 12, 16, and 36 the respondent groups in both studies were consistent with their counterparts. That is, the Administrator groups agreed with each other, the Editor groups agreed with each other and the Staff groups agreed with each other. The mean scores of each group, while they lean in the same direction, reflect considerable variance. The public university's administration appears to be more tolerant of the editor's judgment than does the administration of the private university. Likewise, the public editors are less extreme in most responses than their counterparts at the private school. The two student Staff groups appear to be, on the whole, about the same.

Item 39, which reflected an area of conflict in both studies, revealed a shift in alignment between the groups at the two schools. The Administration and Staff at Oklahoma State University lined up against the editor's freedom to endorse city, state, or national political candidates. At Phillips University, only the Administration was against such endorsement.

Item 38, dealing with the editor's endorsement of candidates for student political office, was not used in the OSU study. On this item, the Phillips University Administration and Editor groups were in agreement (4.08 and 4.00), indicating their willingness to let the editor endorse student candidates. The Staff mean score of 3.07 put that group in opposition to their superordinate groups.

Areas of disagreement in the Supervisory FUNCTION included Items 17 and 20, which appeared in both studies. A third conflict appeared in the Phillips University study with Item 47.

In Item 17, which would allow the editor to establish his own expenditures within his budget, the two Administrative groups disagreed while the two Editor groups agreed. Again a difference in group alignment emerged with the two Staff groups. The OSU Staff respondents lined up with their Editor group while those at Phillips University agreed with their Administrative group.

In Item 20, allowing the editor to determine his news organization and appoint all members of the news staff, the responding groups in the two studies paralleled each other very closely, with the Administrator groups going against this stance and the Editor and Staff groups favoring it.

The additional area of conflict within the Phillips University study was on Item 47, which would allow the editor the freedom to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser. On this issue the Phillips University Administrators and Editors are widely separated, with the Administrators disagreeing (3.08) and the Editors agreeing (7.00). The Staff was heavily weighted in the same direction as the Editor group with a mean score of 5.46.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the author's findings at Phillips University, and has compared these findings with those of a similar study conducted in 1970 by Susan Huser Carter at Oklahoma State University.

In both studies respondents from three groups of SOCIAL SYSTEMS were given a survey instrument consisting of 48 descriptions of the student newspaper editor's behavior and were asked to mark their degree of approval or disapproval on a seven-point continuum for each statement. The instrument was designed to test two active independent variables: BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION. BEHAVIOR was divided into Must-Do and May-Do categories (from which two additional behaviors, Can't-Do and Actual, were inferred). FUNCTION was divided into three areas of News, Editorial, and Supervisory. Each item contained one level of behavior and one level of function. Levels of the SOCIAL SYSTEM were the university Administrators, who hold a superordinate position to that of the editor; the student newspaper Editors (past and present); and the student newspaper Staff members at the time the survey was administered.

A principal purpose of the study was to compare the role perceptions of individuals at Phillips University, a small, private church-related liberal arts institution, with those of a large, public-supported university such as Oklahoma State University.

The author anticipated that the three groups at Phillips University would respond in a more "liberal" manner to the role descriptions of the editor than did the respondents at Oklahoma State University. The findings, however, do not completely support this anticipation; they

strongly suggest that there are few major differences between the perceptions of individuals in the private institution and those in the public institution.

Generally, the findings in this study confirm the findings in the Carter study. The Editor and Administrator respondents at Phillips University emerged as more polarized on many items than their counterparts at Oklahoma State University, but the two groups of student Staff members were, in general, very similar.

This would suggest that, while the Administrators at Oklahoma State University "lean" in the same direction, they do so with differing degrees of enthusiasm. The Phillips University Administrators are more firm in most instances than their counterparts at Oklahoma State University. Likewise, the two groups of student Editors "lean" in the same direction, but the Phillips University editors are more firm in the degree of their support or non-support of a specific position.

