INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4087

76-15,795

BENNETT, David Llewellyn, 1939-
FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF STUDENT NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALISM PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1975
Education, secondary

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF STUDENT NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALISM PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DAVID L. BENNETT

Norman, Oklahoma

1975

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS:
A STUDY OF STUDENT NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALISM
PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR
RELATIONSHIP TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS

APPROVED BY

Glenn R. Snider

C. Joe Holland

Richard B. [illegible]

Howard D. Kidd

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

ANNOUNCES THE FINAL EXAMINATION OF

DAVID L. BENNETT

B.A. Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1962 (Feb.)
M.A. University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1969

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Monday, November 10, 1975, 1:30 p.m.

Room 224, Education Building

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE:

Glenn R. Snider, Ed.D., Chairman
Robert F. Bibens, Ed.D.
Gerald D. Kidd, Ed.D.
C. Joe Holland, Ph.D.

OUTLINE OF STUDIES:

MAJOR CONCENTRATION: Secondary Education

OTHERS: Journalism

BIOGRAPHY:

Born in Clyde, Ohio, May 31, 1939. Graduated from Clyde High School, 1957. B.A. degree from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Feb. 4, 1962. M.A. degree in journalism from Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma, 1969. From 1962-68, high school English-journalism teacher, Buckeye Valley H.S., Delaware, Ohio and Westerville H.S., Westerville, Ohio. From 1968-70, completed M.A. and began Ph.D. degrees, University of Oklahoma. From 1970-72, taught journalism, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minn. From 1972-73, full-time student on Ph.D. degree, University of Oklahoma. From 1973-74, taught journalism, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, Edwardsville, Ill. From 1974 to present, teaching journalism, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Ariz.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is most difficult to express the deep gratitude I feel toward so many, for their contribution to this doctoral endeavor. However, the following three individuals need to be singled out, for the roles they played:

Dr. Glenn R. Snider, chairman of the doctoral committee, gave continued guidance over a six-year period and demonstrated frequent understanding and support of the writer, during periods of personal stress;

Dr. C. Joe Holland, as chairman of the OU Journalism Department in 1968, gave this writer an opportunity to achieve certain goals in graduate school, when others were more reluctant. Without that personal commitment, none of this would have occurred;

Kathleen K. Bennett, the writer's wife, gave of herself in a manner for which there could be no substitute. Her patience, love and personal belief in her husband were consistent sources of strength.

The writer also expresses appreciation to members of the doctoral committee, Dr. Gerald D. Kidd and Dr. Robert F. Bibens, for their professional

guidance and assistance.

Appreciation is also expressed to Robert Black and Dr. Thomas Bement, for statistical counseling, and to Brian Pearson for many hours of computer assistance.

Appreciation is expressed to many high school journalism teachers and principals whose cooperation in the gathering of data was crucial.

Finally, deep gratitude is expressed to my parents -- Mr. and Mrs. Howard L. Bennett -- who, despite time and distance, never ceased to encourage their son in reaching this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

LIST OF FIGURES xiv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Introduction 1
Background of the Study 8
Purpose of the Study 11
Statement of the Problem 12
Hypotheses 12
Significance of the Study 14
Definition of Terms 14
Delimitations 17
Methodology 18
Organization of the Study 20

II. REVIEW OF SELECTED AND RELATED LITERATURE 21

In Loco Parentis 23
The Civil Rights Movement and Related Issues 29
Literature Relating to Students' Right of Free Expression 38
Verbal and Physical Expression 42
Symbolic Expression 44
Written Expression 51
Literature Related to High School Journalism and Student Newspapers . 60
High School Journalism Courses 60
High School Newspapers 66

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURE 77

Subjects 77

Construction and Description of Instruments 80
Procedure 84
Administering the Test 87
Design 88

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 91

Introduction 91
Testing the Hypotheses and Analysis of the Data 93
Findings Pertaining to a Comparison of Principals' and Advisers' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers 98
Findings Pertaining to Respondents' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers, When Grouped into Four Enrollment Classifications 106
Findings Pertaining to Respondents' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers, When Grouped into Physically Segregated and Physically Desegregated High School Classifications 136
Findings Relating to Actual Performances of High School Student Newspapers and Subject Matter Taught in High School Journalism Courses 152

V. RESULTS 163

Summary 163
Major Findings 167
Conclusions 179
Recommendations 181

BIBLIOGRAPHY 183

APPENDIX A 197

APPENDIX B 209

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Percentage of Two Primary Groups of Respondents Based on the Total Number of High Schools in the Study	79
2.	Enrollment and Racial Classification Breakdowns Based on All Responding High Schools	79
3.	Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences Between Advisers and Principals	100
4.	Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Mean Differences Between Advisers and Principals Before Discriminant Analysis	100
5.	Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means, Standard Deviations and Grand Means for Advisers and Principals	102
6.	Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences Between Advisers and Principals	103
7.	Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Mean Differences Between Advisers and Principals Before Discriminant Analysis	104
8.	Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means, Standard Deviations and Grand Means for Advisers and Principals . . .	106
9.	Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined	109

Table | Page

10. Differences Between Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined . 110

11. Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 112

12. Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 112

13. Step 3 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 113

14. Step 4 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 113

15. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined . . . 115

16. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate . 117

17. Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 120

18. Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 121

Table | Page

19. Step 3 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 122

20. Step 4 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 123

21. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes For Advisers 124

22. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes For Principals 125

23. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 126

24. Differences Between Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis with Advisers and Principals Combined 127

25. Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 128

26. Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 129

27. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined . . 130

Table Page

28. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 132

29. Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 133

30. Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 134

31. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Advisers 137

32. Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Principals 137

33. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined 140

34. Differences Between Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined . . 141

35. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude with Advisers and Principals Combined 142

36. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate 143

Table Page

37. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes for Advisers 145

38. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes for Principals 145

39. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined . . . 147

40. Differences Between Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined 148

41. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined 149

42. Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate . . . 150

43. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Advisers 152

44. Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Principals 153

45. Means and Standard Deviations of the Frequency of Human Relations and Human Rights Articles in Student Newspapers 156

Table Page

46. Means and Standard Deviations of the Frequency of School Events and Activities Articles in Student Newspapers 158

47. Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Mass Media Issues and Problems in the Journalism Classes . 160

48. Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Newspaper Skills in the Journalism Classes 161

49. Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Human Relations Values and Responsibilities in the Journalism Classes 162

50. Raw Scores of Advisers with Regard to Six Attitude Factors 210

51. Raw Scores of Principals with Regard to Six Attitude Factors 213

52. Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 1: Reporting Human Relations Problems in the Newspaper 216

53. Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 2: Basic Human Relations Beliefs 216

54. Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 3: Basic Human Rights Beliefs 217

55. Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 4: Conflict and Intergroup Relations Reporting 217

56. Factor Loading for Each Item in Factor 5: Censorship and Control of the Student Newspaper 218

57. Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 6: Basic Freedom of Expression and Press Beliefs 218

Table Page

58. Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Reporting of Human Relations and Human Rights Problems in the Student Newspaper . . . 219

59. Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Reporting of Student Activity News in the Student Newspaper 220

60. Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Mass Media Issues and Problems in the Journalism Classes 220

61. Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Newspaper Skills in the Journalism Classes 221

62. Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Human Rights Concepts in the Journalism Classes 221

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Sample Questionnaire Rating Item	81
2.	Sample Item From Censorship Factor	105

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF STUDENT NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALISM PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RELATIONS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the post-World War II years, and increasing in the 1960s, a greater concern emerged for the rights of America's youth in general, and for the rights of students in particular. This concern permeated all levels of public school education, from primary schools to colleges.

Fundamentally, the United States has been a country functioning as a political democracy. Implicit with this circumstance was the principle, that in order to preserve the freedoms persons cherished, citizens needed to know and exercise their rights as prescribed by the Constitution. However, this was not regarded as applicable to all persons, as millions have been denied many of these basic rights. The Constitution never stated that this was limited to adults, the rich, to those in positions of authority, or to those in the majority, but it seemed to mean this. The years since

the mid-1950s, however, produced a general civil rights movement. Many groups and individuals sought greater protection of the human and civil rights they believed were denied them, due to their minority and/or disadvantaged status.

In short, the awareness that the Constitution should protect all of the country's people grew significantly. This awareness was no less significant among the nation's youth. The Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s gave impetus to dissent and violence on college campuses, over the nation. Ackerly (1969) suggested:

> . . . student demonstrations of dissent -- be they lengthy sit-ins, teach-ins, boycotts, walkouts, walk-ins, or full-scale riots -- concentrated attention on the prerogatives of students, especially their right to be heard.[1]

It was predictable that with such a model to follow, the right to be heard ultimately became a major issue of the public high school as well. A raft of court cases involving various rights of high school students -- many decided in favor of students -- verify that this happened.

Although the principle that students should have

---

[1]Robert L. Ackerly, The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, (Washington, D.C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969), p. 1.

rights was not new -- indeed it preceded the Middle Ages -- the rationale behind the current clamor for the increased rights of high school students was relatively new. Basically, this rationale said that if society expected its citizens to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed rights responsibly, then the schools needed to provide a climate in which youth could learn those desired behaviors. This could best have been achieved adequately, if schools had aided students in actively exercising the rights about which they wished them to learn.

The American Civil Liberties Union (1968) offered the following guideline on this matter:

> . . . freedom implies the right to make mistakes and that students must therefore sometimes be permitted to act in ways which are predictably unwise, so long as the consequences of their acts are not dangerous to life and property, and do not seriously disrupt the academic process.[2]

Unfortunately, high school students too often were not accorded an opportunity to exercise many rights, let alone to have made mistakes in the process. Nonetheless, the pressure to loosen the log jams which hindered students' freedom to exercise their rights continued to mount.

---

[2]American Civil Liberties Union, Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools, (New York: ACLU, 1968), p. 10.

This pressure was directed mostly at achieving the same civil liberties given all citizens, namely, freedom of speech, press, assembly, association, religion, and freedom from invidious discrimination. Generally, in one manner or another, each of these freedoms was intricately linked with the broad freedom of expression. Regarding this broad concern, Lucas (1971) indicated the Supreme Court had established that:

> Educational authorities -- principals, deans, boards of education, etc. -- must make a showing of "clear and present danger" posed by a student's expression before curtailing action can be taken. This standard derives, of course, from the important role of expression -- even nonverbal expression -- in a free society, the special need to preserve free inquiry in the educational setting, and tightly limited area allowed for government intrusion into speech.[3]

Freedom of expression has been interpreted to mean freedom of speech, of the press and freedom with regard to appearance and dress. Perhaps, the press has been the most representative area within this broad freedom. The rationale for this is that in a political democracy, it has been crucial to maintain a free press. A free press has been the personification of freedom of expression. Implicit in the very nature of the press has been the responsibility to be a vehicle for various forms

---

[3]Roy Lucas, "The Rights of Students," The Rights of Americans: What They Are -- What They Should Be, ed. by Norman Dorsen (New York: Random House, Inc., 1971), p. 575.

of expression and thereby provide people with access to the truth.

It was no less incumbent on public high schools than on society at large, to provide an atmosphere in which the press -- in this case the student press -- could function freely. By so doing, it could provide a vehicle for students to learn how to exercise an important right responsibly. Such a student press could serve a second meaningful function, namely, to provide access for varying viewpoints existing within the school.

In other words, the high school press could have served a pertinent human relations function by providing a voice for all divergent groups within the school. Moreover, this function may have been realized if the student press had been allowed to exist in a climate of freedom, without prior censorship because the right of free speech and press has always been based on a prior commitment to a search for the truth.

There was considerable support for these notions. The ACLU (1968) suggested:

> The right of every student to have access to varied points of view, to confront and study controversial issues, to be treated without prejudice or penalty for what he reads or writes, and to have facilities for learning available in the school library and the classroom may not be derogated or denied . . . The student press should be considered a learning device. Its pages should not be looked upon as an official image of the school,

> always required to present a polished appearance to the extramural world. Learning effectively proceeds through trial and error, and as much or more may sometimes be gained from reactions to a poor article or a tasteless publication as from the traditional pieces, groomed carefully for external inspection.[4]

Unfortunately, there was little direct evidence to suggest that the high school press was free, in the sense described above. Nor did it appear that the high school press was viewed and/or used as an effective human relations vehicle. This situation applied to student newspapers as well as classroom journalism programs. In a broader sense, this was inconsistent with democratic values in public, secondary education. It was at least a show of indifference toward students' right of free expression.

Much of the responsibility for this phenomenon must be borne by the adult leadership in high schools. Largely, this was dependent on the recent shift in attitude toward student rights in general. Dolce (1971) assessed this change by suggesting:

> This shift in consensus concerning the nature of the child, including a change in concept of minors as having an active, self-initiating nature rather than simply a passive reflective-of-adults nature is responsible in large part for the differing opinions concerning the

---

[4]ACLU, Secondary Schools, pp. 10-12.

> rights of students. Some adults have made this intellectual transition; others have not . . . To those who value individual rights above the orderliness of society, the problems of control of behavior are secondary to the primacy of student rights.[5]

Campbell (1970) related this notion to high school journalism specifically:

> What does it matter if the principal fails the minority of the students in journalism and student publishing? To be sure, principals have been confronted with unrest -- racial problems, drug problems and others. Some of the unrest may have been eliminated had there been effective communication. And, this kind of communication cannot be achieved through a monthly newspaper . . . The inescapable truth is that many principals simply are not doing for student journalism what they do for other curricular and co-curricular activities.[6]

If human rights were to be better understood by high school students, in the hope that this would lead to the improvement of human relations attitudes and behaviors, then this understanding needed to be conscientiously and actively facilitated. It was important that the approaches to reaching this goal were comprehensive. It would have been a mistake to isolate human rights - human relations as entities within themselves, being quite separate from

---

[5]Carl J. Dolce, A Sensible Assessment of Student Rights and Responsibilities (paper presented at the 103rd annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., Feb. 20-24), pp. 3-4.

[6]Laurence R. Campbell, The Human Equation and the School Newspaper, (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1970), p. 26.

the total inner workings of a given high school system.

As Dolce and Campbell suggested, student rights are fundamental to improving human relations problems, in the school. Given the link between the right of free expression and the nature of high school journalism, it seemed reasonable to assume that opportunities were greater here than in many areas of the education program, for the development of attitudes and understandings regarding the responsible discharge of this right.

Background of the Study

Before the 1960s, there was very little challenge to the authority of secondary school administrators over students' attitudes and behaviors. Much of this was attributed to the fact that "in loco parentis" thinking remained dominant. This philosophy suggested that students were in school to learn and school authorities were in the best position to determine what they should learn and how that should be accomplished. Little attention was given to the notion of constitutional rights; nor were students generally accorded much freedom to exercise any such rights unfettered.

The decade following the mid-1960s, however, saw an increase in the number of court cases tending to reverse many of these traditions. Gaddy (1971) attributed this phenomenon to three factors:

> First, many of the issues litigated in the courts would not have arisen had administrators and school boards been more attuned to the legal, judicial, and social tenor of American society. Second, secondary and elementary school students in recent years have become much more inclined to challenge school rules and regulations. Third, federal and state courts have become more willing to accept cases involving the internal affairs of public education. The net effect of these three factors has been a dramatic increase in the number of court cases involving precollege students during the 1960s.[7]

An additional influence, of course, was the aftermath of the Civil Rights movement. The attempts to implement school desegregation, integration, and non-discrimination guidelines brought a greater concern for the total human relations concern in the public schools. Paying greater attention to individual and group rights became a necessary outgrowth of this concern. Consequently, there were many studies conducted and programs devised which sought to improve human relations - human rights practices in schools all over the nation.

This phenomenon was a consideration leading to the conducting of this study. As noted earlier, it was assumed that there was a relationship between improving human relations and expanding students' opportunities to exercise their right of free expression. This indicated

---

[7]Dale Gaddy, Rights and Freedoms of Public School Students: Directions from the 1960s (Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems in Education, 1971), p. 54.

a need for such a study. Furthermore, whereas there had been many studies dealing with human rights - human relations, and studies on student newspapers and high school journalism programs, there apparently had been no investigation conducted on the problem identified here in Oklahoma.

A second factor influencing this research was a previous study conducted by Bennett in 1969. The results of that study dealing with the nature of Oklahoma high school journalism programs, indicated two strong, general conditions:

1. The status and quality of high school journalism in Oklahoma were quite low.

2. Oklahoma high school principals generally held favorable attitudes toward high school journalism programs but did little to ensure high quality, particularly in regard to supporting student freedom of expression through the school newspaper.[8]

These two conclusions were supported by similar findings from studies conducted in other states. These studies are discussed in Chapter II.

---

[8]David L. Bennett, The Status of Scholastic Journalism: An Analytical Survey of the Nature of and Attitude Toward Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1969), pp. 62-66.

Sparked by both the results of this research and by the growing concern for improving human rights - human relations in high schools, this study was conceived and conducted.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to explore the relationship between high school journalism, the student newspaper and the improving of human relations - human rights attitudes, within the school. The assumption was that improving human relations attitudes in the school depended largely on respecting the rights of all students and of all people, and on creating an atmosphere in which these rights could be exercised freely and responsibly. It was believed that high school journalism and student newspapers could be important in such a learning process.

To achieve this aim, the study investigated the activities of the journalism courses and student newspapers and the attitudes of principals, newspaper advisers, and journalism teachers, toward human rights, human relations and students' freedom of press. It was intended that these findings would serve as indicators to what could be done to increase high school journalism's importance and enhance its role as an integrating factor in improving interpersonal and intergroup relations, in the high school.

Statement of the Problem

The problem for investigation was: Do student newspapers and classroom journalism courses facilitate a significant concern for human rights and effective human relations in the high school?

More specifically, the study attempted to discover answers to the following secondary questions:

1. What are the major purposes of journalism courses and student newspapers, in Oklahoma high schools?

2. How much press freedom and censorship exist in Oklahoma high school newspaper situations?

3. To what extent do high school enrollment size and racial mix affect purposes of and attitudes toward the high school newspaper?

4. To what extent are the functions and values taught in the journalism courses practiced by the student newspapers?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were proposed for the study of this particular problem and related questions:

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of high school principals and newspaper advisers with regard to the role of the student newspaper in advancing effective human relations and a

concern for human rights in the high school.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between high schools in four enrollment classifications, with regard to advisers' and principals' attitudes toward the role of the student newspaper in advancing human relations and a concern for human rights in the high school.

Hypotheis 3. There is no significant difference between physically desegregated and physically segregated high schools, with regard to advisers' and principals' attitudes toward the role of the student newspaper in advancing human relations and a concern for human rights in the high school.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of high school principals and newspaper advisers, with regard to students' exercising of freedom of press.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant difference between high schools in four enrollment classifications, with regard to high school principals' and newspaper advisers' attitudes toward students' exercising of freedom of press.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between physically desegregated and physically segregated high schools, with regard to advisers' and principals'

attitudes toward students' exercising of freedom of press.

Significance of the Study

Several aspects of this study had significant implications for future use. First, this study was designed to provide information in an area where very little information based on research data had existed. Second, this study was conducted, in part, to give principals and journalism advisers valuable insight into improving the role of high school journalism programs as human relations facilitators. Third, this study was conducted, in part, to provide information concerning the quality of existing journalism programs in Oklahoma high schools. Fourth, this study was conducted, in part, to provide additional information on the increasing concern over students' right of free expression in public high schools. Fifth, this study was conducted also to provide some indication of whether or not the quality of high school curricula -- in this case journalism -- varies among high schools with differing enrollments and racial mixes; and finally, this study was conducted to provide a base on which future studies might be developed.

Definition of Terms

Human relations was defined as the sum total of

relationships between individuals and between groups. The basic determiner of good or bad human relations was the degree to which groups and individuals were willing to grant and respect the rights of others.

The definition of human rights used was that formulated by Phi Delta Kappa (1971) as follows:

> The human rights most prized by our society grew out of struggles celebrated in the history of Western civilization. Man's unending search for human rights produced the tenets of Judaism and Christianity; the principles of Graeco-Roman philosophy and law; the Magna Carta; the Petition of Right; the Declaration of Independence; the Constitution of the United States; the Declaration of the Rights of Man; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations; and a long list of other declarations, documents, proclamations, legislative enactments, and judicial decisions, the proud product of democracy.
>
> Among the rights these landmark statements seek to secure are life; liberty; security of person; equality of opportunity for every individual in every facet of life; freedom of speech; freedom of press; freedom of (or from) religious belief; the right of due process; freedom of assembly, petition, and redress of grievances; protection against unreasonable search and seizure; freedom from self-incrimination; the right to trial by a jury of peers; the right to privacy; the right to fair and equal representation in government; the right to own property and enter into contracts; the right to select leaders through the exercise of the franchise; and the right to dissent.[9]

In this study, the rights of free speech and free press

---

[9]Phi Delta Kappa Teacher Education Project on Human Rights, A Guide for Improving Teacher Education in Human Rights (Norman, Oklahoma, 1971), pp. 3-4.

were of primary concern.