The result is that the Phillips University Administrators and Editors are farther apart in their perceptions of the editor's role than are the Oklahoma State University Administrators and Editors. A difference between the views of Administrators and Editors also was evident in a few items for which data were collected solely at Phillips University.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study paralleled a similar study by Susan Huser Carter at Oklahoma State University in 1970. It was conducted in an attempt to isolate, identify, and compare role expectations of three groups at Phillips University toward the student editor of the Haymaker and to examine those role expectations in relation to the expectations found in Carter's study of similar groups at OSU. It was assumed that this author's findings would either substantiate or refute the findings in the Carter study by pointing out similarities or differences between the responding groups at the two institutions. It was also assumed that if this study substantiated the Carter findings, the results of both studies might make a more positive contribution to the understanding and agreement of the student newspaper editor's role in a university community, whether that university be a private, church-related liberal arts institution such as Phillips University, or a publicly supported, multi-faceted university such as Oklahoma State University.

The research objectives at Phillips were sub-divided into four areas of interest. They were:

- 1) To determine areas of agreement concerning the editor's expected duties which would indicate Must-Do BEHAVIOR.
- 2) To discover areas of agreement concerning unexpected duties for the editor which would indicate Can't-Do BEHAVIOR.

- 3) To determine areas of agreement concerning the editor's permitted duties which would indicate May-Do BEHAVIOR.
- 4) To determine areas of disagreement concerning the editor's actual behavior which would point to potential areas of conflict between the groups within the SOCIAL SYSTEM.

In both studies the participants were members of the student editor's SOCIAL SYSTEM and consisted of university Administrators, the Editors themselves, past and present, and the Staff members who were on the student newspaper at the time the survey was taken.

The survey instrument consisted of 48 items describing various hypothetical behavior positions of the editor. BEHAVIOR, then, was a variable which was sub-divided into two levels, Must-Do and May-Do. Another variable, FUNCTION, was added to test the respondents' reactions to the editor's BEHAVIOR in terms of the editor's role in making decisions involving News, Editorial, and staff Supervisory matters. Each item tested one level of BEHAVIOR and one level of FUNCTION.

Twenty-eight of these research instruments were sent to the three SOCIAL SYSTEM groups at Phillips University (compared to 53 in the Carter study), with 12 going to the university Administrator group, three going to the Editor group, and 13 going to the student Staff group. All were completed and returned.

It should be noted that the sample size in this study was barely more than half the size of the Carter sample. This was due to the smaller size of the Phillips University population, which would have to be multiplied some 15 times to equal the size of the Oklahoma State University population. Attention also should be directed to the small size of the Editor group at Phillips (3), compared to that at OSU (9).

This was because there have been only three student editors of the Haymaker during the past six years. In each case the editor has held office for two consecutive years.

Differences in Perceived Editor's Role

Both Carter and this author found that the mean approval of various editor BEHAVIORS depended on the particular SOCIAL SYSTEM group responding.

Mean scores of BEHAVIOR and FUNCTION for the three groups surveyed appear in Table IV, page 39. These data show that the groups combined to give greater support to the editor's May-Do BEHAVIOR than to his Must-Do BEHAVIOR. This confirmation went beyond the limits of Carter's respondents by mean scores of 4.92 (PU Must-Do) to 5.17 (OSU Must-Do) and 5.32 (PU May-Do) and 5.54 (OSU May-Do). In both studies the probability of a difference this large occurring by chance was beyond the .01 level.

Both studies also confirmed that the mean approval of Supervisory FUNCTION was significantly greater than the mean approval of News and/or Editorial FUNCTIONS when the groups were responding in terms of Must-Do BEHAVIOR only.

Mean scores of FUNCTION and SOCIAL SYSTEM appear in Table V, page 42, and indicate that the three groups at Phillips also varied in their perceptions of the editor's FUNCTION, with the greatest variance occurring between Administrators (4.90) and Editors (5.74). This is a greater variance than occurred in the Carter study, where the Administrator mean was 5.19 and the Editor mean was 5.89.

Mean scores of BEHAVIOR by SOCIAL SYSTEM appear in Table VI, page 43, and show that there is the same variance in the two studies between BEHAVIOR and between FUNCTION.

● Specific similarities as well as differences in the perceptions and expectations of the groups in both studies are most easily seen in the three Consensus tables and the Actual Behavior table. They are Tables VII, pages 45 and 46; VIII, page 49; IX, pages 52 and 53; and X, pages 57 and 58. Each table shows consensus reached in both this study and the Carter study in an item-by-item listing.

The consensus on Must-Do BEHAVIOR among Phillips University groups matched the Carter findings with only two exceptions. Those exceptions were on Items 6 and 14 which appeared in the Carter study but not in this study. Responses to those items suggest that the editor at Phillips University is not expected to print names of students charged with criminal acts, nor should he edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, and accuracy before publication.

Areas where the Phillips and Oklahoma State University groups agreed with each other included the editor's News FUNCTION. Responses favored the editor's consulting with the faculty adviser on stories which he thinks may be libelous, covering off-campus news events of interest to the university community, and presenting all sides of controversial issues.

Editorially, according to test groups at both schools, the editor should make sure that opinion is confined to the editorial page or in opinion columns, give opportunity for other opinions to be expressed in letters to the editor, use his editorial and opinion materials to

interpret campus events and give them perspective, and be responsible for publication of all editorial content.

In terms of Supervision, student editors at both schools are expected to be fiscally responsible and work in harmony with the circulation and advertising departments in planning special editions, reprimand by dismissal, if necessary those staff members who do not perform satisfactorily, hold periodic staff meetings, be available to handle criticism of the paper personally instead of using the faculty adviser as a "buffer," and make sure staff members do not take advantage of the newspaper for their own personal publicity.

The consensus on Can't-Do BEHAVIOR among Phillips groups matched the Carter findings with two exceptions. In this instance the Phillips respondents added Item 14 to the Can't-Do listings, and failed to support the OSU groups' consensus on Item 44. Item 14 means that the Phillips groups do not expect the editor to edit letters published for style, brevity, and accuracy. In failing to reach Can't-Do consensus on Item 44, the Phillips respondents shifted that item to May-Do consensus. Item 44 gives the editor freedom to determine the number of pages in each issue regardless of the amount of advertising sold.

Areas of Can't-Do consensus where both the Phillips and Oklahoma State respondents agreed were in their belief that the editor should not block a news story even if it might give the university a bad image and that the editor should not submit his editorials to the publisher before they are printed.

The consensus on May-Do BEHAVIOR among Phillips groups paralleled the Carter study with three exceptions. The first was Item 38, which would allow the editor to endorse political candidates for student office.

The Phillips groups did not include this as a May-Do item, but the OSU groups did. The second exception was Item 44, which allows the editor to determine the number of pages in each issue regardless of the amount of advertising sold. Phillips University respondents included this as a May-Do item, but the OSU groups did not. The third exception was Item 47, which would allow the editor to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser. That item was included as a May-Do BEHAVIOR by the Oklahoma State University groups but not by the Phillips University groups.

Areas of May-Do consensus where both the Phillips University respondents and the Oklahoma State University respondents agreed with each other were in the expectation that the editor may feel free to protect the source of his news, cover news events dealing with important social and political issues on campus, report on the meetings of university groups, and refuse to print stories that have already appeared in the community newspaper.

Other areas of May-Do consensus included the expectations that the editor may feel free to print letters to the editor from persons outside the university community, criticize the university administration so long as that criticism is based on accurate information, and select and write editorials related to city, state, national, or international issues that are of interest to the campus community.

The final area of May-Do consensus between the groups in both studies included the expectations that the editor may feel free to supervise his staff, including hiring, selection of syndicated materials within the limits of his budget, and obtaining information of a "background" nature that might not be expected to appear in print.