Freedom of expression technically included numerous behaviors. It was used here, however, in reference to free speech and free press. Freedom of speech and freedom of press referred to the basic, constitutionally guaranteed rights to express information, opinions and ideas on any subject or issue. In the Phi Delta Kappa guide, this concept was expressed as follows:

> All students should have access to truth in relevant published materials and must be free to discuss controversial issues, with responsible direction, in the classroom or on the school campus.[10]

Enrollment groups referred to the four classifications of high schools, which were identified according to the number of students enrolled.

Journalism courses and classroom journalism were interchangeably used to refer to formal in-class instruction in various areas of journalism. They were to be distinguished from the mechanics involved in producing a student newspaper.

A high school newspaper was any school-approved, student-staffed newspaper that came out periodically during the school year.

Prior restraint referred to the act of censoring certain kinds of newspaper copy before they appeared in

---

[10] Ibid., p. 5.

print, either through direct or indirect control, by some school authority figure.

A journalism adviser was one who was responsible for both teaching journalism courses and advising the high school newspaper. In all but one high school used in this study, these two responsibilities were handled by the same individual.

A physically segregated high school was one which was predominantly white (Caucasian) and a physically desegregated high school was one composed of both white and non-white (Negro, American Indian and Mexican-American) students. Ten per cent or more non-white students were required to classify a high school as physically desegregated. This figure was established after consultation with Dr. Joe Garrison, Dr. Melvin Todd, and Dr. Glenn Snider of the Consultative Center for Equal Educational Opportunity Studies, at the University of Oklahoma.

Delimitations

The study included all of the 133 Oklahoma high schools which offered journalism courses during the 1972-73 school year, as reported by the State Department of Education.

The study was concerned only with the responses of high school principals, high school newspaper advisers

and high school journalism teachers.

The study involved a philosophical question basically, and even though the instrument used investigated specific behaviors of high school journalism courses and newspapers, it was possible that there were discrepancies between what advisers said took place and what actually took place in the classroom and on the newspaper. This possibility could have been alleviated perhaps, if personal contact followups had been used, such as content analysis of newspapers and personal interviews. However, time and cost prohibited such activities.

Methodology

These concerns were approached through the following steps: First, two instruments were constructed. These instruments were questionnaires which were comprised of items based on an instrument previously constructed by Bennett (1969), on an instrument from a pilot study which preceded the investigation at hand (1972), and on instruments from several high school journalism studies conducted by Dr. Laurence R. Campbell at Florida State University.

The instrument for this study was designed to investigate the attitudes of high school principals and high school journalism advisers, with regard to the

problem and the related questions of the study. Also, the intrument was designed to obtain a wide range of factual information relating to the quality and nature of existing high school journalism programs in Oklahoma.

Second, six hypotheses were formulated, based on the central concerns of the study.

Third, the questionnaire was administered to principals and journalism advisers in all Oklahoma high schools which had journalism programs. The questionnaires were administered by mail, and two followups were used to obtain maximum response.

Fourth, the data was collected, tabulated and interpreted. For this phase, three statistical instruments were utilized. Factor analysis was used to further validate the study. It eliminated certain questionnaire items which did not fit into the response patterns of the respondents, and clustered the remaining items into factors which made maximum psychological sense. A total of six factors emerged and were labeled. The data was then subjected to chi square goodness of fit tests, to ensure the normality of distribution, and thereby ensured that the significance levels derived through the discriminant analyses would be accurate. These factors were then subjected to discriminant function analyses, which were designed to determine how advisers' and

principals' attitudes varied, with regard to the six factors, when they were sub-grouped. Discriminant function analyses were conducted by comparing all principals to all advisers, by combining these respondents into four high school enrollment classifications, and by grouping them into two groups identified as physically segregated and physically desegregated high schools for comparison.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I contains the introduction, background of the study, purpose of the study, statement of the problem, methodology, hypotheses, significance of the study, definition of terms, delimitations and organization of the study.

Chapter II consists of a review of selected and related literature.

Chapter III deals with the design of the study, the selection of subjects, procedures, instrumentation, administration and scoring of the instrument, and statistical treatment.

Chapter IV presents the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Chapter V contains the summary, major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED AND RELATED LITERATURE

Prior to the 1960s, the role, the rights and the responsibilities of the high school student press and high school journalism had not been subjects of widespread debate. Likewise, the status of high school students' rights generally -- and the right of freedom of expression specifically -- had not been the subject of much debate. That condition had been altered, during the 1960s and early 1970s. Much of this change may be attributed to an overall change in the educational climate of public high schools, which in turn resulted chiefly from the Civil Rights movement of the sixties. The overall student rights movement and the push by students for greater participation in all phases of their educational program was, therefore, a net result of this social and political movement. Plasco (1969) reflected this change:

> Until recently, the general public and the legal profession have had little concern about the civil rights of the individual student in our public educational system. The student has been forced to fight his own battle against the procedures by which these regulations have been enforced. The result often has been the loss of

some of his personal freedoms.[11]

Increased numbers of court cases emerged as the result of clashes between high school authorities and students over freedom of expression and press issues. These judicial cases supported the notion that these freedoms were no longer non-controversial areas, in the public schools. High school administrators, teachers and students had thus become increasingly concerned with the issue of students' freedom of expression. Simultaneously, the courts had made decisions which loosened traditional school controls, regarding this right.

This increase of attention to student freedom of expression should not be viewed as being isolated from other social phenomena. Certainly, it was a part of the broader student rights movement. Similarly, the student rights movement emerged as the result of multiple contributing factors. Many writers suggest that two of these factors which significantly influenced the rise of the student rights movement were: (1) The Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s which was complemented by certain national and international issues and problems, the most notable of which were the Vietnam War and racial

---

[11]Marvin R. Plasco, "School, Student and Appearance Regulations," Cleveland-Marshall Law Review, 18 (Jan., 1969), p. 143.

strife; and (2) the gradual dissipation of "in loco parentis" thinking in the public schools.

To better understand the current demand for student freedom of expression and press, and to be able to relate it to the broader perspective of the student rights movement, these two factors needed to be briefly examined.

In Loco Parentis

This doctrine had been an integral part of the American public school fiber, for many generations. It was a common law concept which said that the school assumed the same responsibility and authority over the student as the parents would have, in the absence of those parents. Although it predated well into antiquity, I. W. Blackstone, the famed English jurist of the 18th Century provided the first formal usage of this concept: ". . . to protect individual tutors and governesses in the employ of a household so that they might operate in a disciplinary fashion similar to that of the parents."[12]

Originally, the doctrine was used to support the public school's right to administer corporal punishment to the student. However, through the years it provided

---

[12]Richard Farson, Birth Rights, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), p. 118.

wide ranging authority for school officials over virtually all aspects of student life, within the school. One 19th Century case -- Lander v. Seaver, 1859 -- concerning student disciplinary action, reflected this early expansion of the doctrine. In its sweeping opinion, the Vermont court said:

> Acts done to deface or injure the schoolroom, to destroy the books of scholars, or the books or apparatus for instruction, or the instrument of punishment of the master; language used to other scholars to stir up disorder and insubordination, or to heap odium and disgrace upon the master; writings and pictures placed so as to suggest evil and corrupt language, images and thoughts to the youth who must frequent the school; all such or similar acts tend directly to impair the usefulness of the school, the welfare of the scholars and the authority of the master. By common consent and by the universal custom in our New England schools, the master has always been deemed to have the right to punish such offenses. Such power is essential to the preservation of order, decency, decorum and good government in schools.[13]

This degree of harshness may have abated in more modern times, but the evidence seemed substantial that the "in loco parentis" philosophy prevailed long after this early case. A 1970 Syracuse University study verified the long existence of this practice:

> Historically, the public schools have had the very special function of certifying for the young what is "right", what is customary, what

---

[13]Lander v. Seaver, 32 Vt. 121 (1859) as quoted in Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 8.

> is legitimate, what is expected, what is laudable, and what is "wrong" in the American society.[14]

The study further suggested that this historic function was no longer viable.

Triezenberg concurred (1971). He suggested that the protective armor "in locoparentis," which had provided schools with a rationale in discipline matters, had been torn away.[15] The Educational School Boards Association (1970) concluded: "In terms of setting limits to student rights, then, 'in loco parentis' no longer provides satisfactory authority -- if, indeed, it ever did."[16]

Gradually, court decisions turned the tide of thinking from the extremes expressed in the 1859 Lander v. Seaver ruling, to the more "liberalized" thoughts expressed above. Kleeman (1972), citing Chicago school law authority Allen Schwartz, noted that "in loco parentis" was traceable to the Code of Hammurabi in the 18th Century B.C., and that it came to this country via common law. He said: "Recent court rulings . . . have

---

[14]Ackerly, Authority, p. 9.

[15]George Triezenberg, "How To Live with Due Process," The Bulletin of the NASSP, No. 352 (Feb., 1971), p. 62.

[16]Educational School Boards Association, Policies That Clarify Student Rights and Responsibilities, (a school board policy development kit prepared by the ESBA, Waterford, Conn., Oct., 1970), p. 5.

pointed to its narrowness and inapplicability to student rights."[17]

One of the more notable and influential court cases, in this regard was West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette (1943). The court ruled that the school's authority to compel attendance and obedience of school rules did not take precedence over students' constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. The majority opinion asserted that this amendment:

> . . . protects the citizen against the State itself and all of its creatures -- the Board of Education not excepted. These have, of course, important, delicate and highly discretionary functions, but none that they may not perform within the limits of the Bill of Rights. That they are educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of Constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes.[18]

Ackerly (1969) noted that the now famous In re Gault spelled out specifically what the Barnette decision had suggested 24 years earlier, when it said:

---

[17]Richard P. Kleeman, Student Rights and Responsibilities: Courts Force Schools To Change, (an Education U.S.A. Special Report, Washington, D.C., National School Public Relations Assoc., 1972), p. 4.

[18]Gordon Nelson, "Aspects of the Legal Relationship Between Students and the Public High Schools," unpublished paper, prepared for the Consultative Center for Equal Education Opportunity, University of Oklahoma, 1971, (mimeographed), introductory page.

"Whatever may be their precise impact, neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights is for adults alone."[19] The implications of this statement for "in loco parentis" were obvious. Kleeman (1972) suggested, as have others, that it was the 1969 Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District case that struck a further blow to "in loco parentis."[20] In this landmark freedom of expression case, the court said:

> First Amendment rights, applied in light of the special characteristics of the school environment are available to teachers and students. It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate. This has been the unmistakable holding of this court for almost 50 years.[21]

On this decision, Kleeman reflected:

> Tinker was decided, and the hoary doctrine "in loco parentis" -- the theory that schools and teachers could exercise total control over students because they acted as parent-substitutes and out of concern for students' welfare -- would never be the same again.[22]

---

[19]Ackerly, Authority, p. 4.

[20]Kleeman, Responsibilities, p. 3.

[21]National Education Association, Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (developed by the NEA Task Force on Student Involvement, Washington, D.C., 1971), p. 21.

[22]Kleeman, Responsibilities, p. 3.

Klahn (1971) contended that because of Tinker, "The 'in loco parentis' concept of the past has been circumscribed as it relates to free speech and nondisruptive types of protest."[23]

Kidd, Schuyver and Scott (1973) cited the 1971 freedom of expression case, Turley v. Adel Community School District, in which the court had further adverse reflections on the "in loco parentis" doctrine specifically:

> The Court firmly believes that it is the parents who are primarily responsible for their child's appearance. The shop-worn concept of schools being "in loco parentis" is not accepted by this court.[24]

The "in loco parentis" doctrine was not dead, however. Gatti and Gatti (1972) noted that it was still used as one of the oldest and most valuable legal defenses protecting teachers from liability in student disciplinary cases. Even though its practical applicability has narrowed, the following legal guideline was cited:

> While acting within the scope of your [the teacher's] duty, you stand in the shoes of the parent; therefore, you may generally

---

[23]Richard P. Klahn, "The Tinker Case: A Principal's View Two Years Later," The Bulletin of the NASSP, No. 352 (Feb., 1971), p. 73.

[24]Gerald D. Kidd, Billye M. Van Schuyver, and Lederle Scott, "The Students Right to Freedom of Expression," Oklahoma Teacher, (March, 1973), p. 9.

> exercise such powers as the parent would exercise over the student . . . you have the powers of a parent in school related matters of: work performance, student conduct; discipline; and your students' immediate welfare.[25]

Neither was it clear that this traditional doctrine had disappeared from all aspects of public school regulation. Temple University law authority H.C. Hudgins (1971) noted: "It is clear that the courts have left the doctrine of 'in loco parentis' undisturbed with respect to locker searches."[26]

However, it appeared certain that the doctrine no longer carried the same meaning as it once did, over a century ago. Its gradual dissipation had been a contributing factor to the increased challenges to traditional school authority, concerning many student rights areas. Freedom of expression has been one of the more predominant ones.

The Civil Rights Movement and Related Issues

As "in loco parentis" domination was lessening, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s, spurred by other issues and problems, made it more difficult for

---

[25]Daniel J. Gatti and Richard D. Gatti, The Teacher and the Law, (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1972), pp. 48-49.

[26]Kleeman, Responsibilities, p. 24.

schools to continue functioning in the tradition of this doctrine, as they had historically. Parker, O'Neil and Econopouly (1965) suggested that the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, "is to date, very likely the singlemost important decision of the twentieth century."[27] On that date, the court held that segregation of children in the nation's public schools was in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Clearly, the Brown decision was important for a myriad of reasons. The most obvious reason was its impact on the "separate but equal" concept practiced in multi-racial school districts. But, it was equally revolutionary to the student rights movement. For the first time, it set in motion the forces which would limit the control that school authorities had over students' rights. Gaddy (1971) offered this analysis:

> At issue is not the authority of school officials to suspend, expel, or otherwise discipline students; rather, the issue is the legal limitations or modifications that school officials can place on the constitutional rights and freedoms of students.[28]

---

[27]Donald Parker, Robert M. O'Neil, and Nicholas Econopouly, Civil Liberties: Case Studies and the Law, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 79.

[28]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 5.

Nelson (1971) noted the emphasis the courts placed on education being a "right":

> And the United States Supreme Court, in the Brown v. Board of Education case, stated that the opportunity of an education, 'where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be available to all on equal terms.'[29]

During the 20 years since the Brown decision, the concept that students involved in the public school education process were entitled to legal protection of their constitutional rights had become firmly entrenched. Concurrently, it was established that any attempt by school authorities to sever a student from the mainstream of his peer group had to be accompanied by evidence of appropriate due process.

Triezenberg noted five cases that established important precedents which had been cited frequently in regard to this concept: Monroe v. Pape (1961), Madera v. Board of Education (1967), Brown v. Board of Education (1954), Esteban v. Central Missouri State College (1969), and Dixon v. Alabama Board of Education (1961).[30] Triezenberg made several concise analyses of these cases.

Monroe expanded the notion that students could bring suit and seek redress, and that state action could

---

[29]Nelson, "Legal Relationships," p. 17.

[30]Triezenberg, "Due Process," p. 64.

not violate the U.S. Constitution. Both Brown and Madera established education as a right. Brown was discussed earlier. In Madera, the court said:

> It has long been clear that where a government affects the private interest of an individual, it may not proceed arbitrarily, but must observe due process of law.[31]

The Dixon case furthered the principle of due process six years earlier. The court ruled that students should be informed in a formal hearing, of charges brought against them. Esteban pointed out that where such procedural conditions had been met, the student did not "enjoy an unfettered right to do as he wished. School officials within a framework of constitutional standards can regulate student conduct."[32]

Of course, there were numerous other cases during this two decade period which contributed significantly to the concept that students' constitutional rights need protection. Most of these cases arose from civil rights related issues or other societal issues of the 1960s. Students were rebelling over myriad causes.

Hentoff (1971), Kleeman (1972), Westin (1969), Fish (1970), the New York Times (1971), and others,

---

[31] Ibid., p. 65.

[32] Ibid., pp. 65-66.

reflected this condition.[33] Fish cited a 1969 speech by Westin, in which the latter related a study he had conducted to determine the principal sources of unrest among high school students. Racial discrimination, political dissent (Vietnam and the draft primarily), dress codes, discipline codes and educational reform respectively, were listed as being the most prevalent reasons for student dissent.[34] This documentation lends support to the aforementioned premise concerning the two factors behind the student rights movement. Out of much of this dissention came court cases.

Cuban (1972) further reflected these conditions:

> This burgeoning revolt by our sequestered youth is rooted in diverse rebellions outside the high schools that began in the early 1960s: the drive for civil rights; the awakenings on college campuses from the Free Speech Movement to the 1968 Battle of Morningside Heights; and the multi-dimensional antiwar movement.[35]

---

[33]Nat Hentoff, "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights," Saturday Review of Literature (May 22, 1971); Kleeman, Responsibilities, (1972); Alan Westin, "Civic Education in a Crisis Age," (a speech delivered April 10, 1969); Kenneth Fish, Conflict and Dissent in the High School (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1970); Douglas E. Kneeland, "Youth Rebellion of 60s Waning," New York Times, Oct. 21, 1971.

[34]Fish, Conflict and Dissent, p. 9.

[35]Larry Cuban, Youth as a Minority: An Anatomy of Student Rights (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1972), p. 36.

The 1970 President's Commission on Campus Unrest concluded precisely that racism, the war in Southeast Asia and personal freedoms were at the root of student unrest. The Commission suggested that the racial issues of the larger society during the 1960s had filtered through to the college campuses and on to the public high schools. It also suggested that dissent over the war fed from the fervor created by the racial issues, and that both of these created a climate which influenced the rebellion against rules, discipline and loss of personal freedom. The Commission concluded that deprivation of individual rights was at the core of unrest and that it continued where the Civil Rights Movement had ended.[36]

Trump and Hunt's (1969) study added more credence to this line of thinking. They reported that the issues raised by protesting students centered on school regulations at a third of the respondent schools, race relations and other social or political issues at a fourth of the schools, and the instructional program at half of the schools.[37]

---

[36]President's Commission on Campus Unrest, The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (Washington, D.C., 1970), pp. 51-59.

[37]J. Lloyd Trump and Jane Hunt, "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism," The Bulletin of the NASSP, No. 53, (May, 1969), pp. 150-158.

Cuban gave the following assessment:

> This unfinished revolution demands that the excluded -- blacks, women, the poor, the ethnic groups -- be granted the same rights, esteem and material abundance as affluent white Protestants. The excluded are to be included. This is a quantitative revolution, stressing jobs, housing, education, income and rights.[38]

There was no doubt that many high school students of the 1960s dissented in various ways over these rights issues. Gaddy (1971) citing Newsweek, The Chronicle of Higher Education and Anrig gave an indicator of this phenomenon:

> Indeed, according to Newsweek, some 6,000 incidents of protests were registered in America's public schools in 1969. Compare this with a 1968 study released by the United States National Student Association that showed only 221 college demonstrations on 101 American campuses the year before. Anrig avers that "the potential for disturbances in high schools is impressive. There are, after all, no more than 1,600 four-year colleges and universities in the country. But there are 26,000 high schools with two and a half times the enrollment of the colleges".[39]

Many of these protests ended in court as freedom of expression cases. The 1969 Tinker case, involving the wearing of armbands in protest of Vietnam military actions by the United States, often has been cited as the

---

[38]Cuban, Youth as a Minority, p. 55.

[39]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 4.

epitome of high school protest cases because of the definitive ruling handed down by the court. However, Kleeman illustrated that the protests had been going on for some time, before this landmark case:

> Even before Tinker, the Civil Rights movement flourished; college students were asserting their rights on campuses from Berkeley to Boston; young people of all ages were increasingly involved in antiwar and other protests -- at the Democratic National Convention, for example. Furthermore, extending the vote to 18-year-olds was the subject of prolonged debate that called attention to the rights of the young and culminated in the 26th Amendment.[40]

Whatever the causes, whatever the reasons, the end of the 1960s brought a new awareness of students' rights on the part of both students, as well as of high school officials. The New York Times (1971) reflected the gradual shift to the students' rights movement:

> With the war in Vietnam becoming less visible, with the draft lottery accepted as more equitable, with the 18-year-old vote a reality, with a lagging of time some distinctly new patterns are emerging among young people.[41]

This emerging pattern to which the Times referred consisted of the formal recognition of and formalization of students rights, by multiple forces.