The fourth area, role behaviors which are expected to cause conflict between one or more of the SOCIAL SYSTEM groups, showed that the areas of conflict at Phillips University are more numerous than the areas of conflict at Oklahoma State University. The Carter study at OSU identified ten specific items of conflict. This study showed the same ten items as conflict areas at Phillips University, plus three additional conflict items not found at OSU. The additional areas of conflict at Phillips University include one item in each of the News, Editorial, and Supervisory FUNCTIONS.

The added conflict under News FUNCTION was Item 6, which states that the editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts. At Phillips University the Administration and the Editor groups disagreed (3.58 and 3.66) with the student Staff (5.38).

The added conflict under Editorial FUNCTION was Item 38, which states that the editor should feel free to endorse candidates for student political offices. Again, the Administration and the Editor groups were in agreement (4.08 and 4.00), while the student Staff disagreed (3.07).

The added conflict under Supervisory FUNCTION was Item 47, which states that the editor should feel free to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser. This time the Administration disagreed (3.08) while the Editors and Staff groups agreed (7.00 and 5.46).

News function behavior which was expected to cause conflict at both institutions included the editor's being solely responsible for the news content of the paper, withdrawing stories if told to do so by the

publisher or adviser, and the using his own judgment on whether to allow obscene language in news and feature stories.

Editorial function behavior which was expected to cause conflict at both institutions included the editor's having to submit his editorials to the faculty adviser for approval, holding back on news articles which might cause the off-campus public to have a bad image of the university, and endorsing city, state, or national political candidates.

Supervisory function behavior which was expected to cause conflict at both institutions included the editor's having sole authority to make up his salary budget, control expenditures for syndicated materials, and appoint the news staff.

Conclusions

This author can only conclude, as did Carter, that significant differences do exist between groups within the university community concerning the role of the editor of the student newspaper, and that such differences offer the opportunity for conflict to arise between groups and/or individuals.

However, the present study also confirms that there are areas of significant agreement between the groups and individuals. Those differences and agreements have been presented in preceding chapters and sections of this document.

In addition, this study reveals that, insofar as the student editor is concerned, certain groups at institutions of higher learning differing in organization and philosophy are in many ways similar in their perceived expectations of the editor's behavior. The areas of disagreement between corresponding groups at the two institutions were not found

to be severe in this study. This would indicate, then, that there is greater similarity than differences between the role perceptions of individuals at the two types of schools. In other words, such philosophical and organizational differences do not extend significantly to the role perceptions of individuals within those institutions.

Recommendations

Many of the problems revealed in this study center around the perception of individuals in terms of their position within the SOCIAL SYSTEM (which is, in reality, a type of structure or organization). Thus, one alternative is to retain the existing structure of the system and to develop a policy of behavioral guidelines for the Haymaker editor. A second alternative is to restructure the social system by taking the student editor and staff out of the administrators' social system and establishing the student newspaper as a separate entity.

If the first alternative were to be followed, the student newspaper would remain economically tied to the university and dependent upon the university for its survival. The establishment of guidelines for the editor's behavior in certain situations would enable the groups within the SOCIAL SYSTEM to know in advance what is expected of the editor. Thus, the editor would know when he is in danger of creating conflict between himself and one of the other groups; and if he proceeded with behavior known to cause conflict he would do so at his own risk. The guidelines would, of course, be subject to periodic review by all parties concerned.

If the second alternative were to be followed, and many universities are moving in this direction, as was explained in the opening

chapters of this thesis, the student newspaper would be separated financially from the university and would be structured along the lines of a professional newspaper. Such a move at Phillips University, at present, is not a viable one. The Haymaker could not survive on the advertising revenue it now receives. Advertising presently accounts for some 60 per cent of the operating budget. The remainder comes from student fees, which are turned over by the administration to the student senate and allocated by that body to numerous campus organizations, including the student publications.

However, advertising revenue continues to increase each year and this author believes that within a few years the Haymaker could become self-supporting.

Within the framework of either alternative given above, another recommendation is in order. Lack of understanding between individuals can contribute to conflict. This author does not presume to believe that understanding always leads to agreement. In fact, individuals may understand each other's position on an issue and still disagree. However, the important thing is to keep disagreement from becoming conflict. To accomplish this, it is recommended that the administration and the editor make every effort to be open and candid with each other. This could be accomplished through regular exchanges of information that would go beyond the surface "announcements" of what has happened or is going to happen.

Finally, this author recommends to any who might find themselves in one of the SOCIAL SYSTEM groups identified in this study, that they encourage a study of this kind on the groups at their college or

university. Insight into potential areas of conflict might prevent that conflict, and lead to better understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1960.
- Carter, Susan Huser. "Perceived Role of the Student Editor of the Daily O'Collegian." (Unpub. Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)
- "Constitution of Committee on Student Publications," Phillips University, March, 1970.
- Ebert, Teresa L. "More Papers Cutting Ties with Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education (November 6, 1972).
- Folson, Robert. "How Free Is College Journalism?" New Republic (April 2, 1956).
- Greenfield, Jeff. "College Newspapers in Search of Their Own Voice." Harper's (May, 1966).
- Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B., and Michael Y. Nunnery. Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections. Berkley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1971.
- Porter, William E. "Radicalism and the Young Journalist." Saturday Review (December 11, 1971).
- Small, William J. Political Power and the Press. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1972.
- Sorensen, Parry D. "One Way to Get Rid of Racy College Papers." The National Observer (January 13, 1973).

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Mass Communication
 PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY
 Enid, Oklahoma
 November, 1972

Dear

You have been selected as one of several key people in the Phillips University community to participate in a study of role perception of the position of editor of the Haymaker.

Your cooperation in this study is very important as I am trying to find out what people, like you, think the editor should and should not do as well as what the editor may do if he chooses.

The attached questionnaire will require only a short time to complete. Because the number of people selected is small, your help is quite important.

The following pages contain a number of statements which one could approve or disapprove. A seven-point scale beneath each statement allows you to record how much you approve or disapprove each statement.

The sample scale below indicates approximately what the different scale positions are supposed to represent. It should be used as a guide in marking your responses.

Very						Very
Highly	Highly	Slightly		Slightly	Highly	Highly
<u>Approve</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>

On the scale following each statement on these pages, please place an "X" at the position that comes closest to matching your feeling about the statement. For example the statement might read:

The editor should feel free to print names of students in news stories who are on probation or expelled.

If you only slightly approve of this statement, you would place an "X" in the third blank as follows:

Highly						Highly
Approve	_____	_____	X	_____	_____	Disapprove

All items are based on statements that people across the country have made concerning editors of campus newspapers. Statements which include the phrase, "the editor should," are not to be interpreted as being advocated by me. This phrase indicates the editor should perform this way every time.

It is not necessary for you to sign your name. The word administrator, staff or editor written in the upper righthand corner indicates your relationship with the position of editor.

Remember that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers to any of the statements; it all depends on your own viewpoint. Please mark every statement, but every statement should have only one mark.

I will be very grateful if you take the time to fill out the questionnaire as instructed and return it to me as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Prof. Lynn Smith

1. The editor should consult with the faculty adviser on any news story which the editor thinks may be libelous.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

2. The editor should assign a reporter to cover off-campus news of special interest to the university community.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

3. The editor should take special care to be sure that all pertinent views are presented in news stories on controversial issues, particularly in areas where opinion of the general student body are involved. Example: Disruption of library services by black students.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

4. The editor should be solely responsible for publication of all news content.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

5. When the editor thinks a news story gives the reader a bad image of the university, he should prevent it from being published.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

6. The editor should print names and stories concerning members of the university community who are charged with criminal acts such as theft, possession of drugs, etc.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

7. The editor should withdraw news stories from the paper before publication if the university president advises him to do so,