In the late sixties and early seventies, numerous

---

[40]Kleeman, Responsibilities, p. 3.

[41]Kneeland, "Youth Rebellion," p. 1.

leading national organizations adopted statements in support of specific students' rights. The American Civil Liberties Union, the National Education Association, Phi Delta Kappa, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals were among the leaders, in this regard. There were many more, as well.

In 1971, the National Education Association's Representative Assembly adopted a strong statement on student rights and responsibilities -- an indication of the trend toward gradual recognition of student rights in the public schools. The same year, at the national Parent-Teachers Association convention, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland stated:

> Organization and discipline are required to maintain our institutions, but at every point when they limit individual rights, they should be re-examined.[42]

The trend filtered into all levels of public school education during the early 1970s. Students were encouraged to participate in most phases of the school process -- boards of education, departmental decision making, personnel selections, advisory groups, among others. By 1972, 15 states had adopted major students' rights and responsibilities statements, with many others

---

[42]Kleeman, Responsibilities, p. 6.

under consideration.

It was evident that with the re-evaluation of "in loco parentis" and with the strengthening of the Civil Rights Movement, during the 1960s, continuing into the 1970s, the demand for more equitable treatment of students' rights, including the right of freedom of expression, would continue. Concerning the demand for more protection of and better opportunity for high school students' freedom of expression and press, there were two major bodies of literature which were important: (1) The large number of court cases and related literature which strengthened students' constitutional right of free expression; and (2) studies that reflected the status of and nature of the high school student press and high school journalism programs.

Literature Relating to Students' Right of Free Expression

Although there was a wealth of literature which demonstrated the trend toward greater recognition of students' right of free expression, little scientific data was available in this area. Not one major study was discovered which investigated specifically high school students' right of free expression. However, a review of selected, related pieces of literature did show indicators of recent thinking, with regard to this matter.

As illustrated previously, the students' rights movement, in general, gained considerable momentum during the 1960s and early 1970s. Because much of its early thrust was evident in various forms of protest or demonstrations designed to vent feelings on issues, the exercise of free expression became one of the early battlegrounds.

Broadly speaking, any example of overt or covert demonstration of feelings or views was considered a form of expression. However, the opposition to the many manifestations of student expression was varied. Dolce assessed the situation as follows:

> Students have the right to express their religious, political, and/or philosophical beliefs. They should have the right of intellectual dissent. Those who oppose such a conclusion do so usually on the basis of one or two premises: (1) The assertion of intellectual dissent and the right to express religious, political, and/or philosophical beliefs leads to uncontrolled, disorderly conduct; (2) the major function of the school is to indoctrinate; consequently, dissent is dysfunctional.[43]

Student freedom of expression was described philosophically by MacIver (1955) as: " . . . the freedom to express and to defend views or beliefs, and the freedom to question and to differ, without authoritative

---

[43]Dolce, Sensible Assessment, p. 6.

repression and without scholastic penalization."[44]

This did not mean, however, that freedom of expression for high school students was absolute. Like other citizens, students' right of free expression was subject to limitations.

The Harvard Law Review (1968) asserted that a state:

> . . . may be able to impose much more severe restrictions on demonstrative activity at the high school level (and, presumably, at the elementary school level) conducted during school time because of its responsbility to use limited student time most efficiently.[45]

Ackerly (1969) suggested:

> Students may freely express their points of view provided they do not seek to coerce others to join in their mode of expression and provided also that they do not otherwise intrude upon the rights of others during school hours.[46]

The American Civil Liberties Union (1968) earlier had stressed a similar notion:

> Generally speaking, students have the right to express publicly and to hear any opinion on any subject which they believe is worthy of consideration. Assemblies and extra-curricular organizations are the more obvious, appropriate forums for the oral exchange of ideas and offer the opportunity for students to hear views on

---

[44]R. M. MacIver, Academic Freedom in Our Time, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 207.

[45]"Developments in the Law: Academic Freedom," Harvard Law Review, 81, (1968), p. 1132.

[46]Ackerly, Authority, p. 7.

> topics of relatively specialized interest. Whatever the forum, the faculty should defend the right of students to hear and participate in discussions of controversial issues. Restrictions may be tolerated only when they are employed to forestall events which would clearly endanger the health or safety of members of the school community or clearly and imminently disrupt the educational process.[47]

It was within the boundaries described above that conflicts arose between students seeking greater freedom of expression and school officials who sought to regulate and restrict that freedom. At what precise point expression became dangerous to others in the high school or when it may have "clearly and imminently disrupted the educational process," was the crux of the problem.

The high school student of the late 1960s and early 1970s sought solutions to this dilemma partly through open dissent but largely in the courts. Lucas (1971) observed:

> The corporate university or school board grants students no voting power. The gains of students have come from court decrees, negotiations of undue length, and the use of force. Future increases are most likely to come about in the same way.[48]

For more thorough understanding of this concept, it was valuable to examine some of the major high school freedom of expression court rulings. Because of the

---

[47]ACLU, Secondary Schools, p. 11.

[48]Lucas, "The Rights of Students," p. 587.

complexity of the area of free expression, the cases discussed herein were more simply subdivided into three categories: Verbal and Physical, Symbolic and Written Expression.

Verbal and Physical Expression

Gaddy (1971) contended that although there were several cases which touched on the issue of verbal expression, only two -- Byrd v. Gary (1960) and Brown v. Greer (1969) -- faced it directly.[49]

In Byrd, the courts upheld the school's discretionary decision of sending a group of students home for attempting to organize a boycott of the school cafeteria. In Brown, Gaddy noted that:

> . . . several students . . . had used profane language in verbally assaulting school officials, had been involved in altercations with fellow students, had disrupted classes, and had physically assaulted a teacher and the school principal.[50]

The courts upheld the subsequent suspension of the students in both cases. Clearly, the courts were concerned about the disruptive nature of the expression involved:

> . . . if actions of the type involved herein

---

[49]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 10.

[50]Ibid.

> . . . are not punished and discouraged, they will not only lead to anarchy but will result in a suppression of the liberty and autonomy that are the lifeblood of a democracy and its educational institutions.[51]

Although these two cases did not result in any relief to the high school students, it was clear that the courts had supported the right of verbal expression as it had occurred in sit-ins, student demonstrations, picketing and civil disobedience. Gatti and Gatti (1972) cited the 1966 Brown v. Louisiana ruling as evidence of this fact:

> These rights [free speech and assembly] are not confined to verbal expression. They embrace appropriate types of action which certainly include the right in a peaceable and orderly manner to protest by silent and reproachful presence, in a place where the protestant has every right to be . . .[52]

Certainly, high school students did not have unlimited right to demonstrate, but neither were peaceful demonstrations (and verbal expressions inclusive therein) totally prohibited within school premises. Gatti and Gatti noted the following legal guidelines:

1. Students have the right to assemble peaceably in school buildings, but they have no right to exclude or disrupt others from free movement in the area or building.

2. Students may not engage in destruction of property, riotous action or other unlawful

---

[51]Brown v. Greer, 296 F. Supp. (Miss., 1969), p. 602.

[52]Gatti and Gatti, Teacher and the Law, p. 168.

acts and expect protection through the First Amendment.

3. If the demonstration deprives others of the right to pursue their studies in a relatively tranquil atmosphere, it may be restricted.

4. Every student has the right to be interviewed . . . by recruiters for membership in legal organizations, but any student or group may protest against the organization if he does not interfere with the other students' right to have such an interview.[53]

Symbolic Expression

Traditionally, this area of expression was synonomously linked with the wearing or displaying of physical articles -- such as badges or armbands -- as so-called "symbols" of students' feelings concerning a particular issue. However, it often was enlargedto include other areas such as hair styles and styles of dress. These were construed as being symbolic representations of racial, cultural, ethnic or peer group identification.

The courts affected major changes in school policies, in this area, during the preceding 50 years. For example, the 1921 Pugsley v. Sellmeyer case illustrated the hard line some public school systems took concerning the personal appearance of students. In that case,

---

[53] Ibid., p. 169.

18-year-old Pearl Pugsley was denied admission to a public school in Clay County, Arkansas, for wearing talcum powder on her face. It was a violation of a board of directors' regulation. The policy read in part: "The wearing of transparent hosiery, low-necked dresses or any style of clothing tending toward immodesty in dress, or the use of face paint or cosmetics, is prohibited."[54] The regulation was upheld by the state's supreme court as being reasonable.

That sort of illustration demonstrated the depths of the "in loco parentis" thinking discussed earlier. Despite that doctrine's gradual dissipation, its effects were still evident by the 1960s, in the area of symbolic expression. During that period, for example, there was a deluge of freedom of expression cases involving student hair styles.

Kidd, Schuyver and Scott (1973) cited the 1965 Leonard v. School Committee of Attleboro as the beginning of this pheonomenon. They stated that this case, "which was decided in favor of the school's right to regulate hair styles, was the first of 68 hair style and clothing cases to be heard by the nation's high courts within a period of seven years."[55]

---

[54]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 8.

[55]Kidd, Schuyver, and Scott, "Freedom of Expression," p. 8.

A majority of the hair style cases up through 1970 were decided in favor of the school's right to regulate students' grooming behaviors. However, 1971 and 1972 saw a gradual shift in the court rulings.

Kidd, Schuyver and Scott (1973) and Gatti and Gatti (1972) both contended that the 1970 Karr v. Schmidt ruling was the case which changed the tide in favor of the students. The court ruled that the school could not deny students the right "to present himself or herself physically to the world in the manner of his or her choice," unless there was a "compelling subordinating interest in doing so."[56]

As to what those "compelling subordinating interests" were, the courts offered the following legal guidelines:

1. Appearance must yield to the demands of safety. For example, the wearing of long hair near machinery in vocational "shop" classes is necessarily subject to regulation.

2. Appearance yields to the requirements of health. For example, if the student's hair is dirty and infected with lice, he may be sent home.

3. Appearance which does not conform to the rudiments of decency may be regulated.

4. Appearance which causes actual substantial disruption may be restricted.[57]

---

[56]Gatti and Gatti, Teacher and the Law, p. 177.

[57]Ibid., pp. 177-178.

The late 1960s saw a rash of symbolic expression cases brought on by students wearing external symbols, in protest over such issues as the Vietnam War and race. The tone was set by two Mississippi cases in 1966 -- Burnside v. Byars and Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education. Both cases involved race and the students' wearing of "freedom buttons," but the outcomes were different.

In Burnside, the court issued an injunction against the school, prohibiting it from denying students the right to display the buttons. In Blackwell, the courts upheld the school's suspension of the students for wearing the buttons. In affirming a lower court's decision to uphold the suspensions, in the latter case, the federal court spelled out the difference between the two:

> The proper operation of public school systems is one of the highest and most fundamental responsibilities of the state. The school authorities in the instant case had a legitimate and substantial interest in the orderly conduct of the school and a duty to protect such substantial interests in the school's operation. Again we emphasize the difference in the conduct here involved and that involved in Burnside. In this case, the reprehensible conduct described above [loud disturbances in the halls during classes, further disturbances in school after students had been suspended, and displays of hostility toward school officials] was so inexorably tied to the wearing of the buttons that the two are not separable. In these circumstances we consider the rule of the school authorities reasonable. As we said in Burnside, "It is not for us to consider whether such rules are wise or expedient but merely whether they

> are reasonable exercise of the power and discretion of the school authorities.[58]

The court had spelled out a harbinger of things to come when it chose to define what constituted a "reasonable exercise of power and discretion." Three years later in Guzick v. Drebus, the court denied student Thomas Guzick injunctive relief when the school suspended him for wearing an antiwar button. In upholding the school's authority to prohibit such displays, the court noted that the regulation prohibited the wearing of all symbols and not just objectionable ones. As in Blackwell, the court viewed the prohibition against all symbols as reasonably related to the prevention of disruptive conduct.[59]

That same year, the court ruled on the first and most important of three "armband" cases -- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District (1969). The majority held that the wearing of black armbands protesting the Vietnam War, did not interfere with the school's discipline. In its ruling, the court strongly reaffirmed students' rights, in general, when it said:

> In our system, state operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials

---

[58]Blackwell v. Issaquena, p. 754.

[59]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, pp. 12-14.

> do not possess absolute control over their students. Students in school as well as out of school are "persons" under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the State.[60]

Moreover, Tinker established the most definitive guideline on such forms of expression. Ackerly (1971) reflected on the court's landmark decision:

> There can be no restriction on the wearing of buttons or other insignia expressing a point of view, but the rights of those not sharing that opinion must be equally protected. Wearing provocative buttons or distributing controversial literature during regular school hours cannot be permitted to disrupt the work of the school . . . Restrictions on the wearing of buttons and armbands and the distribution of literature have been upheld only where the practice materially and substantially interfered with school discipline.[61]

This so-called "substantial disruption" guideline had been cited and upheld in all subsequent, major high school expression cases since 1969. Twice more in 1969, for example, the Tinker guideline was applied to armband cases in Ferrel v. Dallas Independent School District and Einhorn v. Maus respectively.

In Ferrel, the court interpreted the school's barring of armbands as necessary to prevent disruption or

---

[60]Nelson, "Legal Relationships," p. 2.

[61]Ackerly, Authority, pp. 7-8

violence that the armbands' appearance probably would have sparked.[62] This was due to the prevailing inflammatory climate in Dallas that day. In Einhorn, there was no material or substantial threat of disruption, and the court upheld the constitutional protection of this form of expression, in this instance.[63]

Symbolic expression cases delved into the area of physical symbols being related to cultural pride as well. In Hernandez v. School District Number One, Denver, Colo. (1970), the court upheld a school regulation prohibiting black berets. Evidence was presented in court that the berets became signals of conflict, despite the fact that the berets were also means of political expression related to cultural pride. In short, the berets brought about real threat of disruption to the atmosphere of the school.[64]

In Aguirre v. Tahoka Independent School District (1971), on the other hand, the wearing of brown armbands protesting the treatment of Mexican-Americans was upheld

---

[62]Ferrel v. Dallas Independent School District, 261 F. Supp. 545 (Texas, 1966); aff'd 392 F. 2d 697 (1968); cert. denied, 393 U.S. 856 (1968), p. 552.

[63]Einhorn v. Maus, 300 F. Supp. (Pa., 1969), pp. 1170-1171.

[64]Hernandez v. School District Number One, 315 F. Supp. 289 (Denver, Colo., 1970) as cited in Harry C. Mallios, "Symbolic Expression: The New Battle Facing School Administrators," Intellect, 101:117-118, (1972).

as an accepted symbolic expression related to cultural pride. Here, the students were orderly, and disruption did not accompany the exhibited expression.[65]

By 1972, the overall legal guidelines for symbolic expression, seemed quite clear. Mallios (1972) offered the following capsuled analysis:

> . . . individuals may desire to wear a particular type of symbol or insignia, and the courts have interpreted this as behavior constituting communication of an idea which is subject to protection of the Constitution. Nevertheless, explicitly implied is that the rights of students not sharing the expression exhibited should not be abused and, therefore, they are equally protected. When the expression exhibited produces a disturbance or disruption to the school or violates the legal rights of other students, restrictions by school authorities prohibiting this expression have been upheld.[66]

Written Expression

Freedom of the press had been one of the most long-standing and fiercely defended areas of free expression in the United States' history. Trager (1970) asserted that the same condition was true for the high school student press, as for the professional press:

> High school and college students are under the same First Amendment protections as the rest of the citizenry; they do not relinquish those rights as a condition for school attendance. The courts

---

[65]Aquirre v. Tahoka Independent School District, 311 F. Supp. 644, (N.D. Texas, 1970), cited by Mallios, "Symbolic Expression," p. 118.

[66]Ibid., p. 118.

> have said that the Bill of Rights guaranties are not limited to any one class of people and that juveniles and students are not exceptions to this. The Fourteenth Amendment applies to all state educational institutions and protects the rights of school children against unreasonable rules and regulations, including restrictions against freedom of the press . . . Particularly are school officials forbidden to allow only expressions of facts and opinions which they wish to have read. The Court has said that freedom of expression would not exist if allowed only in specific places at specific times by a benevolent government. The Constitution says no abridgement of free expression and "it means what it says." The courts have made clear that free press does not mean freedom for approved attitudes only, and that simply because school officials do not wish to contend with dissident attitudes or because those attitudes "may cause trouble," school authorities cannot prohibit such writings.[67]

However, it was in this latter area alluded to by Trager that several important court cases were decided during the 1960s. Gaddy (1971) observed: "Unauthorized or underground publications have prompted most of the legal action involving the written expression of precollege students."[68] Moreover, during this period, in which student dissent was frequent, the so-called underground press in the high school was common.

Estimates vary on the number of high school

---

[67]Robert Trager, "Freedom of the Scholastic Press: Landmark Legal Cases," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, Washington D.C., Aug. 17, 1970 (mimeographed), pp. 12-13.

[68]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 16.

underground newspapers, during this period. A 1969 article in Nation's Schools, for example, placed the total at approximately 200 for the 1969-70 period.[69] A New York Times article in the same year, however, estimated the total to be closer to 1,000 for the same period.[70] Whatever the precise number, they apparently were met with less than open arms by high school officials. More importantly, these student newspapers -- both school sponsored and non-school sponsored -- that were cast into litigation, produced several important guidelines for high school press freedom.

Two cases were particularly noteworthy, in this regard: Zucker v. Panitz (1969) and Scoville v. Joliet High School District (1970).

Zucker v. Panitz was perhaps the landmark case in freedom of the high school press. At issue, was the right of the student newspaper to publish a group of students' antiVietnam War advertisement. The advertisement was prohibited by the school's principal. The publication was a school sponsored newspaper. A

---

[69]"High School Students Are Rushing Into Print -- and Court," Nation's Schools, 83 (Jan., 1969), p. 30.

[70]Leth S. King, "Defiant Students Keep The Underground Press Rolling," New York Times (May 19, 1969), p. 35.

Federal District Court ruled that the principal's actions were unconstitutional. The court concluded that since the newspaper was open to free expression of ideas in the news, editorial, and letters columns, then:

> . . . it is unfair in the light of the free speech doctrine, to close it as a forum to this specific idea . . . It would be both incongruous and dangerous for this court to hold that students who wish to express their views on matters intimately related to them, through traditionally accepted nondisruptive modes of communication, may be precluded from doing so.[71]

In Scoville v. Joliet High School District (1970), two students were suspended for distributing a nonschool literary journal. Several items in the journal attacked school regulations and various school officials, using language that the court considered beyond constitutional protection. In upholding the suspensions, the court said:

> Where speech takes the form of immediate incitement to disregard legitimate administrative regulations necessary to orderly maintenance of a public high school system . . . and where speech is directed to an audience which, because of its immaturity, is more likely to react to the detriment of the school system, then that language is not protected by the First Amendment, and any claimed First Amendment rights must be subjugated to the good of the school.[72]

---

[71]Zucker v. Panitz, 299 F. Supp. 102 (S.D. N. Y., 1969), quoted in Trager, "Freedom of the Scholastic Press," p. 32.

[72]Scoville v. Board of Education, 286 F. Supp. 988 (Ill., 1968); rev'd, 425 F 2d 10 (1970), quoted in Trager, "Freedom of the Scholastic Press," p. 33.

Further, the court echoed the philosophical tone set forth in the Tinker case when it said that First Amendment rights were as fully protected within the educational system as outside of it, subject to the limitations enunciated in Tinker. The same principle was articulated on the college level two years earlier, in the Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education (1967). The court had said plainly: "A state cannot force a college student to forfeit his constitutionally protected right of freedom of expression as a condition to his attending a state-supported institution."[73]

That right was upheld for high school students, as well. The fact that Dickey involved a university and Scoville involved a high school was termed "of no importance" by the court because the relevant rules and principles of the First Amendment apply to both equally.

Other cases involving the high school press tended to reflect the guidelines set in the Zucker and Scoville cases, although not necessarily with the same outcomes. Contrasting with Scoville, for example, was Sullivan v. Houston Independent School District (1971),

---

[73]Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education, 273 F. Supp. 613 (M.D. Ala., 1967), as quoted in NEA, Code of Student Rights, p. 23.

in which the suspensions of two students for distributing underground newspapers were overruled. The court said it appeared that the suspensions occurred because the administrators did not like the papers' contents, and that rules had been formulated after the fact. The court issued a permanent injunction against school officials:

> . . . from imposing serious disciplinary sanction, in the absence of precise and narrowly drawn regulations, upon students who write, print, distribute, or otherwise engage in the publication of newspapers either on or off of school premises, during either school hours or nonschool hours, unless such activities materially and substantially disrupt the normal operations of the school.[74]

While the court reinforced the basic principle of Tinker in that case, it also noted that if the school drew "precise" rules, distribution could be barred.