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

8. The editor should withdraw news stories from the paper before publication if the faculty adviser advises him to do so.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

9. The editor should make sure that opinion is confined to the editorial page in opinion columns and editorials.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

10. The editor should provide a forum on the editorial page for exchange of comment and criticism, even if it is contrary to the newspaper's point of view. Example: Letters to the Editor space.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

11. The editor should accept sole responsibility for publication of all editorial and opinion content.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

12. The editor should submit his editorials to the faculty adviser for approval before publication.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

13. The editor should submit his editorials to the university president for approval before publication.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

14. The editor should edit any letter to the editor for style, brevity, conciseness and accuracy before publication.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

15. The editor should attempt through editorials or opinion columns to interpret campus events for the university community and set it in perspective from all information available to him. Example: Student Senate action, University Senate action, funding of the new student center or budget allocations of university funds.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

16. Since the Haymaker has an off-campus public, the editor should keep in mind the impression of the university he is creating when writing editorials.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

17. The editor, alone, should make up the budget setting salaries for staff, money for photography, syndicated columns and other expenses within his allotted funds.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

18. The editor should cooperate with the circulation and advertising departments in planning special editions to increase advertising revenue.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

19. The editor should, with publications committee approval, dismiss staff members who, in his opinion, are irresponsible or do unsatisfactory work.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

20. The editor, alone, should determine his news organization and appoint all members of the news staff.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

21. The editor should hold periodic staff meetings to discuss contents of the paper, receive staff suggestions and critique the newspaper.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

22. The editor should be on hand to approve all articles, letters or other material proposed for publication which involve public controversy before they are published.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

23. The editor should deal directly with all persons concerning newspaper criticism himself rather than asking the faculty adviser to serve as a "buffer" or mediator.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

24. The editor should make sure members of the news staff do not take advantage of the newspaper for their own personal publicity. Example: photographs or feature stories about individuals on staff.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

25. The editor should feel free to refuse to reveal his sources for a news story.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

26. The editor should feel free to assign reporters to write in-depth, interpretative news stories on social and political issues on campus such as drugs, the pill, racial problems, etc.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

27. The editor should feel free to report meetings of any group whose decisions would affect members of the university community.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

28. The editor should feel free to use his own judgement on whether to allow obscene language in news and feature stories.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

29. The editor should feel free to determine whether a particular topic is suitable for a news story.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

30. The editor should feel free to determine whether to print unsolicited material which is not carried as paid advertising. Example: local business announcements.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

31. When a news story has previously been printed in the Enid News & Eagle or other state paper, the editor should feel free to refuse to publish it in the Haymaker.

32. When space is limited, the editor should feel free to cut the length of a major sports story in order to print news about intellectual activities such as conferences on drugs or sex education.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

33. The editor should feel free to print letters to the editor from persons outside the university community.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

34. The editor should feel free to criticize present administration policies or policy changes in editorials, but he is obligated to base his criticism on complete and accurate information available to him.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

35. The editor should feel free to use his own judgement in selecting topics for editorials.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

36. The editor should use his own judgement in whether to allow obscene language in editorials and opinion columns.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

37. The editor should feel free to write editorials promoting students' interests on controversial issues. Example: tuition increase or dormitory closing hours.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

38. The editor should feel free to endorse candidates for student political offices.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

39. The editor should feel free to endorse Enid, state or national political candidates.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

40. The editor should feel free to write editorials related to Enid, state or national social and political problems when they affect members of the university community. Example: amnesty for draft dodgers, open housing, welfare programs.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

41. The editor should feel free to appoint students without journalism training to his paid staff.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

42. The editor should feel free to select and order any syndicated features he desires, such as cartoons or columns, within his allotted budget.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

43. The editor should feel free to become friends with student government leaders, but he should be strictly objective in reporting their activities.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

44. The editor should feel free to determine the number of pages in each issue of the paper regardless of the amount of advertising sold.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