In Schwartz v. Schuker (1969), a student was suspended for flagrantly defying school authorities by attempting to distribute a nonschool newspaper, despite specific school regulations prohibiting such activity. The court upheld the suspension and said in part:

> While there is a certain aura of sacredness attached to the First Amendment, nevertheless

---

[74]Sullivan v. Houston Independent School District, 307 F. Supp., 1346 (S.D. Texas, 1969) as quoted in Trager, "Freedom of the Scholastic Press," p. 33a.

> these First Amendment rights must be balanced against the duty and obligations of the state to educate students in an orderly and decent manner to protect the rights not of a few but of all of the students in the school system . . . Gross disrespect and contempt for the officials of an educational institution may be justification not only for suspension but also for expulsion of a student.[75]

Shortly after Schwartz, a federal court in Michigan reversed the expulsion of a student in the Vought v. Van Buren Public Schools (1969) case. The student had been expelled for possession and distribution of a tabloid newspaper that was said to have violated the school's obscenity regulations. The court ruled against the school because evidence was introduced in court illustrating that the four-letter words found in the newspaper -- which had been the basis for its prohibition and the student's suspension -- were also found in other required readings available in the school's library. The court concluded:

> We are compelled to reject the position of the defendants [school officials] in this case because it is preposterous on its face. It is contrary to any sense of fairness or consistency -- a student, placed in the situation in which this school has placed this student, is required to make a judgment that we, as a court would find

---

[75]Schwartz v. Schuker, 298 F. Supp. 238, 242 (U.S. Dist. Ct. N.Y., 1969) as quoted in Gatti and Gatti, Teacher and the Law, p. 173.

difficult to make.[76]

Out of these cases, and others, the courts were reasonably consistent in their adherence to the "substantial disruption" principle found in Tinker. The seeming inconsistencies of the rulings could have been attributed to the unique technicalities of each individual case. Gatti and Gatti (1972) summarized the lesson to be gained from these high school press cases:

> Where the school has opened the newspaper as a forum for the dissemination of student ideas, broad censorship of editorial policy is not warranted. Limited review is permissible, but the students have a right to express their criticisms or ideas when such expression will not clearly materially and substantially affect the discipline and operation of the school.[77]

Similarly, it was demonstrated that nonschool newspapers -- the so-called underground newspapers -- were not absolutely barred from the high school. The potential for such action appeared to be greater, but the legal principles which applied to school-sponsored newspapers were applicable here also. Gatti and Gatti offered these conclusions:

1. In all cases, ideological censorship must be avoided.

2. Underground newspapers may be restricted and

---

[76]Vought v. Van Buren Public Schools, 306 F. Supp. 1396 (Mich., 1969), as quoted in Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 10.

[77]Gatti and Gatti, Teacher and the Law, p. 172.

> the responsible students disciplined, if the paper is libelous, clearly obscene, or is such that it would reasonably lead school officials to forecast material or substantial disruption of the educational process or the rights of others.
>
> 3. No publications may be totally prohibited; but in the interests of safety, regulations may be put on the times and places for distribution.[78]

Much of the courts; thinking gradually was incorporated into the various state students' rights codes which were alluded to earlier in this chapter. One reflection of this was noted by Glasser and Levine (1972). The authors quoted the chancellor of the New York City Schools, who commented on the Matter of Sklarsky, et. al. case:

> It should require little argument that the preventing of publication of an article because it "called into disrepute the school administration" is to practice the very censorship of ideas and stifling of criticism and dissent that is prohibited by the Statement of Rights and Responsibilities, as well as by the First Amendment.[79]

Overall, it was clear that students had the right of free expression. Although the courts were reluctant to intervene in the relationship between high school

---

[78] Ibid., p. 174.

[79] Ira Glasser and Alan Levine, New York Civil Liberties Union Student Rights Project Report on the First Two Years, 1970-72, (New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, Sept. 1972), p. 72.

students and school administrations, they showed a tendency to do so when students' rights were abridged. In all areas of free expression -- symbolic speech, demonstrations, newspapers and personal appearance -- the courts showed that freedom is relatively absolute. But, it was equally clear that these rights of free expression could not be infringed upon unless the schools demonstrated that the activities "materially and substantially interfered with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school.[80]

Literature Related to High School Journalism and Student Newspapers

The fact that the courts considerably strengthened high school students' right of free expression and press did not necessarily mean that the status of high school journalism and student publications improved. Although high school newspapers and high school journalism coursework typically had been considered one and the same, in many high schools, the two served separate functions and needed to be examined individually.

High School Journalism Courses

The development and growth of the so-called

---

[80]Gatti and Gatti, Teacher and the Law, p. 172.

"communications revolution" during the 1940s and after brought increased interest in the study of the mass communications, their processes and their effects. It was inevitable that the demand for greater emphasis of this and the mass media it included would likewise increase at the high school level. Such was the case at least since the 1950s.

McLuhan (1956) pointed to the need to explore the mass media more fully, in high school journalism curriculum.[81] Grieco (1967) and Gerbner (1968) suggested that the study of the mass media should be a requirement in the high school curriculum.[82] Organizations such as the Curriculum Committee of the Journalism Education Association (1968) outlined extensive units in mass media for high school journalism courses.

However, studies indicated that there was a lack of emphasis on journalism coursework, in the high school.

---

[81]Marshall McLuhan discussed at length the need for "maximizing the various features of our new media," in Educational Effects of Mass Media of Communication," Teachers College Record, LVII (March, 1956), pp. 400-410.

[82]Marie Grieco, "Communications, the Undiscovered Country," Library Journal, XCII (Feb. 15, 1967), pp. 845-848; and George Gerbner, "Smaller Than Life: Teachers and Schools in the Mass Media," Problems and Controversies in Television and Radio, ed. by Harry J. Skornia and Jack William Kitson (Palo Alto: Pacific Books, Publishers, 1968), p. 205.

Tebbel (1965), in calling for more emphasis, contended that journalism education, in general, was not meeting the demands placed on it by this communications revolution.[83] This basic argument was supported by Cranford (1960), Boyd (1960), Perry and Jackson (1964), Campbell (1969), Bennett (1969), Windhauser and Click (1972) and Gibbs (1972).[84]

Campbell (1969), for example, in his study of seven middle western states concluded that despite the dictates of the times, little had changed in high school journalism courses, in the last few decades. He said, in part: "There is relatively little evidence of the existence of journalism courses which stress mass media in society, as phenomena the consumer should understand."[85]

---

[83]John R. Tebbel, "Journalism Education: Myth and Reality," Saturday Review, (Nov. 13, 1965), p. 95.

[84]Robert J. Cranford, "Where Are Career Choices For Journalism Made?" Journalism Quarterly, XXXVII (Summer, 1960), pp. 422-424; John A. Boyd, "High School Journalism Instruction in Indiana," Journalism Quarterly, XXXVII (Autumn, 1960), pp. 586-587; Murvin H. Perry and Rex Jackson, "Career Guidance Problems in Kansas High Schools," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Autumn, 1964), pp. 587-588; Laurence R. Campbell, Journalism in Middle West High Schools in 1969 (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1969); Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma; John W. Windhauser and J. William Click, "High School Journalism Courses: Teachers and Perceived Professional Needs in Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania," (a paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism conference, Carbondale, Ill., Aug., 1972); and Annette Gibbs, Ten Guidelines for Principals and a Free Student Press (Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia, School of Education, 1972).

[85]Campbell, Journalism in Middle West, p. 21.

There were a number of reasons related to this general lack of emphasis on journalism curriculum. Bennett (1969) suggested the following analysis:

> Lack of journalism curricula, journalism teachers with inadequate backgrounds for teaching high school journalism, lack of common purpose between administrators and teachers for the journalism program, too much control by principals and not enough freedom for advisers, numerous inconsistencies between principals' attidues and the realities of existing high school journalism situations, are some of the major conditions that are indicative of a machine that is in dire need of repair.[86]

Others supported that line of thinking. As far back as 1939, Campbell was stressing the need for high school journalism teachers with better training in journalism. He noted that many authorities at that time were recommending at least six college journalism courses for teachers of high school journalism. In the same study, Campbell said that high school principals "apparently give little thought to their journalism teachers specialized training in journalism."[87]

Cranford (1960), Boyd (1960), Balk (1966), Perry and Jackson (1964), Bennett (1969), Campbell (1968, 1970, 1971) all found in separate studies that high school

---

[86]Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma, p.60.

[87]Laurence R. Campbell, "Training Sponsors for High School Journalism," Journalism Quarterly XVI (Dec., 1939), p. 368.

journalism teachers had serious background deficiencies, in journalism.[88] Boyd (1960), for example, discovered that 58 per cent of Indiana journalism teachers did not have journalism backgrounds.[89] Bennett (1969) found that 55 per cent of the high school journalism teachers in his Oklahoma study had six hours or less of college journalism coursework.[90] Furthermore, Campbell's (1971) study showed that only 55 per cent of the 612 principals from six states attempted to employ journalism teachers with journalism backgrounds.[91] By comparison, the same study revealed that in teaching areas such as physical education, English, music, and others, principals attempted to hire teachers with the appropriate expertise,

---

[88]Cranford, "Journalism Made?"; Boyd, "Instruction in Indiana"; Alfred Balk, "Where Are Tomorrow's Journalists?" Saturday Review Jan. 8, 1966, pp. 105-106; Perry and Jackson, "Kansas High School"; Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma; Laurence R. Campbell, The High School Newspaper as a Medium of Good Will (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1968); Laurence R. Campbell, Student Press Codes with High School Unrest, 1970 (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1970); and Laurence R. Campbell, The High School Newspaper as a Public Relation Medium (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1971).

[89]Boyd, "Instruction in Indiana," p. 587.

[90]Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma, p. 20.

[91]Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 5.

in more than 80 per cent of the cases. Campbell concluded that not requiring journalism teachers and newspaper advisers to have journalism backgrounds was one of the greatest failures of the high school principal, in improving quality in this area.[92]

Similar studies found other factors which contributed to weaknesses of high school journalism education. Perry and Jackson (1964) found that guidance counselors were poorly informed about the journalism program.[93] Horine (1966) concluded that there was too much control by authoritative administrators.[94] Kimball and Lubell (1960) found that high school students viewed journalism as being low in prestige.[95]

In addition to these problems, evidence demonstrated that high school journalism lacked support in other ways. Bennett (1969) and Boyd (1960) both found that a majority of high school journalism teachers were not given a lighter teaching load, in order to handle their

---

[92]Ibid.

[93]Perry and Jackson, "Kansas High Schools," p. 588.

[94]Don Horine, "How Principals, Advisers and Editors View the High School Newspaper," Journalism Quarterly, XLIII (Summer, 1966), p. 345.

[95]Penn T. Kimball and Samuel Lubell, "High School Students Attitudes Toward Journalism as a Career," Journalism Quarterly, XXXVII (Summer, 1960), p. 422.

newspaper advisement responsibilities, received no release time to work on publications during school hours and received no extra-duty pay for advising student publications.[96]

Campbell (1971) concluded that most high schools were very lax in meeting minimal journalism needs in the areas of writing tools, typewriters, teaching aids, library books and the budgeting of funds.[97]

High School Newspapers

Ackerly (1969) emphasized the following:

> School-sponsored publications should be free from policy restrictions outside of the normal rules for responsible journalism. These publications should be as free as other newspapers in the community to report the news and to editorialize . . . Non-school sponsored papers and other publications, including an "underground press," should not be prohibited, assuming that they, too, observe the normal rules for responsible journalism.[98]

Manchikes (1972) echoing a similar theme contended that:

> It would seem that school publications are free to express ideas of the students, even though they are controversial, unpopular or even criticize school administrators so long as they are not libelous, obscene, pornographic, or so

---

[96]Boyd, "Instruction in Indiana," p. 587.

[97]Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 4.

[98]Ackerly, Authority, p. 17.

> inflammatory or irresponsible to such an extent that they endanger or disrupt orderly administration of school activities, or create disciplinary problems which result in or create such disruption.[99]

These two statements were among many which supported the basic free press principles articulated by the courts, as was documented earlier in this study. Nonetheless, the evidence suggested that the status of the high school newspaper, in practice, was reflected in a different light.

Generally, the status of the high school newspaper was inadequate. That condition was augmented by a number of physical factors, as well as administrative attitudes toward student newspapers. Campbell (1970) assessed the situation as follows:

> Student journalists often are handicapped in producing a timely newspaper which provides leadership that exhibits perception, maturity, and responsibilities, for these reasons:
>
> 1. Often their adviser is an English teacher who never has enrolled in a college journalism course.
> 2. Facilities of the publication center are not designed for journalism, though other curricular and co-curricular programs have the facilities they need.
> 3. Financing the newspaper is difficult, for about one-fourth face a deficit each year.[100]

Campbell (1971) provided further perspective on the relationship between the newspaper adviser's background

---

[99]Alice Manchikes, "The Role of the High School Newspaper: Problems and Solutions," Kentucky English Bulletin, Vol. 22, No. 1, (Fall, 1972), p. 22.

[100]Campbell, High School Unrest 1970, p. 6.

and the status of the newspaper, in other studies. In this study, he noted that the greatest weakness in improving the high school newspaper was not requiring newspaper advisers to have journalism backgrounds.[101] In support of this, Campbell previously had concluded in a 1969 study of several states, that the higher the number of hours in journalism an adviser had, the more sound was his/her high school's newspaper.[102]

In the same study, Campbell observed several other weaknesses of the newspaper adviser. He noted that it appeared the adviser had changed little in 40 years, in terms of innovative approaches to his/her job. This in turn affected the quality and status of the paper.

Perhaps the most critical problem area for high school student newspapers was in regard to censorship of the copy content, by either school administrators or faculty advisers. Many of the court cases dealt with earlier in this chapter, reflected this condition, in several areas of expression. Bennett (1969), James (1970), Campbell (1969, 1970, 1970, 1971) and Manchikes (1972) all supported the notion that censorship was

---

[101] Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 5.

[102] Campbell, Journalism in Middle West, p. 19.

prevalent in high school newspaper situations.[103] James (1970) indicated the nature of censorship, as it was practiced in Arizona high schools:

> Pre-publication censorship typically takes one or more of the following forms: (1) By "understood" prohibitions developed through previous years; (2) By specific prohibitions issued yearly by the administration; (3) By reading of pre-published copy by an administrator; (4) By cutting off or a threat of cutting off funds . . . That problem becomes still more explicit as one reads the accounts of post-publication censorship. One courageous journalism teacher (whose paper won a national first place in feature writing recently) reported that funds were cut off in 1968 for speaking out against existing school policies.[104]

In his 1970 assessment of the high school newspaper situation, Campbell commented on the censorship role of principals:

> Worst of all, principals at times insist on censorship of any content with which they disagree, in effect frustrating students taught to think for themselves and support their convictions.[105]

---

[103] Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma; Max James, "Propaganda or Education? Censorship and School Journalism," Arizona English Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Oct. 1970); Ibid., p. 22; Campbell, High School Unrest 1970, p. 6; Campbell, Human Equations, p. 32; Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 5; and Manchikes, "Problems and Solutions," p. 18.

[104] James, "Propaganda," p. 38.

[105] Campbell, High School Unrest 1970, p. 6.

Campbell (1971) observed the repercussions of censorship actions taken by the principal:

> Repressive measures alienate staffs, sometimes impelling them to stress the adversary role of the newspaper or to shift to underground newspaper staffs. Censorship always damages internal morale.[106]

Much of the reason for censorship appeared to lie in the basic attitudes held by principals and advisers, toward the role of the high school newspaper. For example, regarding the possibility that repression by administrators contributed to underground newspapers springing up, one of Campbell's (1970) studies concluded that principals and advisers did not perceive this. A large majority of both groups indicated that they did not believe they were to blame for the presence of underground newspapers, in high schools.[107]

Other attitude studies and sources gave further insight into why there was a discrepancy between students' right of free press and repressive behaviors by administrators and advisers. Wolseley and Campbell (1954), Bentel (1956), the Committee on Modern Journalism (1962), and the American Civil Liberties Union (1968), all stressed the need to allow high school journalists to have the

---

[106] Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 5.

[107] Campbell, Human Equation, p. 45.

freedom to make errors and function independently.[108] Wolseley and Campbell (1954) stated the position in these terms:

> If students with proper instruction and guidance cannot develop enough good judgment themselves to decide what should or should not be printed, there seems to be little excuse for secondary education.[109]

However, the evidence suggested that principals and advisers saw the situation differently. Horine (1966) and Atwood and MacLean (1967) both revealed that principals viewed the high school newspaper as serving primarily a public relations function, for the school. These same two studies showed that principals believed that criticism of the school and/or the administration, by the newspaper, should be avoided.[110]

Bennett (1969) concluded that:

> It appears that most principals in this sample favor prior censorship of student publications. Eighty-three per cent of the principals in this study agree that the student newspaper . . .

---

[108] Roland E. Wolseley and Laurence Campbell, Exploring Journalism, 2nd ed. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954); Dwight Bentel, "College Press Also Should Have Freedom," Editor and Publisher, April 14, 1956; Committee on Modern Journalism, Modern Journalism, ed. by Seigfried Mandel (New York: Pittman Publishing Corp., 1962); and ACLU, Secondary Schools.

[109] Wolseley and Campbell, Exploring Journalism, p. 441.

[110] Horine, "How Principals, Advisers and Editors," p. 343; L. Erwin Atwood and Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr., "How Principals, Advisers, Parents and Pupils View Journalism," Journalism Quarterly, XLIV, (Spring, 1967), p. 78.

> needs to be approved by the administration before publishing.[111]

Horine (1966) revealed a similar finding and noted that many principals, in his study, read copy, exercised censorship over the copy and influenced editorial policy, prior to publication.[112]

Campbell (1970) revealed that both advisers and principals opposed newspaper copy that dealt with controversial issues, opposed copy that hurt the school's image and believed copy should be censored that either the principal or the adviser did not like. Campbell added that advisers appeared to support free press for students, theoretically, but that they maintained authoritarian controls. He concluded:

> If we are to teach students to think, how can we advise them never to question the principal? Is the adviser infallible -- or is he so ineffectual that he cannot teach students to exercise judgment in editing copy. Certainly the adviser who says the staff should eliminate content he does not like is an autocrat -- not someone teaching American citizenship.[113]

---

[111]Bennett, Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma, p. 49.

[112]Horine, "How Principals, Advisers and Editors," p. 344.

[113]Campbell, Human Equation, p. 44.

Earlier, Campbell (1957) had reflected on the importance of the principal's role in aiding the student newspaper: "Superior student publications usually are produced only in schools in which the principal gives student publications sustained public support."[114]

In his 1971 study, Campbell further assessed the importance of the principal's involvement in these terms:

> If high school newspapers are to improve, the principal must take active, positive, constructive steps to improve it. He must set up the conditions under which the staff and adviser can make it a success.[115]

Campbell listed the conditions referred to above as being: (1) Develop a set of policy guidelines that are brief, clear and flexible; (2) promote the news function and see that the money is available to do it well; (3) insist on truth to enable the body to be informed about school matters; and (4) avoid censorship.[116]

One additional, important manifestation of high school press censorship lay in the area of human relations. Censorship deters student journalists from

---

[114]Laurence R. Campbell, A Principal's Guide to High School Journalism, (Iowa City, Iowa: Quill and Scroll Society, 1957), p. 6.

[115]Campbell, Public Relations Medium, p. 5.

[116]Ibid.

dealing with social problems and group interrelationships within the school. Concerning this potential human relations function of the high school press, Campbell (1970) suggested that student unrest was a challenge to American high school newspapers. He contended, however, that efforts by the high school press to give leadership "have elicited both criticism and censorship."[117]

In further dealing with the "human equation," Campbell (1970) emphasized the following:

> What does it matter if the principal fails the minority of the students in journalism and student publishing? To be sure, principals have been confronted with unrest, racial problems, drug problems and others. Some of the unrest may have been eliminated had there been effective communication. And this kind of communication cannot be achieved through a monthly newspaper.[118]

No definitive studies were found which investigated this specific relationship between the high school press and the human relations needs in the high school. However, some studies offered a glimpse at its potential.

Schrader (1969) noted that in a disadvantaged high school, a newspaper with an unbiased policy of focusing on the school's conditions, problems, activities, and other information relevant to the students' interests

---

[117]Campbell, High School Unrest 1970, p. 1.

[118]Campbell, Human Equation, p. 26.

would help to build the students' sense of self respect, pride and participation in the school.[119]

Gaddy (1971) supported this, in tone, by stating one condition for improving the value of the newspaper in the high school as being:

> Endorsing humanism as a right -- i.e., the right of all individuals (including students) to be treated with the same dignity and respect as other members of society.[120]

One possible indication of why principals did not appear to encourage this kind of role by the high school press was offered by Guilliams (1972). He concluded that the majority of educators either did not understand the relation between student rights and the principles underlying the democratic process, or they did not feel the students should be given the same rights as other American citizens.[121]

The long-range importance of such an understanding

---

[119]Steven Schrader, "The Role of the Newspaper in a Disadvantaged School," Bulletin of the Columbia Scholastic Press Advisers Association, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Jan., 1969), pp. 3-5.

[120]Gaddy, Directions from the 1960s, p. 55.

[121]John D. Guilliams, Educators' Attitudes Concernino Rights of Students and Their Relationship to Teachers' Assessment of Student Classroom Behavior, (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1972).

was noted by Maynard (1955). He concluded that attitudes and feelings of pupils of democratically run schools were proved different from the attitudes and feelings of pupils of authoritarian schools, in that the former students expressed a more favorable attitude toward their school. The study contended that whether or not a principal worked in an authoritarian or democratic manner, with regard to students' rights, was an important factor, in this situation.[122]

---

[122]Honor E. Maynard, A Study of Pupil Human Relations Within the School as Influenced by the Principal's Pattern of Behavior, (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Flordia, 1955).

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

A list of 133 Oklahoma high schools, which offered journalism coursework, was provided by the State Department of Education. This represented a complete list of all high schools offering journalism in the entire state, as reported to the State Department of Education. For this study, the principals and journalism advisers were contacted in each of these high schools. It is important to note, that the journalism teacher and newspaper adviser were considered one and the same, in each of the 133 schools, despite the fact that they were two distinct responsibilities.

In each case, the principal and the journalism adviser were sent separate questionnaires containing items which investigated the concerns of this study. A response was received from at least one of the two basic respondents, in all but 13 of the 133 high schools contacted (90 per cent). Of this total there were 98 responses from principals (73.6 per cent) and 94 responses from journalism advisers (70.7 per cent).

For the purpose of analysis, these respondents were further subdivided and grouped in two ways. First, each high school was placed into one of four enrollment classifications; and secondly, each high school was grouped according to whether it was physically segregated or desegregated. This information was provided either by the high schools themselves or by the State Department of Education.

Of the 120 high schools which responded, through one or both of the questionnaires, 53 were classified as segregated high schools and 67 were classified as desegregated high schools. These were based on the previously indicated definitions of those two classifications.

The four enrollment classifications were determined by consulting the Oklahoma Secondary School Activities Association. Based on information provided by that organization, the following enrollment groups were determined:

Group 1 - 1,000 students or more.

Group 2 - 450 to 999 students.

Group 3 - 225 to 449 students.

Groups 4 - 224 students or less.

The totals of these various groupings were recorded in Table 1 and Table 2.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF TWO PRIMARY GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS BASED ON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY (N = 133)

Principals		Advisers	
N	%	N	%
98	73.6	94	70.7

Number of high schools responding in one or both groups = 120

TABLE 2

ENROLLMENT AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION BREAKDOWNS BASED ON ALL RESPONDING HIGH SCHOOLS (N = 120)

Enrollment Classifications					Racial Classifications		
1,000 or More	450 to 999	225 to 449	224 or less	Total	Physically Segregated High Schools	Physically Desegregated High Schools	Total
33	20	37	30	120	53	67	120

The rationale behind subdividing and grouping the subjects into racial and enrollment classifications was that high schools with differing compositions and characteristics might have problems that were unique unto

themselves. A high school that had a substantial racial mix would probably have problems and concerns that differed from those schools which were more racially homogeneous. This appeared to be true even though psychologically integrating the members of a student body needed to be accomplished whether the minority individuals constituted less than ten per cent or more than ten per cent of the student body. However, psychological integration appeared much more difficult, the higher the percentage of minority students.

Construction and Description of Instruments

All subjects in the 133 high schools (principals and journalism advisers) were mailed questionnaires containing information and attitude items and were asked to complete the questionnaire, by responding to each item. All principals were sent one identical questionnaire, and all journalism advisers were sent a separate questionnaire. Both questionnaires consisted of items designed to provide information regarding the two, major concerns of this study, namely, freedom of expression and press, and the role of student newspapers and journalism courses in advancing human relations and human rights. Many of the items were derived from three sources: (1) Bennett's 1969 study; (2) Bennett's 1972 pilot study on the same area; and (3) definitive studies

by Dr. Laurence Campbell, of Florida State University, during the 1960s and early 1970s. These studies were discussed in Chapter II.

The principals' questionnaire consisted of two sections of rating items, using a five-point scale throughout. Figure 1 provides an example of a typical rating item used.

FIGURE 1

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE RATING ITEM

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
High school students have the right of free expression	1	2	3	4	4

Section A of the principals' questionnaire was one of the two sections designed to probe attitudes concerning the major hypotheses of the study and contained 58 items originally. Section B was the second section designed to resolve the hypotheses and consisted of 10 descriptions of realistic human relations-human rights problem situations, which could have arisen in a high school. The situations, although contrived, were based on actual cases reported by the American Civil Liberties Union, or ones originated from the researcher's personal experience in public high schools. Each principal was asked to rate each situation according to

the extent to which he felt each should be explored and discussed in the student newspaper. The same five-point scale was used for rating.

The journalism advisers' questionnaire consisted of four sections. All sections contained rating items. This questionnaire was more extensive than the principals', whereas the principals' questionnaire consisted entirely of attitude items, and items about actual contents of both the student newspaper and the journalism coursework.

Section A consisted of the same identical 58 attitude items contained in the principals' questionnaire. Section B consisted of the same 10 realistic, human relations-human rights problem situations, that were contained in section B of the principals' questionnaire. Section C consisted of 25 items designed to describe the actual contents of the journalism coursework. Advisers were asked to rate each item according to the amount of emphasis it was given in the coursework. The following five-point scale was used in this section: Chief Emphasis (1), High Emphasis (2), Moderate Emphasis (3), Little Emphasis (4), No Emphasis (5). Section D contained 34 items designed to reveal the actual contents of the student newspaper. Advisers were asked to rate each item according to the degree of frequency with which each item appeared in the newspaper. The following

five-point scale was used for rating: Always (1), Frequently (2), Occasionally (3), Rarely (4), Never (5).

Three steps were utilized in validating this instrument. First, the form and structure of the questionnaires were based largely on previous questionnaires utilized in a 1969 study by Bennett, which had been both pretested and post-tested at the time. Secondly, a 1972 summer pilot study had been conducted by Bennett, utilizing principals and students at the University of Oklahoma. That study was designed to investigate the same major concerns which were investigated in this research study. In that pilot study, a group of 10 non-participants were asked to indicate those items which best explored the concerns of the study and which ones did not. Many of the attitude items were subsequently used in the present instrument, after appropriate revisions had been made. Thirdly, factor analysis was employed to eliminate those items which did not measure the major concerns of the study.

Later, chi square goodness of fit tests were utilized to ensure the normality of population distribution and the subsequent validity of the significance tests. The final statistical tests employed were stepwise discriminant function analyses. These further illustrated that the content validity was

sufficient because they correctly classified the respondents, in more than 75 per cent of the cases. The combination of these three, major steps, and the subsequent statistical tests referred to here, produced an instrument and a study which were valid in this instance, and for future studies in this area.

Procedure

The procedure of this study was the testing of the hypotheses, by administering the two questionnaires to the major groups of respondents -- advisers and principals -- in all of the participating high schools. These two groups were defined as:

1. High school principals in those high schools which had both student newspapers and journalism courses offered.

2. High school journalism advisers, in the same high schools.

These two groups were administered an instrument totaling 68 identical attitude items. These items were later condensed into six clusters (factors), through the use of factor analysis. These factors served as the primary basis for formulating and testing six null hypotheses. The advisers' questionnaire also contained two other information sections, discussed earlier in this chapter, which were intended to shed additional light on

the results of the primary attitude study.

The 68 attitude items were first analyzed by factor analysis, in order to determine statistically which items would best describe what all 68 were intended to do and eliminate the unnecessary items in the process. The factor analysis threw out 31 items and concluded that the concerns of the study would be described most parsimoniously through the remaining 37 items. These 37 items clustered into six distinct factors (a factor is set of items which share a pattern of relationship). These six factors were subsequently labeled in the following manner:

Factor 1 - Reporting Human Relations Problems in the Newspaper

Factor 2 - Basic Human Relations Beliefs

Factor 3 - Basic Human Rights Beliefs

Factor 4 - Reporting Conflict and Intergroup Relations in the Newspaper

Factor 5 - Censorship and Control of the Student Newspaper

Factor 6 - Basic Freedom of Expression and Press Beliefs

Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, were used to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, which dealt with the human relations-human rights role of the journalism program.

Factors 5 and 6 were used to test hypotheses 4, 5, and 6, which dealt with the students' right to exercise freedom of press.

These six factors -- described as hypothetical constructs -- were then used as the basis for constructing the six null hypotheses to be tested, that were alluded to above. Chi square goodness of fit tests were applied as discussed earlier in this chapter. Stepwise discriminant function analysis was next utilized to test these hypotheses, using the six factors as independent variables. In this manner, significant differences between the two groups were determined, with regard to their attitudes toward the two major concerns of the study -- i.e., the human relations-human rights role of high school journalism and students' exercising of freedom of press. It also determined the relationship and significant differences between advisers and principals when combined and classified into high school enrollment size groups and racial groups, with regard to the group attitudes toward the same six factors.

The results were then interpreted and used to accept or reject the null hypotheses. The results of the data from the other two sections of the advisers' questionnaires -- which provided additional insight into the major questions of the study -- were recorded and

discussed in relation to the major attitude findings.

In the spring of 1975, the discriminant function analyses were redone because of an original error in programming procedure. The results were reinterpreted accordingly.

Administering the Test

The questionnaires were mailed to principals and journalism advisers, in each of the 133 sample high schools, during the spring of 1973. Each questionnaire mailing included a cover letter and a pre-addressed and stamped return envelope. After one month, approximately 35 per cent of the subjects overall had responded, and the first followup letter was mailed, including all meterials again. This produced an increased response rate up to approximately 53 per cent, by May. A second and final followup was employed, by telephoning each subject who had not yet responded. This effort, raised the return percentage to its ultimate levels of 73.6 per cent and 70.7 per cent, for principals and advisers respectively.

All collection of data was completed by mid-June and was recorded for statistical analysis. This material was then placed in appropriate tables.

Each questionnaire was marked with a number, prior to being mailed to the respondents. This procedure enabled one to determine which subjects, in which high

schools, had not responded and which one had responded. This information was necessary for followup purposes. A master flow chart was maintained as returns came in, for all participating high schools. This chart recorded which high schools had responded, which of the two major respondents in each high school had responded, whether the responding high school was a physically segregated and desegregated high school, and what the enrollment of each responding high school was.

Design

This investigation employed a mail questionnaire method, with subsequent utilization of factor analysis, chi square goodness of fit tests, and stepwise discriminant function analysis techniques.

Factor analysis helped to validate the study, as discussed earlier.

The literature of several multivariate statistical sources, the assistance of Robert Black of the University of Oklahoma's School of Education, and the assistance of Dr. Thomas Bement of Northern Arizona University's Department of Mathematics, were employed in the completion of this technique. Cattell's (1964) method of labeling factors aided in the six factors being labeled, in a manner consistent with the concerns of the study.

Using the six factors as variables, they were subsequently subjected to stepwise discriminant function analysis, as detailed earlier. This procedure determined the significance of difference between groups used in relations to each factor separately, and in relation to all the factors working together at each step of the analysis.

The discriminant function analysis had a number of advantages over analysis of variance, which could also have been used to test the hypotheses. First, only the original 68 indexes could have been compared for variance, on an individual basis, and could not have been examined in terms of their working together, if analysis of variance had been used. The stepwise discriminant function analysis, however, allowed each factor -- which represented maximum communality -- to be examined by itself and in relation to all other factors that were being used to test the hypothesis at hand.

Second, analysis of variance would have done nothing toward further validation of the instrument. The combination of factor analysis and stepwise discriminant function analysis did contribute to content validity. Discriminant function analysis illustrated how many of the original variables would measure what they were intended to measure.

Third, analysis of variance would have provided

no information on the power of differences, in terms of practical significance between the original groups of items in the questionnaire. Discriminant function analysis, however, provided a classification matrix and a function for each group of usable variables. These became the bases of hypothetical constructs. This process allowed for prediction in each group, with considerable accuracy. This was particularly true when multiple groups were involved, such as the four enrollment size groups.

The .05 level of significance was adopted for rejection or acceptance of the stated null hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine whether or not student newspapers and classroom journalism courses, in Oklahoma high schools, facilitated a significant concern for human relations and human rights within the high schools. This was approached primarily through the examination of the attitudes of high school principals and high school journalism advisers, with regard to six variables. Those six variables were: (1) Reporting Human Relations Problems in the High School Newspaper; (2) Basic Human Relations Beliefs; (3) Basic Human Rights Beliefs; (4) Reporting Conflict and Intergroup Relations in the Newspaper; (5) Censorship and Control of the Student Newspaper; and (6) Basic Freedom of Expression and Press Beliefs.

The comparison of differences in attitudes, with regard to the six factors, was of primary concern. It was approached in three basic ways. First, all principals' attitudes were compared to advisers' attitudes. Second, all respondents combined were placed into one of four high

school enrollment size classifications and the four group attitudes were compared. Third, all respondents combined were grouped according to whether they were in a physically segregated or physically desegregated high school, and their group attitudes were compared. In addition to sub-grouping all respondents collectively, advisers and principals were separately divided into enrollment and racial classifications, to test for within group differences.

Other important concerns, which were supplemental to the above primary concerns of the study, consisted of the following questions:

1. What were the major purposes of journalism courses and student newspapers?

2. How much press freedom and censorship existed in Oklahoma high schools?

3. To what extent did high school enrollment size and racial mix affect the purposes of and attitudes toward the high school newspaper?

4. To what extent were the functions and values taught in the journalism courses practiced by the student newspapers?

Data included in this chapter were obtained by administering two separate mail questionnaires to the two primary groups of respondents -- advisers and principals.

Both questionnaires contained identical sets of attitude items, on which the hypotheses to be tested were based, after they had been grouped into factors. In addition, the advisers' questionnaire contained behavior items designed to reveal factual information on the secondary concerns of the study. These results were intended to provide further insight into the relationship between the way school officials think things should be and the way they actually existed, with regard to high school journalism.

The statistical treatments, employed for testing hypotheses stated in Chapter I, were factor analysis and stepwise discriminant analysis. Chi square goodness of fit tests were also utilized to ensure the normality of population distribution and the subsequent validity of the significance tests.

Statistical calculations were performed at the University of Oklahoma and Northern Arizona University. The .05 level of confidence was selected to test for significant differences between factor means.

Testing the Hypotheses and Analysis of the Data

Basically, there were two concerns which served as the basis for hypotheses: (1) The human relations-human rights role of student newspapers, and (2) high school students' right of free expression and press. The three hypotheses relating to the first concern were

tested through factor 1 (human relations reporting, factor 2 (human relations beliefs), factor 3 (human rights beliefs), and factor 4 (conflict and intergroup relations reporting). The three hypotheses relating to the second major concern were tested through factor 5 (censorship and control of the newspaper and factor 6 (freedom of expression and press beliefs). The results of the supplementary sections from the advisers' questionnaires were presented and discussed separately, with regard to the above major concerns.

The results of these tests are presented in four sections, in this chapter. The first section records the results of two discriminant function analyses. These tests were used to determine whether or not the attitudes of all principals differed significantly from the attitudes of all advisers, with regard to the six factors used in the testing of two hypotheses. These tests were used to test hypotheses 1 and 4 specifically. These hypotheses were designed to determine if advisers' and principals' attitudes differed significantly, with regard to the human relations-human rights role of student newspapers (factors 1, 2, 3, 4,), and with regard to students' right of free press (factors 5 and 6), respectively.

The second section of this chapter records the results of three discriminant function analyses for each

hypothesis, or a total of six discriminant function analyses. The first three analyses were used to test hypothesis 2. The first of these tests was used to determine whether or not the combined attitudes of all advisers and principals differed significantly, when the respondents were grouped into one of four high school enrollment size classifications. The second of these tests was used to determine whether or not the attitudes of advisers separately differed significantly, with regard to factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, when the advisers were grouped into one of four high school enrollment size classifications. The third of these tests was used to determine whether or not the attitudes of principals separately differed significantly, with regard to factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, when the principals were grouped into one of four high school enrollment size classifications. The same three-analyses procedure was used to test hypothesis 5, using factors 5 and 6. These two hypotheses were designed to determine if advisers' and principals' attitudes differed significantly, with regard to the human relations-human rights role of student newspapers, and with regard to students' right of free press, when the respondents were grouped into four different enrollment size classifications.

The third section of this chapter records the results of three discriminant function analyses, related

to the testing of hypotheses 3 and 6, a total of six analyses. The first three analyses were used to test hypothesis 3. The first of these tests was used to determine whether or not the combined attitudes of all advisers and principals differed significantly, with regard to factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, when the respondents were grouped into one of two high school racial classifications. The second of these tests was used to determine whether or not the attitudes of advisers separately differed significantly, with regard to factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, when the respondents were grouped into one of two high school racial classifications. The third of these tests was used to determine whether or not the attitudes of principals by themselves differed significantly, with regard to factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, when the respondents were grouped into one of two high school racial classifications. The same procedure was used to test hypothesis 6, using factors 5 and 6. Hypotheses 3 and 6 were designed to determine if advisers' and principals' attitudes -- when grouped into two high school racial classifications -- differed significantly, with regard to the human relations-human rights role of students newspapers, and with regard to students' right of free press, respectively.

The fourth section of this chapter is a

supplementary analysis of data taken from the secondary two sections of the advisers' questionnaire. It includes information that revealed the contents of both the high schools' student newspapers and the journalism coursework. The section includes means and standard deviations, for each of the content areas being considered. This data allowed for further comparison between advisers' and principals, expressed attitudes toward high school journalism and the existing realities. It was important for final discussion of the basic questions of the study.

For each analysis, in all sections, a similar procedure was used. Respondents were divided into the appropriate number of groups -- depending on the hypothesis being tested. Discriminant function analyses were applied, using the appropriate factors as variables, and as the functions for discrimination between the groups. In this manner, the factor which was most important in discriminating between the groups was entered into the analysis first (step one). Subsequent steps entered each of the remaining variables, individually, according to the order of importance of each in discriminating. An F value was computed for each step at which a new variable was entered, and an overall F value was computed for all variables, when they had been entered and were discriminating between groups

together.

The general format for each section consists of a statement of the hypotheses to be tested, followed by tables describing the results of the primary statistical treatment used and an interpretation of the applied statistical method, with reference to the hypothesis tested. This is followed by tables which contain the means and standard deviations, used as indicators of the nature of the respondents' expressed attitudes toward the concerns of the study.

Findings Pertaining to a Comparison of Principals' and Advisers' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers

Hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 4 were tested in this section.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant difference between the attitudes of high school principals and newspaper advisers, with regard to the role of the student newspaper in advancing effective human relations and a concern for human rights in the high school.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there is no significant difference between the attitudes of high school principals and newspaper advisers, with regard to students' exercising of freedom of press.

For these hypotheses, respondents were divided

into two primary groups for testing -- advisers and principals.

Hypothesis 1. The results of the stepwise discriminant function analysis of 94 advisers' and 98 principals' attitudes toward factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, are contained in Tables 3 and 4. The F values for significance at the .05 and .01 levels varied from step to step because the degrees of freedom changed with each step. Hypothesis 1 was rejected because the results indicated that with all four variables entered and working together, advisers are discriminating from principals, with regard to their attitudes toward this concern. Table 3, moreover, reveals that factor 3 was the most discriminating of the four factors and was therefore entered first. What this means, simply, is that advisers and principals differed more with regard to their views toward human rights than they did on the other three variables. Most important, however, Table 4 illustrates that there was significant difference between the group means of advisers and principals, at the .05 level or better. This was true with regard to each of the factors. Table 4 contains the F values for all four factor means, before they were entered into discriminant analysis. Advisers' and principals' F scores for factors 1, 2, and 3 were greater than the 6.81

Table 3

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences Between Advisers and Principals

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	3	1,190	22.40**
2	2	2,189	12.93**
3	1	3,188	8.77**
4	4	4,187	6.66**

**Significant at the .01 level

needed to be significant at the .01 level. The scores for factor 4 were greater than the 3.91 needed for significance at the .05 level.