45. The editor should feel free to aggressively seek out background briefings or off-the-record information on any subject from any news source in the university community. This information would not be for publication but would enable the editor to better understand the situation.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

46. The editor should feel free to allow a member of the news staff to accept employment as campus reporter for a state newspaper.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

47. The editor should feel free to accept or reject advice offered by the faculty adviser.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

48. The editor should feel free to extend the deadline in order to include a late-breaking news event.

highly approve _____ highly disapprove

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS' SCORES ON QUESTIONNAIRE

ADMINISTRATORS' SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MUST-DO BEHAVIOR
IN NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Participants	1	7	4	5	5	5	3	6	5	5	6	6	4	5	5	6	6	2	2	5	5	6	6	6	5
	2	7	7	6	5	5	4	3	5	7	7	7	3	1	3	6	7	1	6	6	2	7	6	6	6
	3	5	6	6	6	3	3	5	6	7	7	6	5	3	5	6	7	6	6	6	3	5	7	6	6
	4	7	5	7	1	4	1	4	6	5	6	1	7	4	1	6	7	1	7	7	1	7	4	1	7
	5	7	6	6	1	7	4	7	7	7	7	3	6	3	1	6	6	1	7	7	1	7	7	1	7
	6	7	7	7	2	3	6	7	7	6	7	6	6	4	6	7	7	1	4	6	2	6	7	7	7
	7	7	2	7	2	5	2	7	7	6	7	2	6	6	1	2	7	1	7	5	5	7	7	2	7
	8	7	7	7	3	2	3	4	1	7	7	7	1	1	7	6	6	1	7	7	1	7	4	7	6
	9	7	7	6	4	7	4	4	4	7	7	5	7	1	1	5	7	7	7	7	5	7	7	4	4
	10	7	4	6	2	3	5	7	4	7	6	2	2	2	2	5	7	2	4	6	3	5	7	2	6
	11	7	5	5	1	1	4	7	7	5	7	1	1	1	7	6	6	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	12	6	5	6	5	2	4	2	2	6	6	5	3	2	5	5	6	2	3	3	4	6	6	5	5

EDITORS' SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MUST-DO BEHAVIOR IN
NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Participants 13	6	7	7	7	1	2	1	1	7	7	7	1	1	3	7	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
14	7	6	7	5	3	4	2	4	7	7	7	1	1	7	7	4	3	7	4	5	7	7	4	7	7
15	7	7	7	7	1	5	1	1	7	7	7	1	1	2	7	3	5	7	6	6	7	7	6	7	7

STAFF SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MUST-DO BEHAVIOR IN
NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
Participants	16	7	7	7	5	1	1	1	1	7	7	5	1	1	1	7	1	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	17	7	7	7	2	3	6	2	6	7	7	7	3	1	1	7	6	3	7	5	3	7	7	6	7
	18	7	6	7	3	2	5	7	7	6	7	6	3	1	2	7	5	4	5	5	4	5	6	4	3
	19	6	6	7	7	1	7	1	2	7	7	7	1	1	1	7	5	6	5	6	5	7	7	7	7
	20	6	6	7	3	1	7	1	1	6	7	3	1	1	6	6	3	5	6	7	5	7	6	6	7
	21	7	4	7	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	1	4	7	1	1	7	1	1	7	7	7	7
	22	7	4	7	3	4	5	1	5	3	6	4	1	1	4	7	5	2	5	6	4	7	7	6	7
	23	7	6	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	6	5	4	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	3	6	6	6	5
	24	6	6	6	3	5	6	1	2	6	6	6	2	1	3	6	5	3	6	6	3	6	6	5	6
	25	6	5	7	5	4	6	2	5	6	6	6	3	2	2	5	5	6	6	5	4	5	6	6	6
	26	7	7	5	4	7	4	4	4	7	7	7	1	1	1	7	5	4	7	7	6	7	7	7	7
	27	5	3	5	2	2	5	3	5	6	7	3	2	2	5	7	4	3	5	5	5	5	6	6	6
	28	7	6	7	6	2	6	1	6	7	7	7	1	1	5	7	6	5	7	7	6	7	7	6	7