Table 4

Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Mean Differences Between Advisers and Principals Before Discriminant Analysis

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	1,190	8.19**
2	1,190	12.09**
3	1,190	22.40**
4	1,190	4.64*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Despite the fact that there was significant difference between advisers' and principals' group means, for each of the four factors, the respondents tended to hold generally favorable attitudes. Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations for each of the four factors. The group means indicate that the respondents, collectively expressed favorable attitudes. Closer examination, however, revealed two important findings. First, respondents expressed considerably more favorable attitudes toward factors 2, 3, and 4, than they did toward factor 1.

One possible explanation for why the respondents expressed less favorable attitudes toward factor 1 is that it was composed of items that concerned the reporting of realistic human relations problems, whereas 2, 3, and 4 dealt primarily with basic attitudes toward general human relations-human rights concepts. Factor 1, in effect, provided a check on the attitudes expressed in the other three; i.e., it dealt with the extent to which advisers and principals believed that high school newspapers should act as human relations-human rights facilitators through their reporting of such problem situations.

The second important finding concerned the difference in attitude between advisers and principals.

Clearly, principals expressed less favorable views than advisers, with regard to all four factors. Furthermore, with regard to factor 1, principals held unfavorable views as a group.

Table 5

Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means, Standard Deviations and Grand Means for Advisers and Principals

		Advisers (N=94)		Principals (N=98)		
Factor	No. of Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Mean
1	11	30.16	9.82	34.85	12.63	32.55
2	5	8.13	2.31	9.51	3.12	8.83
3	4	7.07	2.37	9.03	3.26	8.07
4	4	9.94	3.67	11.11	3.88	10.54

Hypothesis 4. The results of the stepwise discriminant function analysis of 94 advisers' and 98 principals' attitudes toward factors 5 and 6 are contained in Tables 6 and 7. Factor 5 was concerned with basic attitudes toward the censorship of high school student newspapers and restrictions on student freedom of press. Factor 6 was concerned with basic attitudes toward high school students' right of free expression and press. Hypothesis 4 was rejected because the computed F value

Table 6

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences Between Advisers and Principals

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	5	1,190	39.08**
2	6	2,189	31.94**

**Significant at the .01 level

of factors 5 and 6 working together indicated significant difference between advisers and principals. Table 6 revealed that, with both factors entered, an F value of 31.94 was computed. This was much more than the 4.75 needed to be significant at the .01 level. Factor 5 was the most discriminating of the two factors, with an F value of 39.08. Table 7, however, shows that both factors individually discriminated far beyond the 6.81 needed to be significant at the .01 level, and that there was little difference in the relative importance of the two variables. In practical terms, this indicated that advisers and principals expressed different views toward high school students exercising freedom of expression and press, at a highly significant level.

As to whether or not the respondents held favorable or unfavorable views toward these concerns,

Table 7

Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Mean Differences Between Advisers and Principals Before Discriminant Analysis

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
5	1,190	39.08**
6	1,190	36.92**

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 8 contains the means, standard deviations and grand means for each factor. Comparison of mean scores suggested that advisers and principals, collectively, tended to hold favorable views, with regard to factor 6, which concerned students having the right to exercise free expression. However, this was overshadowed by the fact that they appeared to favor the use of censorship and control more than they did the right of free expression. The grand mean for factor 5, concerning censorship and control, is 21.57, or a generally middle point of view. The grand mean for factor 6, concerning students' right of free expression and press, is 11.30, or slightly favorable in attitude toward this right. It should be noted, that the items included in factor 5 were worded in a positive manner. Consequently, the agreeable response mean indicated an attitude supporting

the use of censorship and control.

An example of such wording is illustrated in Figure 2. This explains why advisers registered less

FIGURE 2

SAMPLE ITEM FROM CENSORSHIP FACTOR

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
High school journalists should be tightly controlled because they are still immature and need to learn responsibility first.	1	2	3	4	5

favorable responses than principals, with regard to factor 5 and more favorable responses toward factor 6, the factor containing the items which were worded more negatively. This was borne out by the fact that advisers had a group mean of 24.39, and principals had a group mean of 18.86, with regard to censorship and control. Clearly, principals favored the use of censorship and control to a greater degree than did advisers.

This data accounted for the highly significant amount of difference between the two groups. The same held true, generally, with regard to attitudes toward freedom of expression and press. The grand mean clearly

indicated that all respondents collectively favored students' right of free expression and press. However, advisers agreed more strongly that high school students had this right. This was evidenced by their group mean of 9.55, as compared to principals' group mean of 12.98.

Table 8

Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means, Standard Deviations and Grand Means for Advisers and Principals

		Advisers (N=94)		Principals (N=98)		
Factor	No. of Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Mean
5	8	24.39	6.05	18.86	6.21	21.57
6	5	9.55	3.38	12.98	4.35	11.30

Findings Pertaining to Respondents' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers, When Grouped into Four Enrollment Classifications

Hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 5 were tested in this section.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is no significant difference between high schools in four enrollment classifications, with regard to advisers' and principals' attitudes toward the role of the student newspaper in

advancing human relations and a concern for human rights, in the high school.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there is no significant difference between high schools in four enrollment classifications, with regard to advisers' and principals' attitudes toward students' exercising of freedom of press.

For these hypotheses, advisers and principals were combined and then grouped into the following high school enrollment classifications: group 1 (1,000 or more); group 2 (450 to 999); group 3 (225 to 449); and group 4 (224 or less). Three separate stepwise discriminant function analyses were conducted, for each of the two hypotheses.

In the first analysis, all advisers and principals collectively were grouped into the four enrollment classifications and were compared, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the six factors used in the two hypotheses. In the second analysis, all advisers separately were grouped into the four enrollment classifications and were compared, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the six factors used. In the third analysis, all principals separately were grouped into the four enrollment classifications and were compared to their expressed attitudes toward the six factors used. These last two separate analyses provided

a closer examination of the attitudes of adviser and principals, with regard to the effects of enrollment grouping on attitudes toward the concerns of the study. They also provided a basis for determining whether the attitudes of advisers or principals were affected by the size of total enrollment grouping.

Hypothesis 2. The results of the stepwise discriminant function analysis, for all advisers and principals combined and grouped into four enrollment classifications, are contained in Tables 9-13. Table 9 contains the summary of F values, as each factor was entered step by step. Table 10 contains the F values of the mean differences before they were entered into analysis. Tables 11-13 contain the F matrices, which illustrate the degree of difference between the four enrollment groups, with regard to each of the four factors applicable to this hypothesis. As with hypothesis 1, the critical variables here were factors 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected because the results indicated that, with all four variables entered and working together, there was significant difference between the four enrollment groups. Table 9 records an F value of 3.88, for all four factors working together, which is more than the 2.23 needed to be significant at

the .01 level. Table 9 also revealed that factor 4 was the most discriminating of the four factors and was therefore entered into analysis first.

What this revealed, simply, was that there was more discrimination between the four enrollment groups, with regard to conflict and intergroup relations reporting than there was with the other three variables. It should be noted, however, that there was significant difference between the enrollment group means, with regard to factors 1, 3, and 4, at the .01 level, as shown in Table 10. There was no significant difference between the groups, however, with regard to factor 2.

Table 9

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	4	3,118	14.20**
2	1	6,374	7.76**
3	3	9,453	5.21**
4	2	12,490	3.88**

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 10

Differences Between Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	3,188	9.63**
2	3,188	0.69
3	3,188	6.84**
4	3,188	14.20**

**Significant at the .01 level

Tables 11-14 indicated that enrollment groups 1 and 4 were the most discriminating groups. There was significant difference between enrollment group 1 and enrollment groups 2, 3, and 4, at the .01 level, as each of the four variables were entered into the analysis. The only deviation from this condition appeared at step 4. Table 14 shows that group 1 differed from groups 3 and 4 at the .01 level. However, the F value of 2.72 for the difference between group 1 and 2 indicated that it was enough to meet the 2.43 necessary to be significant at the .05 level or better, with regard to all four factors. Group 2 did not differ significantly from enrollment group 3, with regard to any of the four

factors. Tables 11-14 also showed that enrollment groups 3 and 4 did not differ significantly, with regard to any of the four human relations-human rights factors used for this hypothesis.

These findings suggested that the greater the difference in enrollment size of high schools, the more significant the difference between the expressed attitudes of advisers and principals with regard to the human relations-human rights functions of high school newspapers. It was also apparent that in the very large high schools these differences were most significant, as evidenced by the fact that the degree of significant difference between group 1 and the other three groups was greater than the difference between any of the other enrollment groups.

Concerning whether the respondents held favorable or unfavorable views toward these four factors, Table 15 indicated that a pattern similar to that presented in the preceding tables prevailed. Table 15 contains the summary of group means, grand means, and standard deviations, for each of the four enrollment groups, with the advisers and principals combined.

Generally, the data suggested that the larger the high school, the more favorable the collective, expressed attitudes of both advisers and principals, toward the

Table 11

Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 4				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	10.23**			
Group 3	23.21**	1.22		
Group 4 (N=47)	38.08**	5.95*	2.31	1,188

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 12

Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 1				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	5.15**			
Group 3	12.05**	1.38		
Group 4 (N=47)	21.14**	5.42**	1.78	2,187

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 13

Step 3 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 3				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	3.61*			
Group 3	8.14**	0.92		
Group 4 (N=47)	14.37**	3.60*	1.23	3,186

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 14

Step 4 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 2				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	2.72*			
Group 3	6.08**	0.70		
Group 4 (N=47)	10.72**	2.71*	0.92	4,185

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

human relations-human rights concerns. Conversely, the smaller the high school enrollment the less favorable and in some instances the more unfavorable the attitudes. For example, the means for factor 1, which dealt with the reporting of human relations problem situations in the high school, indicated that group 1 high schools expressed slightly favorable views toward this role. As the high schools decreased in size, however, attitudes tended to become less favorable, so that when the means of group 4 high schools were examined it was clear the respondents held generally unfavorable views toward this role.

A similar but less pronounced pattern occurred with factor 4, which dealt with conflict and intergroup reporting. A comparison between factors 1 and 4 showed that there was an unfavorable tendency expressed. Group 3 means illustrated a slightly positive group attitude. Group 4 respondents, however, registered negative group means for both of these factors, even though the respondents were more negative toward factor 1 than factor 4. With factors 2 and 3, which dealt with human relations and human rights beliefs respectively, the same pattern of variance between large and small high school groups prevailed. However, the basic attitudes tended to be favorable.

These results suggested a conclusion similar to that discussed under hypothesis 1. That is, advisers and principals tended to hold generally favorable attitudes, with regard to basic beliefs concerning the human relations-human rights role of student newspapers, but when confronted with realistic problem situations their views were considerably less favorable toward the student newspaper reporting them.

Table 15

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Items	Group 1 (N=55)		Group 2 (N=36)		Group 3 (N=54)		Group 4 (N=47)		Grand Means
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
1	11	27.22	9.87	30.56	12.82	34.39	10.29	38.21	10.91	32.55
2	5	8.38	2.50	8.97	2.56	8.94	3.51	9.13	2.54	8.83
3	4	6.73	2.33	8.03	3.14	8.46	3.17	9.23	2.94	8.07
4	4	8.15	3.26	10.53	3.33	11.35	4.01	12.40	3.15	10.54

When advisers and principals were separated and classified into the same four enrollment groups, the resulting data generally followed the same basic pattern, as when they were combined. Table 16 contains the summary

of F values, as each step was entered, for both advisers and principals separately. It tended to follow the same basic pattern as when advisers and principals were combined. For both advisers and principals, there was significant difference when all four factors were entered. However, the differencesamong principals were greater than among advisers. With all four factors entered, advisers registered an F value of 1.87, which was significant at the .05 level. Principals, registered an F score of 2.30, which was more than the 2.28 required to be significant at the .01 level. Apparently, then, the degree of significant difference between the principals' enrollment groups was great enough to offset that of the advisers' enrollment groups and create the results presented in Table 9, when all respondents were combined.

Tables 17-20 contain the F matrices for each step of the analysis and enables one to compare advisers to principals, with regard to the degree of difference between their enrollment groups, at each step. Although the basic pattern is essentially the same as when the respondents were combined, there were two different findings worth noting. First, the factors were not entered at the same step level. For both groups, factors 4 and 3 were entered first and last respectively. Factors

Table 16

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94)			Principals (N=98)		
Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	4	3,90	5.88**	4	3,94	7.50**
2	2	6,178	3.27**	1	6,186	4.29**
3	1	9,214	2.45*	2	9,224	3.05**
4	3	12,230	1.87*	3	12,241	2.30**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

1 and 2, however, were entered at different steps, as shown in Tables 18 and 19. This simply meant that the degree of difference between the four enrollment groups, with regard to factors 1 and 2, varied between advisers and principals. In practical terms, principals differed more in their expressed attitudes toward the reporting of human relations problem situations (factor 1) than did advisers. Advisers, on the other hand, differed more in their expressed attitudes toward basic human relations beliefs (factor 2) than did principals.

A second important finding was that concerning a

comparison of advisers and principals, with regard to the degree of difference between enrollment group attitudes toward the four factors. Generally, the pattern for advisers and principals separately, followed that of the combined discriminant function analysis, with regard to each of the factors used here. The most notable exception was that those respondents in enrollment group 2, for both advisers and principals, did not differ significantly from group 4 respondents, as was the case with the combined analysis.

The most important aspect of comparing F matrices, moreover, was that the degree of significant difference between large high schools' attitudes and small high schools' attitudes was much more pronounced in the principals' analysis than in the advisers'. Both advisers and principals differed at the same significance levels through all four steps, and for all four enrollment groups, except at step 3. Table 19 indicates that group 1 differed from group 3 at the .05 level for advisers and at the .01 level for principals. Other than that difference, the significance levels were the same. However, the F values for principals were consistently higher than those for advisers, despite the likeness in significance levels.

This implied that principals in large high

schools differed from principals in small high schools much more, with regard to human relations-human rights attitudes, than advisers in large high schools differed from advisers in small high schools, with regard to the same concerns. Table 17 demonstrates this point very clearly, with regard to factor 4, which was the most discriminating factor. The F value of 14.31 for group 1 advisers differing from group 4 advisers, indicated significance at the .01 level. Similarly, group 1 and 4 principals differed significantly, at the .01 level, for the same factor, but the F value of 20.84 was considerably higher. Both, however, were well beyond the 6.96 needed for significance at the .01 level.

The comparison of means of the two groups, in Tables 21 and 22 showed a continuation of the same general pattern as that just discussed. In this case, not only did both advisers and principals from large high schools differ significantly from those of small high schools, but also this tendency applied to the group attitudes as well. That is, both advisers and principals from small high schools tended to express less favorable attitudes than those from large high schools. Further, principals expressed much less favorable attitudes than advisers, with regard to the four human relations-human rights factors. In fact,

Table 17

Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94) Factor Entered = 4				Principals (N=98) Factor Entered = 4			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	4.72*				5.22*			
3	10.63**	0.51			12.03**	0.71		
4	14.31**	1.96	0.66	1,90	20.84**	3.31	1.19	1,94

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 18

Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisors (N=94)				Principals (N=98)			
	Factor Entered = 2				Factor Entered = 1			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	2.38				2.66			
3	5.39**	0.53			6.45**	0.48		
4	8.12**	2.19	0.78	2,89	12.61**	2.84	1.25	2,93
N=19, 28								

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 19

Step 3 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisors (N=94)				Principals (N=98)			
	Factor Entered = 1				Factor Entered = 2			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	1.96				2.04			
3	3.63*	1.07			4.26**	0.53		
4	5.42**	2.07	0.52	3,88	8.42**	2.56	1.00	3,92

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 20

Step 4 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94) Factor Entered = 3				Principals (N=98) Factor Entered = 3			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	1.46				1.62			
3	2.70*	0.80			3.27*	0.39		
4	4.19*	1.64	0.48	4,87	6.32**	1.91	0.74	4,91
N=19,28								

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

with regard to factor 1, principals expressed generally negative attitudes toward the human relations-human rights role of the student newspaper, as evidenced by their grand mean of 34.85. This was particularly true for those principals classified into smaller enrollment groups.

Table 21

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes For Advisers

Factor	Items	Group 1 (N=30)		Group 2 (N=18)		Group 3 (N=27)		Group 4 (N=19)		Grand Means
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
1	11	26.66	8.12	28.05	10.57	32.67	7.92	34.11	12.05	30.16
2	5	7.90	2.06	7.67	2.00	8.19	2.54	8.84	2.59	8.13
3	4	6.17	2.26	6.78	2.32	7.44	1.83	8.26	2.81	7.07
4	4	7.90	3.29	10.11	3.43	10.85	3.89	11.68	2.79	9.94

Hypothesis 5. The results of the stepwise discriminant functions analysis of 94 advisers' and 98 principals' combined attitudes toward factors 5 and 6 are contained in Tables 23 and 24. Factor 5 was concerned with basic attitudes toward the censorship of high school student newspapers and restrictions on student freedom of press. Factor 6 concerned basic attitudes

Table 22

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes for Principals

Factor	Items	Group 1 (N=25)		Group 2 (N=18)		Group 3 (N=27)		Group 4 (N=28)		Grand Means
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
1	11	27.88	11.78	33.06	14.61	36.11	12.16	41.00	9.27	34.85
2	5	8.96	2.88	10.28	2.42	9.70	4.18	9.32	2.54	9.51
3	4	7.40	2.27	9.28	3.41	9.48	3.88	9.89	2.90	9.03
4	4	8.44	3.25	10.94	3.26	11.85	4.14	12.89	3.34	11.11

toward high school students' right of free expression and press. Hypothesis 5 was rejected because the computed F values of factors 5 and 6 working together showed significant difference between the four enrollment groups. Table 23 revealed that, with both factors entered an F value of 4.82 was computed. This was more than the 2.90 needed to be significant at the .01 level.

Factor 6 was the most discriminating of the two factors, with an F value of 8.50, which was a reversal of the order of importance indicated when advisers were compared to principals without being grouped into enrollment classifications (Tables 6 and 7). Nonetheless, Table 24 showed that both factors individually discriminated

Table 23

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	6	3,188	8.50**
2	5	6,374	4.82**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

significantly. The F value for factor 6 was 8.50, which was more than the 3.91 necessary to be significant at the .01 level. This indicated that when all 192 advisers and principals were combined and then grouped into four enrollment classifications, there was significant difference between the four groups, with regard to their views toward high school students exercising freedom of expression and press.

The F matrices contained in Tables 25 and 26 indicated that enrollment groups 1 and 4 were the most discriminating groups, just as they were with hypothesis 2. The F values in both tables, indicated significant difference between enrollment group 1 and enrollment groups 3 and 4, at the .01 level, with regard to both factors. There was no significant difference between

Table 24

Differences Between Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
5	3,188	3.75*
6	3,188	8.50**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

the respondents in group 2 and the respondents in group 4, at the .05 level, with regard to both factors. Enrollment group 2 did not, however, differ significantly from group 3. Likewise, enrollment group 3 did not differ significantly from enrollment group 4.

These findings generally coincided with those found in relation to hypothesis 2. They suggested that the greater the difference in high school enrollment size, the more significantly different the attitudes of advisers and principals in those high schools were, with regard to censorship of the high school student newspaper, and with regard to basic beliefs concerning freedom of expression and press. It also appeared that group 1 high schools was the most discriminating group, in that the

the degree of significant difference between it and other groups was greater than the differences between any of those groups together.

Table 25

Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 6				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	2.68			
Group 3	14.44**	3.07		
Group 4 (N=47)	21.29**	6.52*	0.89	1,188

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 27 contains the summary of group means, grand means, standard deviations, and F values, for each of the four enrollment groups, with the advisers and principals combined, with regard to the freedom of expression and press factors. Concerning whether the respondents held favorable or unfavorable views toward these two factors, Table 27 suggested that a pattern similar to the preceding discussion prevailed. Generally, the data suggested that the larger the high school, the

Table 26

Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor Entered = 5				
	Group 1 (N=55)	Group 2 (N=36)	Group 3 (N=54)	Degrees of Freedom
Group 2	2.09			
Group 3	8.23**	1.53		
Group 4 (N=47)	12.72**	3.46*	0.67	2,187

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

more favorable the expressed attitudes toward freedom of press and of expression. Conversely, the smaller the high school the less favorable were the expressed attitudes toward students' freedom of press and of expression and the more favorable toward the use of censorship.

Overall, the data indicated that respondents in all four enrollment groups held favorable views toward high school students' right of free expression and press. But, respondents in all four enrollment groups tended to support the use of censorship as well. What this suggests is that advisers and principals, in this study, held ambiguous attitudes, for whatever the reason. That

is, they both appeared to support students' right of free press, but they both appeared to favor restricting that freedom, in practical working situations.

Table 27

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined

		Group 1 (N=55)		Group 2 (N=36)		Group 3 (N=54)		Group 4 (N=47)		
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means
5	8	23.87	7.49	21.58	5.76	20.85	6.62	19.68	5.93	21.57
6	5	9.31	3.35	10.72	3.90	12.24	4.62	13.00	4.12	11.30

When advisers and principals were separated and classified into the same four enrollment groups, the resulting data generally followed the same basic pattern, that was revealed when they were combined. Table 28 contains the summary of F values as each step was entered, for both advisers and principals separately. It tends to follow the same basic pattern set when advisers and principals were combined. That is, the significant difference between high schools with large and small enrollments generally held true here as well.

Moreover, there were three other important findings. First, there was more significant difference

between enrollment groups for advisers than for principals, with regard to both factors. With both factors entered, at step 2, advisers' groups registered an F value of 3.31, which was more than the 2.92 needed to be significant at the .01 level. The principals, however, also with both factors entered, registered an F value of 2.24, which was more than the 2.16 needed to be significant at the .05 level but below the 2.92 needed for .01 significance. In pratical terms, it was inferred from this that principals were more unified in their views toward the use of censorship and students' right of free expression and press, than were advisers. This inference was supported by the second important finding which dealt with the degree of difference between advisers' enrollment groups and principals enrollment groups.

Tables 29 and 30 contain the F matrices for each step of the analysis and enables comparison of advisers to principals, with regard to the degree of difference between their enrollment groups, at each step level. Generally, the pattern for both advisers and principals followed that of the combined discriminant function analysis, with regard to each of the two factors used here. There was greater discrimination between enrollment groups, for advisers at each step level, than there was for principals.

Table 28

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94)			Principals (N=98)		
Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	6	3,90	5.04**	6	3,93	3.82*
2	5	6,178	3.31**	5	6,186	2.24*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 30 reveals, that with both factors entered and working together, advisers' group 1 differed significantly from groups 2 and 3 at the .05 level, and advisers' groups 1 and 4 were significantly different at the .01 level. Principals' group 1, on the other hand, differed significantly from both groups 3 and 4 at the .05 level, and there was no significant difference between groups 1 and 2.

This led to a third finding, which dealt with the nature of the attitudes expressed by advisers and principals separately, regarding factors 5 and 6, when they were placed into enrollment groups. Tables 31 and 32 contain the means, grand means, standard deviations

Table 29

Step 1 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94) Factor Entered = 6				Principals (N=98) Factor Entered = 6			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	2.36				0.72			
3	7.14**	0.68			8.29**	3.11		
4	13.60**	3.59	1.55	1,90	7.51**	2.65	0.03	1,94
N=19, 28								

**Significant at the .01 level

Table 30

Step 2 F Matrix of Enrollment Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94) Factor Entered = 5				Principals (N=98) Factor Entered = 5			
Groups	1 (N=30)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom	1 (N=25)	2 (N=18)	3 (N=27)	Degrees of Freedom
2	3.13*				0.36			
3	4.57*	0.57			4.79*	2.22		
4	8.65**	1.77	0.97	2,89	4.29*	1.88	0.02	2,93
N=19, 28								

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

and F values for advisers and principals separately, when placed into enrollment groups. The means indicate that principals followed the pattern of the combined principal and adviser analysis, discussed previously, to a much stronger degree than advisers. The tables also indicate that the above suggestion was correct -- that principals as a whole differed less than advisers as a whole, particularly with regard to the use of censorship toward student newspapers. Table 31 reveals that advisers in all four enrollment groups combined have F values of 3.89 and 5.04, for factors 5 and 6 respectively. Both values were beyond the 2.72 necessary to be significant at the .05 level, and factor 6 had an F value that was more than the 4.04 necessary for significance at the .01 level. The same was not true for principals. Table 32 shows that the F value for the principals' means were 0.76 and 3.82, for factors 5 and 6 respectively. The former F value was insufficient for significance at the .05 level, and the latter was more than the 2.72 necessary for significance at the .05 level.

Based on the above findings, it was conjectured that principals rather strongly favored the use of censorship and control, with regard to high school student newspapers, and did not differ significantly in this expressed attitude, from enrollment group to

enrollment group. Principals also expressed support for students' freedom of expression and press but differed significantly in that view, from enrollment group to enrollment group. Advisers, on the other hand, tended to be more supportive of students' freedom of expression and press than principals. They also supported censorship and control of high school newspapers less than did principals. In fact, group 1 and 2 advisers tended to oppose the use of censorship and control. Advisers in smaller high school groups 3 and 4, however, favored slightly the use of censorship. Advisers tended to vary more in these views than did principals. Again, an examination of group means suggested that this variance occurred because of the significant differences between large and small high school respondents.

Findings Pertaining to Respondents' Attitudes Toward Students' Freedom of Press and the Human Relations-Human Rights Role of Student Newspapers, When Grouped into Physically Segregated and Physically Desegregated High School Classifications

Hypothesis 3 and 6 were tested in this section.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is no significant difference between physically desegregated and physically segregated high schools, with regard to advisers' and principals' attitudes toward the role of the student newspaper, in advancing human relations and a concern for

Table 31

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Advisers

Factor Items		Group 1 (N=30)		Group 2 (N=18)		Group 3 (N=27)		Group 4 (N=17)		Grand Means	F
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
5	8	27.23	6.13	23.11	5.96	23.78	5.22	22.00	5.82	24.39	3.89*
6	5	7.93	2.60	9.39	2.59	10.19	3.43	11.37	4.03	9.55	5.04**

Degrees of Freedom = 3,90
*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 32

Enrollment Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Principals

Factor Items		Group 1 (N=25)		Group 2 (N=18)		Group 3 (N=27)		Group 4 (N=28)		Grand Means	F
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD		
5	8	19.84	7.06	20.06	5.27	17.93	6.66	18.11	5.57	18.86	0.76
6	5	10.96	3.45	12.06	4.56	14.30	4.79	14.11	3.86	12.98	3.82*

Degrees of Freedom = 3,94
*Significant at the .05 level

human rights in the high school.

Hypothesis 6 stated that there is no significant difference between physically desegregated and physically segregated high schools, with regard to advisers' and principals attitudes toward students exercising of freedom of press.

For these two hypotheses, advisers and principals were grouped into one of two classifications, depending on whether they were associated with a high school that was physically desegregated or one that was physically segregated. A physically desegregated high school was defined earlier as being one in which ten per cent or more of the student enrollment consisted of Black, American Indian, and/or Mexican-American students. Three separate stepwise discriminant analyses were conducted, for each hypothesis -- a total of six analyses. First, all advisers and principals combined were grouped into the two racial classifications and compared, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, which dealt with human relations-human rights concerns. Second, all advisers separately were grouped into the same two racial classifications and compared, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the same four factors. Third, all principals separately were grouped into the same two racial classifications and compared, with

regard to their expressed attitudes toward the same four factors. These two latter, separate analyses provided an additional closer look at the attitudes of the two primary respondent groups used in the study, with regard to the pattern of their responses when grouped into racial classifications. The same three-analyses procedure was conducted for factors 5 and 6, which dealt with censorship and students' right of free expression and press.

Hypothesis 3. The results of the stepwise discriminant analysis, for all advisers and principals combined, when grouped into the two racial classifications are contained in Tables 33 and 34. Table 33 contains the step-by-step summary of F values, as each of the four factors was entered into analysis. Table 34 contains the F values of the mean differences, for all factors, before each was entered into the discriminant function analysis. Hypothesis 3 was accepted because the results of the analysis indicate that, with all four factors entered and working together, there was no significant difference between the two racial groups. Table 33 records an F value of 0.42, for all four factors working together, which is considerably less than the 2.43 necessary to be significant at the .05 level. Table 33 also reveals that although factor 3 was the most discriminating of the four, there was no significant difference between

the two racial groups, at any step in the analysis. This indicated that there was no significant difference between advisers and principals combined, when the respondents were grouped into physically segregated and desegregated classifications, with regard to their attitudes toward the human relations-human rights role of the high school student newspaper. Table 34 supports this result. Table 34 contains the F values for the differences between the group means before they were entered into discriminant function analysis. There was no significant difference between the two racial groups, at the .05 level, with regard to any of the four factor means.

Table 33

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	3	1,190	0.80
2	1	2,189	0.65
3	2	3,188	0.56
4	4	4,187	0.42

Table 34

Differences Between Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	1,190	0.02
2	1,190	0.02
3	1,190	0.80
4	1,190	0.08

In addition to there being no significant difference between respondents in physically segregated high schools and respondents in physically desegregated high schools, Table 35 shows that respondents held generally favorable views toward the human relations-human rights role of high school student newspapers. Table 35 contains the means and standard deviations for each of the four factors. The group means indicate that the respondents, collectively expressed favorable attitudes.

Closer examination, however, reveals an important finding. Respondents expressed considerably more favorable attitudes toward factors 2, 3, and 4, than they did toward factor 1. In the case of factor 1, the

group mean of 32.55 indicated a more neutral attitude. This same basic pattern also was evident with hypotheses 1 and 2, which dealt with the same four factors. Again, a possible explanation for why the respondents expressed less favorable views toward factor 1 is that it was composed of items that concerned the reporting of specific, realistic, human relations problems. Factors 2, 3, and 4, however, were composed of items that dealt mostly toward general human relations-human rights concepts.

Table 35

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=87) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=105) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means
1	11	32.44	11.93	32.65	11.29	32.55
2	5	8.80	2.94	8.86	2.75	8.83
3	4	8.29	3.13	7.90	2.93	8.07
4	4	10.62	3.87	10.47	3.79	10.54

When advisers and principals were separated and classified into the same two racial groups, the resulting data followed essentially the same basic pattern, as when they were combined. Table 36 contains the summary

of F values, as each step was entered, for both advisers and principals separately. It reveals that the F value pattern is the same, as when the respondents were combined, but that the order of the factors being entered into the analysis differed considerably. Regardless, the F values of 0.33 and 0.25, for advisers and principals respectively, with all four factors entered in the analysis, indicated that both were well below the 2.48 neededto be significantly different at the .05 level. Apparently, then, neither advisers nor principals differed among themselves, when they were classified into racial groups.

Table 36

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Human Relations-Human Rights Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94)			Principals (N=98)		
Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	1	1,92	0.53	3	1,96	0.51
2	3	2,91	0.48	2	2,95	0.38
3	2	3,90	0.41	4	3,94	0.29
4	4	4,89	0.33	1	4,93	0.25

The comparison of means of the two groups is contained in Tables 37 and 38. They reveal that principals tended to hold less favorable views toward each of the four factors than did advisers. This was already discussed in relation to Table 5, which contained the same findings, with regard to the grand means for both advisers and principals. These findings were also true with regard to factor 1, which dealt with the reporting of realistic human relations problems. Advisers' attitudes, in both racial groups, tended to be not agreeable toward this factor. The F values for differences between these group means, furthermore, indicated that there was no significant difference. These results suggest that, as in other findings in this study, the main differences lay between advisers and principals. In this case, there was no significant difference between racial groups, regardless of whether they involved advisers and principals combined or separately. Also, principals tended to hold less favorable views than advisers.

Hypothesis 6. The results of the stepwise discriminant function analysis of 94 advisers' and 98 principals' combined attitudes toward factors 5 and 6 are contained in Tables 39 and 40. Factor 5 was concerned with basic attitudes toward the censorship of

Table 37

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes for Advisers

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=40) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=54) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means
1	11	29.30	9.05	30.80	10.39	30.16
2	5	8.05	1.91	8.19	2.58	8.13
3	4	7.13	2.61	7.04	2.21	7.07
4	4	9.73	3.30	10.09	3.94	9.94

Table 38

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Human Relations-Human Rights Attitudes for Principals

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=47) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=51) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means
1	11	35.11	13.44	34.61	11.96	34.85
2	5	9.45	3.49	9.57	2.78	9.51
3	4	9.28	3.21	8.80	3.32	9.03
4	4	11.38	4.18	10.86	3.61	11.11

high school students newspapers and restrictions on student freedom of press. Factor 6 concerned basic attitudes toward high school students' right of free expression and press. Hypothesis 6 was accepted because the computed F values when both factors were entered and were working together indicated no significant differences between the two racial groups. Factor 6 was entered first, as being the most discriminating factor. Table 39 indicates that the F value of 5.28 was more than the 3.91 needed to be significant at the .05 level. This situation was changed at the second step, however, when factor 5 was entered. With 5 and 6 working together, an F value of 2.79 was computed, which was less than the 3.06 needed to be significant at the .05 level.

In practical terms, this suggested that when all respondents were grouped into racial groups, there was significant difference between the groups, with regard to expressed views concerning high school students exercising freedom of expression and press. However, there was no significant difference with regard to their expressed views concerning the use of censorship and control. In short, there was more censensus toward factor 6 than toward factor 5. But, taken together there was no significant difference, so the hypothesis was accepted. This marked a new development in the

study. This was the first time that there was no significant difference between groups, when both factors 5 and 6 were working together. The reverse was true for findings relating to hypotheses 4 and 5, discussed earlier in this chapter.

Table 39

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Combined

Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	6	1,190	5.28*
2	5	2,189	2.79

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 41 contains the summary of group means, grand means and standard deviations, for both racial groups, with the advisers and principals combined. Concerning whether the respondents held favorable or unfavorable views toward these two factors, Table 41 suggests that the combined respondents from physically desegregated high schools (group 2) held less restrictive views toward students freedom of expression and press than did respondents from physically segregated high

Table 40

Differences Between Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Factor Means Before Discriminant Analysis, with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	F
5	1,190	1.59
6	1,190	5.28*

*Significant at the .05 level

schools (group 1). However, the group means for both factors revealed that the expressed attitudes found in both racial groups were generally favorable toward students' right of freedom of expression and press, but they also favored the use of censorship and control. The same apparent ambiguity had been found and discussed earlier in this chapter, with regard to hypotheses 4 and 5.

It could be conjectured from these findings, that advisers and principals, in high schools containing racial mix, tended to have more favorable views toward students exercising freedom of expression and press, and they differed significantly from advisers and principals in high schools not containing a racial mix. Also, it appeared that advisers and principals in high schools

containing racial mix tended to be less in favor of the use of censorship, than advisers and principals in high schools not containing a racial mix. But, the two groups did not differ significantly in that expressed view.

Table 41

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes with Advisers and Principals Combined

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=87) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=105) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means
5	8	20.90	7.01	22.12	6.44	21.57
6	5	12.07	4.46	10.67	3.99	11.30

When advisers and principals were separated and then classified into the same two racial groups, the resulting data helped to explain the discrepancies found in the data relative to advisers and principals combined. Table 42 contains the summary of F values as each step was entered for both advisers and principals separately. With both factors 5 and 6 working together, advisers' groups recorded an F value of 0.19, which was considerably less than the 2.11 needed to be significantly different

at the .05 level. Principals, on the other hand, recorded much different results. With both factors 5 and 6 working together, principals were less uniform in their expressed views than advisers, with regard to the use of censorship and students' right of free expression and press. It is worth noting, that the reverse was true earlier in this chapter, when advisers and principals were classified into enrollment groups.

Table 42

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of Racial Groups' Freedom of Expression and Press Attitude Differences with Advisers and Principals Separate

	Advisers (N=94)			Principals (N=98)		
Step	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F	Factor Entered	Degrees of Freedom	F
1	6	1,92	0.37	6	1,96	5.18*
2	5	2,91	0.19	5	2,95	3.18*

*Significant at the .05 level

The comparison of means of the two separate groups, when divided into racial classifications, is contained in Tables 43 and 44. The results tended to support the general pattern established when advisers and principals were combined. That is, respondents from physically

desegregated high schools held less restrictive views toward students exercising freedom of press than did respondents from physically segregated high schools. This finding held true for both advisers and principals separately. However, concerning whether advisers and principals, when divided into racial groups, held favorable or unfavorable views toward factors 5 and 6, the results were much different.

A comparison of group means indicated that advisers tended to reject slightly the use of censorship and strongly favored students' right of free expression and press. The F values of 0.11 and 0.37, for factors 5 and 6 respectively, indicated that advisers were unified in those attitudes because the values were well below the 3.96 needed to be significantly different at the .05 level.

Principals, on the other hand, tended to favor the use of censorship. The F value of 1.25 indicated that they were also unified in that attitude because it was below the 3.96 needed to be significantly different at the .05 level. Like advisers, they tended to favor students' right of free expression and press but not nearly as strongly. Furthermore, the F value of 5.18 indicated that principals were not unified in that attitude because it was more than the 3.96 needed to be significantly different at the .05 level.

These findings agreed with those of advisers and principals when grouped together and generally paralleled those relating to hypothesis 5, which involved the same factors. That is, principals in that situation -- when classified into enrollment groups -- held similar views to principals divided into racial groups, and the same held true for advisers, when divided into the same basic groups.

Table 43

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Advisers

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=40) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=54) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means	F
5	8	24.15	6.00	24.57	6.14	24.39	0.11
6	5	9.80	3.35	9.37	3.42	9.55	0.37

Findings Relating to Actual Performances of High School Student Newspapers and Subject Matter Taught in High School Journalism Courses

The findings in this section provided supplemental information, concerning the major results of this study. The data was tabulated from two secondary sections that were included in the advisers' questionnaires.

Table 44

Racial Groups' Factor Means, Standard Deviations, and Grand Means of Freedom of Expression and Press Attitudes for Principals

Factor	Items	Race Group 1 (N=47) $\bar{X}$	SD	Race Group 2 (N=51) $\bar{X}$	SD	Grand Means	F
5	8	18.13	6.67	18.53	5.75	18.86	1.25
6	5	14.00	4.40	12.04	4.13	12.98	5.18*

*Significant at the .05 level

Advisers were asked to respond to the following concerns: One set of items that investigated what was included in their high school newspapers; and another set of items that investigated what was included in their high school journalism courses. The results of these two sets of items were intended to shed further light on the primary attitude study, by providing information on the realities of existing high school journalism programs, which could then be compared to the results of the primary attitude study.

As with the original attitude items, these two sets of items were factor analyzed to ensure the validity of the items that were administered. The factor analysis supported the contention that the items were measuring

what they were designed to measure. This involved five factor groups in all. These factors were as follows: Two factors related to the content of the student newspapers, and three factors related to the content of the journalism coursework. The two relating to the content of the student newspapers included: (1) The reporting of student activity news; and (2) the reporting of human relations and human rights problems. The three factors relating to the content of the journalism coursework included the teaching of: (1) Mass media issues and problems; (2) newspaper skills; and (3) human relations values and responsibilities. A simple tabulation of means and standard deviations was used for analyzing the data.

Table 45 contains the means and standard deviations of 17 items relating to the reporting of human relations and school relations problems. Advisers had been asked to indicate the extent to which articles concerning each of the stated topics appeared in their student newspapers. The following five-point scale was used for rating: (1) Always, (2) Frequently, (3) Occasionally, (4) Rarely, and (5) Never. The results revealed that with the exception of two items, advisers recorded generally negative responses. What this meant, simply, was that the student newspaper in these 94 high schools rarely reported events and issues that concerned

human relations and school relations problems.

It should be noted that the items which elicited the most negative responses were those which dealt with the covering of administration and faculty related areas. It could be assumed that the lack of coverage of such areas is a further reflection of the consistently less favorable attitudes expressed by principals, with regard to the factors related to the six major hypotheses of the study.

Items 16 and 17 were the two items which produced the most positive mean scores of 2.87 and 2.54 respectively. One possible explanation for this deviation was that student feelings toward their school and student grievances were very similar in nature, and they could be interpreted to mean any number of things. For example, student grievances could include a variety of complaints about the school's faculty or administration. If so, they would hardly be threatening and therefore might be reported commonly in the school newspaper.