ADMINISTRATORS' SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MAY-DO BEHAVIOR
IN NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	
Participants	1	5	5	6	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	5	2	5	3	3	5	4	5	5	3	5	4	3	5
	2	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	6	5	5	4	4	5	3	5	6	5	4	3	5	5
	3	7	6	6	3	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	3	6	6	6	6	5	6	7	6	5	5	6	5
	4	7	7	1	1	1	7	1	7	7		7	1	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	6	7	6	1	7
	5	7	6	6	2	3	2	5	5	6	6	6	3	6	6	5	5	6	3	6	6	6	5	1	6
	6	7	7	7	1	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	1	1	1	1	7	7	2	7	2	7	4	4	7
	7	7	6	6	2	5	4	6	6	5	7	6	2	5	3	2	4	2	3	6	6	6	5	1	5
	8	3	7	5	3	5	6	2	7	6	6	7	4	6	1	1	7	6	6	7	7	4	6	5	5
	9	1	5	5	5	5	7	4	1	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	7	7	7	4	4	4	1	6
	10	5	5	6	1	5	4	5	5	3	7	2	2	6	6	4	6	4	4	6	4	5	4	3	4
	11	7	6	6	6	5	6	6	4	4	7	7	6	6	1	1	7	7	7	7	4	4	7	2	6
	12	6	6	6	2	6	6	4	5	5	6	6	2	6	6	5	6	5	5	6	5	3	5	5	6

EDITORS' SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MAY-DO BEHAVIOR IN
NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
Participants 13	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	2	7	7	7	5	7	7	7	7
14	6	7	6	5	7	5	4	6	6	7	6	7	7	5	5	7	6	7	7	3	7	7	7	7
15	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7

STAFF SCORES FOR EDITOR'S MAY-DO BEHAVIOR IN
NEWS, EDITORIAL, AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Item	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	
Participants	16	7	7	7	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	1	1	7	7	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	7
	17	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	1	1	7	2	3	3	2	7	7	3	6	6
	18	6	4	6	6	4	4	4	3	6	6	7	5	6	1	1	6	4	4	6	4	6	7	4	6
	19	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	5	5	6	7	7
	20	7	7	7	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	3	7	7	7	7
	21	7	7	7	1	7	1	7	4	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	7	4	4
	22	7	3	7	7	6	5	4	5	6	6	7	7	7	4	6	7	3	5	3	4	3	6	7	7
	23	6	5	6	5	5	4	3	5	5	6	6	5	6	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	6
	24	6	5	6	4	6	6	6	3	5	6	6	5	6	3	3	6	5	6	6	4	6	5	5	6
	25	5	4	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	4	6
	26	5	7	7	1	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	4	4	1	4	7	4	7	4	6	6
	27	5	5	6	5	5	3	5	6	3	5	6	5	3	2	2	6	5	3	3	4	4	5	5	4
	28	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	5	5	7	7	6	7	7	6	7	7	7	7

VITA²

E. Lynn Smith

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE STUDENT EDITOR OF THE HAYMAKER

Major Field: Mass Communication

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bristow, Oklahoma, May 19, 1941, the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Earl Smith.

Education: Graduated from Ponca City High School, Ponca City, Oklahoma, in May, 1959; received Associate degree from Northern Oklahoma Junior College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma, in 1961; received Bachelor of Science degree in Journalism from Oklahoma State University in 1966; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Mass Communication from Oklahoma State University in July, 1973.

Professional Experience: Reporter, Ponca City News, 1962-63; News Editor, Tonkawa News, 1963-66; Journalism Instructor and Director of Public Relations, Northern Oklahoma Junior College, 1966-67; Supervisor of Employee Communications, Continental Oil Company, Ponca City, Oklahoma, 1967-69; Assistant Professor of Mass Communications, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, 1969 to present.