Table 46 contains the means and standard deviations of nine items which concerned the news reporting of routine school activities and events. Advisers were again asked to rate these items in the same manner as those discussed above. The results clearly indicated that usual school activities were

Table 45

Means and Standard Deviations of the Frequency of Human Relations and Human Rights Articles in Student Newspapers

	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
1.	Teacher grievances	4.34	1.20
2.	Administrative problems	4.15	1.16
3.	Teacher-administration relations	4.13	1.27
4.	Sexual standards and behaviors of students	3.82	1.18
5.	Administration's performance	3.74	1.25
6.	Board of education's actions	3.60	1.27
7.	Problems between student groups	3.38	1.25
8.	Student-teacher relations	3.38	1.26
9.	Community problems	3.32	1.21
10.	Quality of teaching	3.19	1.19
11.	School discipline policies	3.16	1.25
12.	Student-administration relations	3.14	1.31
13.	Rights of students	3.00	1.13
14.	Strengths of school system	3.00	1.25
15.	Quality of school curricula	2.98	1.17
16.	Grievances of students	2.87	1.09
17.	Student feelings toward the school	2.54	1.10

Grand Mean = 3.40

reported much more frequently in the student newspaper, according to 94 responding advisers. Items 8 and 9 resulted in means that indicated these topics appeared somewhat less in the student newspapers than did other seven news activities. It could be speculated that, like items 16 and 17 in Table 45, they were somewhat similar in nature, in that they dealt with the quality of the system. Again, ultimate responsibility for the quality of any public school system lies with the faculty and administrative leaders. Therefore, it would not be unusual for these areas of normal school concerns to be less frequently reported in the student newspaper. This too tended to coincide with the findings relating to the degree of tolerance of school authorities, toward students exercising freedom of press.

The findings in these two groups of items, dealing with the content of the student newspaper suggest a definite pattern. In practical terms, it appeared that areas of school life that were problematic or controversial in nature were much less frequently reported, than those school activity news areas that tended to be routine and traditionally not problematic in nature. Furthermore, these findings tended to support the findings discussed in the first three sections of this chapter. That is, advisers and

principals tended to hold favorable attitudes toward the human relations function of the student press and the right of students to exercise freedom of press. But, advisers to some degree and principals to a much greater degree also held much less favorable views toward the reporting of human relations problems, while they generally favored the use of censorship and control.

Table 46

Means and Standard Deviations of the Frequency of School Events and Activities Articles in Student Newspapers

	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
1.	Sports events	1.14	0.45
2.	School-sponsored clubs and organizations	1.49	0.77
3.	Achievements of students	1.53	0.74
4.	School social events	1.63	0.82
5.	Drama-music activities	1.67	0.74
6.	Student government actions	1.81	0.98
7.	Student academic performances	1.97	0.95
8.	School spirit	2.06	0.97
9.	Career opportunities	2.51	1.16
		Grand Mean = 1.76	

The findings contained in Tables 47, 48 and 49, concern the contents of journalism coursework. The intention of utilizing these items was to determine the relationship between what was stressed in the classroom and what appeared in the newspaper. Table 47 contains the means and standard deviations of eight items which were labeled mass media issues and problems. The results show that these eight areas received slightly more than moderate emphasis in the journalism classroom. All eight of the areas, individually, fell into that general range, with libel and slander and freedom of press being indicated as the most emphasized areas, with means of 2.14 -- or tending toward high emphasis.

Table 48 contains the means and standard deviations of eight items which were labeled newspaper skills. The results show that these eight skills received a group mean of 2.02, which indicated that high emphasis overall was placed on those learning outcomes in the classroom. All eight items, individually recorded means indicating high emphasis in the classroom.

Table 49 contains the means and standard deviations of five items that were labeled human relations values and responsibilities. The results indicated that these five value areas received a group mean of 2.20 which indicated that some emphasis was placed on those teaching areas

Table 47

Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Mass Media Issues and Problems in the Journalism Classes

Items	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. Freedom of press	2.14	0.97
2. Libel and slander	2.14	1.03
3. Social responsibility of the press	2.31	0.93
4. Slanting and stereotyping the news	2.51	1.10
5. Public opinion formation	2.56	1.02
6. Mass media and society	2.64	1.07
7. Forms of censorship	2.66	1.02
8. Protection of news source	2.88	1.38
	Grand Mean = 2.48	

overall. All five items, individually, recorded consistently high means, in that general range.

The findings contained in Tables 47, 48, and 49, suggested another definite pattern. Clearly, newspaper skills were the most emphasized in the classroom, followed by human relations values and responsibilities and then mass media issues and problems, respectively. This suggested that there was a discrepancy between what advisers claimed they emphasized in the

Table 48

Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Newspaper Skills in the Journalism Classes

Items	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. News writing skills	1.59	0.67
2. Ethics of reporting	1.79	0.82
3. Feature writing skills	1.99	0.82
4. Editorial writing skills	2.00	0.80
5. Editing skills	2.06	0.97
6. Interviewing techniques	2.09	0.74
7. Makeup and design techniques	2.29	1.04
8. Headline writing skills	2.31	1.00
	Grand Mean = 2.02	

classroom and what they claimed was covered in the student newspaper. That is, most skill and philosophical aspects of newspaper performance were stressed in the classroom, but when the events and issues in the high school tended to be controversial or problematic, many of the philosophical notions did not appear to be practiced quite as strongly. This same pattern appeared to emerge in the primary attitude study, when both advisers and principals expressed strong attitudes toward human relations-human rights functions of the student press,

Table 49

Means and Standard Deviations of the Emphasis Placed on Human Relations Values and Responsibilities in the Journalism Classes

	Items	$\bar{X}$	SD
1.	Representing all groups in the school	2.01	0.83
2.	Responsibilities concomitant with free expression	2.03	1.08
3.	Human rights	2.12	0.97
4.	Democratic values	2.25	0.87
5.	Giving minority groups a voice	2.57	1.12
		Grand Mean = 2.20	

and toward the students' right to exercise press freedom, but expressed less favorable attitudes toward the coverage of sensitive human relations and human rights problems, in the high school.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Summary

The high school students' rights movement has gained great impetus, in recent years. The right of students to express themselves freely -- particularly through the high school student newspaper -- is one of the most controversial and highly debated issues, in the students' rights movement. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the courts tended to be more supportive of this right. They cited the importance of and generally held that students should be accorded the same constitutional rights as other citizens.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if student newspapers and classroom journalism courses facilitated a significant concern for human rights and effective human relations, in the high school. The study concentrated on two primary concerns. The first was the human relations and human rights role of the student newspaper and journalism classroom. The second concern was with the exercising of students' right of freedom of press. Each of these concerns was examined in terms of

three distinct situations. First, the attitudes of all advisers were compared to all principals, with regard to each of the two major concerns. Second, all advisers and principals were grouped into four classifications of high school enrollment size, and the four group attitudes were compared, with regard to each of the two major concerns. Third, all advisers and principals were grouped into two classifications of physically segregated and physically desegregated high schools, and the two group attitudes were compared, with regard to each of the two major concerns. These six, separate analyses provided the basis for formulating the null hypotheses.

An investigation was also made of the following four secondary questions that related to the major problem under consideration:

1. What were the major purposes of journalism courses and student newspapers, in Oklahoma high schools?

2. How much press freedom and censorship existed in Oklahoma high school newspapers?

3. To what extent did high school enrollment size and racial mix affect purposes of and attitudes toward the high school newspaper?

4. To what extent were the functions and values taught in the journalism courses practiced by the student newspapers?

The sample consisted of a total of 94 journalism advisers and 98 high school principals (N = 192), from 120 Oklahoma high schools. The sample was selected by obtaining a list of all Oklahoma high schools which offered high school journalism, from the Oklahoma State Department of Education. A total of 133 high schools were identified as offering high school journalism, during the 1972-1973 academic school year. All principals and journalism advisers, in each of the 133 high schools were mailed the questionnaires which were used as the instrument in the study. Those advisers and principals who responded constituted the final sample used in the study.

Factor analysis, stepwise discriminant function analysis, chi square goodness of fit tests, and comparison of means were used to analyze the data.

Mail questionnaires were administered in the spring of 1973, to gather the raw data concerning advisers' and principals' attitudes toward the major concerns of the study, and concerning supplementary information relative to the four secondary concerns of the study. This procedure entailed the initial mailing, a followup mailing and a final followup by telephone, in order to ensure maximum return on the instrument.

All questionnaires were hand tabulated, and the

responses of each respondent were coded for later computer analysis.

Factor analysis was used to ensure the content validity of the instrument, and to ensure that the instrument was measuring those concerns it was intended to measure. It also eliminated those items from further analysis which were not measuring the major concerns of the study. This procedure produced six factor groupings which expressed the major concerns of the study, with the greatest parsimony and with the greatest psychological sense. These six factors included a total of 37 of the original 68 attitude items contained in the mail questionnaires. The remaining 31 items were dropped from further analysis.

The supplementary sections of the advisers' questionnaires, which were intended to provide information relative to the secondary questions of the study, were also factor analyzed at the same time. This ensured that the respondents were viewing those items relating to actual newspaper content and journalism coursework content, as they were intended to be viewed. Those items which did not indicate this were eliminated from further analysis. The factor analysis identified a total of 47 of the original 59 items, as being valid for answering the secondary concerns of the study. Chi square goodness

of fit tests were then applied to the data, to ensure the normality of population distribution and the subsequent validity of the significance tests.

Stepwise discriminant analysis was used to test for significant differences between the various groups' factor means.

The stepwise discriminant analyses computed F values for significant differences between the various groups used. This was done for factor mean differences individually, before they were entered into analysis. It was also done for the factors collectively at each step of the analysis. The .05 level of significance was adopted for acceptance or rejection of the stated hypotheses.

Major Findings

1. When all advisers (N = 94) were compared to all principals (N = 98), concerning their attitudes toward four human relations-human rights factors (factors 1, 2, 3, 4), the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of significance:

a. Advisers as a group and principals as a group differed significantly, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward all four human relations and human rights factors. This was true for each factor

separately, and when all four factors were entered into the analysis and were working together.

b. Both advisers and principals expressed generally favorable views, with regard to the human relations-human rights role of the student newspaper, as evidenced by an examination of the mean scores of each factor. However, both groups expressed much more favorable attitudes toward the basic belief that the student press should assume a human relations and human rights role (factors 2, 3, 4), than they did toward the actual reporting of realistic human relations and human rights problem situations (factor 1), when they were faced with these situations.

c. Advisers expressed more favorable views than did principals, with regard to all four human relations-human rights factors. Furthermore, with regard to the actual reporting of realistic human relations and human rights problem situations (factor 1), principals expressed unfavorable views.

2. When all advisers were compared to all principals, concerning their attitudes toward two freedom of expression and press factors, (factors 5, 6), the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of significance:

a. Advisers as a group and principals as a

group differed significantly, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward both freedom of expression and press factors. This was true for each factor separately, and when both factors were entered into analysis and were working together.

b. Advisers and principals collectively expressed slightly favorable views toward students' right to exercise freedom of expression and press (factor 6).

c. Advisers and principals collectively expressed favorable views toward the use of censorship and control, with regard to the high school newspaper.

d. When examined separately, principals expressed considerably less favorable views than advisers toward students' right to exercise freedom of expresssion and press. Also, principals favored the use of censorship and control rather strongly, whereas advisers generally favored the use of such actions, but more reluctantly.

3. When advisers and principals were classified into four high school enrollment size groups, and the four group attitudes toward four human relations-human rights factors (factors 1, 2, 3, 4) were compared the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of significance:

a. With advisers and principals combined and grouped by high school enrollment size, there was

significant difference between the four enrollment groups, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the four human relations-human rights factors, when all four factors were entered into analysis and were working together. This did not hold true for each factor when examined separately. There was no significant difference between groups, with regard to their expressed basic human relations beliefs (factor 2). There was significant difference between the enrollment groups, with regard to the other three factors.

b. With advisers and principals combined and grouped by high school enrollment size, there was greater difference between high schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more (group 1) and high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4), with regard to expressed group attitudes toward the human relations-human rights factors. The same was not true for any other enrollment group comparison.

c. The larger the high school enrollment, the more favorable were the combined attitudes of advisers and principals toward the human relations-human rights concerns. This was true with each of the four factors. Furthermore, respondents from high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4) expressed unfavorable views toward the reporting of conflict and

intergroup relations (factor 4). Also, respondents from high schools with enrollments of less than 450 (groups 3 and 4) expressed negative views toward the reporting of realistic human relations and human rights problem situations (factor 1), when they were confronted with these situations. Except for those two deviations, all enrollment groups recorded favorable attitudes toward each of the four human relations-human rights factors.

d. When advisers and principals were examined separately and classified into four enrollment size groups, there was significant difference between enrollment groups, for both advisers and principals, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the four human relations-human rights factors. This was true when all four factors were entered into analysis and were working together. There was greater significant difference between the principals' enrollment size groups, however, than between the advisers' enrollment size groups.

e. When advisers and principals were examined separately, and classified into four enrollment size groups, there were greater differences between the high schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more (group 1) and high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4), than between any other two groups, with regard to all four

factors. This was true for both advisers' and principals' enrollment groups. However, the differences between group 1 and group 4 respondents was much greater for principals than for advisers.

f. Principals overall expressed less favorable attitudes than advisers, with regard to the human relations-human rights concerns of the student newspaper. This was true with each of the four factors individually. Furthermore, principals from high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4) expressed unfavorable views concerning the reporting of conflict and intergroup relations problems (factor 4). The same was not true for advisers. Principals from all sized high schools, except the largest ones (group 1), expressed negative views toward the reporting of realistic human relations and human rights problem situations (factor 1), when they were confronted with these situations. The same was true for only those advisers from the smallest high schools (group 4).

4. When advisers and principals were classified into four enrollment size groups and the four group attitudes toward the two freedom of expression and press factors (factors 5, 6) were compared, the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of significance:

a. When advisers and principals were combined and grouped by high school enrollment, there was significant difference between the four enrollment groups, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the two freedom of expression and press factors, when both factors were entered into analysis and were working together. This was also true for each factor when examined separately.

b. When advisers and principals were combined and grouped by high school enrollment, there was greater difference between high schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more (group 1) and high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4), with regard to expressed group attitudes toward the freedom of press factors, than between any other two enrollment groups, when compared on the same factors. Furthermore, the views of these respondents from high schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more were significantly different from respondents from high schools with enrollments of less than 450 (groups 3, 4), with regard to both freedom of press factors.

c. The larger the high school enrollment, the more favorable were the combined attitudes of advisers and principals, toward the freedom of press factors. This was true for both factors individually. Furthermore,

respondents from all four enrollment groups expressed favorable views, with regard to students' exercising their rights of freedom of expression and press (factor 6). At the same time, respondents from all high schools with enrollment of 1,000 or less (groups 2, 3, 4) expressed favorable views toward the use of censorship and control, while respondents from the largest high schools (group 1) tended to express neutral views. For both factors, small enrollment high schools recorded the most negative views.

d. When advisers and principals were examined separately and classified into four enrollment size groups, there was significant difference between enrollment groups, for both advisers and principals, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the two freedom of press factors, when both factors were entered into analysis and were working together.

There was greater significant difference between the advisers' enrollment groups, however, than between the principals' enrollment groups.

e. When advisers and principals were examined separately, and classified into four enrollment size groups, there were greater differences between the high schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more (group 1) and high schools with enrollments of less than 225 (group 4),

than between any other two groups, with regard to the freedom of expression and press factors. This was true for both advisers' and principals' enrollment groups. However, the differences between group 1 and group 4 attitudes were much greater with advisers than with principals. This was a marked departure from the pattern found when the human relations-human rights factors were involved.

f. Principals overall expressed less favorable attitudes than advisers, with regard to the freedom of expression and press rights of students. This was true with both factors, individually. Furthermore, principals in all four enrollment groups favored the use of censorship and control (factor 5) rather strongly. Advisers, on the other hand, tended to disapprove of such actions. Both groups of respondents expressed favorable views toward students' right of free expression and press, but advisers views were considerably stronger, in this regard.

5. When advisers and principals were classified into two racial groups, according to whether the high school was physically segregated or physically desegregated, and their group attitudes toward four human relations-human rights factors (factors 1, 2, 3, 4), were compared the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of

significance:

a. Respondents in physically segregated high schools (race group 1) did not differ significantly from respondents in physically desegregated high schools (race group 2), with regard to their expressed attitudes toward all four human relations and human rights factors. This was true for each factor separately, and when all four factors were entered into the analysis and were working together.

b. Respondents in both the physically segregated and physically desegregated groups expressed generally favorable views, with regard to the human relations-human rights role of the student newspaper, as evidencedby examination of the mean scores of all four factors. However, both groups expressed more favorable attitudes toward the basic beliefs that the student press should assume a human relations and human rights role (factors 2, 3, 4), than they did toward the reporting of realistic human relations and human rights problem situations. Respondents in both racial groups expressed a generally neutral, although a slightly favorable, view toward factor 1.

c. When advisers and principals were examined separately and classified into the same two racial groups, there was no significant difference between

either the advisers' racial groups or principals' racial groups, with regard to their expressed attitudes toward the four human relations-human rights variables. This was true when all four factors were entered into analysis and were working together, and when each factor was examined separately.

6. When advisers and principals were classified into two racial groups, according to whether the high school was physically segregated or physically desegregated, and their group attitudes toward two freedom of expression and press factors (factors 5, 6), were compared, the following resulted, with regard to the .05 level of significance:

a. Respondents in physically segregated high schools (race group 1) did not differ significantly from respondents in physically desegregated high schools (race group 2), with regard to their expressed attitudes toward students' right to exercise freedom of press. This was true when both factors were entered into analysis and were working together, but it did not hold true for each factor separately. There was significant difference between groups, with regard to attitudes expressed toward basic freedom of expression and press (factor 6), but there was no significant difference between groups, with regard to attitudes expressed

toward the use of censorship and control (factor 5).

b. The combined respondents from physically desegregated high schools held less restrictive views toward students right of freedom of expression and press, than did combined respondents from physically segregated high schools. However, while both groups expressed generally favorable attitudes toward basic beliefs concerning students' right of freedom of expression and press, both groups also favored the use of censorship and control.

c. When advisers and principals were separated and classified into the same two racial groups, there was significant difference between principals' groups but not between advisers' groups, with regard to attitudes expressed toward students exercising freedom of press. For both advisers and principals racial groups, however, respondents from physically segregated high schools held less favorable views toward students' right of freedom of expression and press and favored more the use of censorship and control, than did respondents from physically desegregated high schools.

7. When advisers were asked to respond to two sets of items, concerning the actual contents of their high school's student newspaper and the actual contents of the school's journalism coursework, the following

resulted:

a. High school student newspapers rarely reported events and issues regarding human relations and human rights problems.

b. High school student newspapers regularly reported news that could be considered routine, noncontroversial school activities and events.

c. High school journalism courses moderately emphasized the learning of concepts dealing with mass media issues and problem areas.

d. High school journalism courses gave strong emphasis to the learning of skills important to producing a student newspaper.

e. High school journalism courses gave somewhat strong emphasis to the learning of principles relating to human relations values and responsibilities.

Conclusions

The major findings in this study suggested that:

1. The purposes of high school journalism courses were to deal primarily with basic skills and concepts necessary to produce a student newspaper.

2. School newspapers rarely reported or dealt with controversial issues or problems, in the schools studied.

3. The purpose of high school student newspapers

appeared to be to cover the routine, daily news dealing with student activities and events. There appeared to be little attention given to school situations which dealt with administrative and/or faculty problems or relations.

4. Generally, principals were less supportive than advisers of students' freedom of expression and generally favored more censorship and control.

5. Small high schools were more likely than large high schools to restrict the reporting of controversial issues and problems.

6. Segregated high schools were more likely to be restrictive than high schools which were racially desegregated.

7. The larger the high school the more likely it was to believe that student newspapers should serve a human relations function in the high school.

8. Advisers and principals, in both physically segregated and desegregated high schools, believed that student newspapers should serve a human relations function in the high school.

9. This study failed to demonstrate conclusively that student newspapers and classroom journalism courses actually facilitated a significant concern for human rights and human relations, within the high schools.

10. The strong tendency toward the use of

censorship, and the tendency to disapprove of reporting on sensitive and controversial school problems and issues, all suggested that both advisers and principals supported actions which were at variance with their views.

Recommendations

It was recommended that:

1. This study be duplicated but with the addition of more content analysis of a representative sample of student newspapers, in order to obtain more empirical evidence of what student newspapers actually print.

2. A study be done of the most effective way of changing the attitudes of school authorities, to enable them to perceive the potential value of student publications as performing a vital human relations function in the high schools.

3. Student newspapers and high school students be given more freedom and encouragement to perform all of the traditional functions that the professional press is charged to perform, and that high school authorities be encouraged to be more tolerant of the probability of student mistakes because of the need to learn responsibility through experience.

4. School administrators and journalism faculty encourage the free and open discussion of sensitive and

controversial issues, which relate to student life and activities, in both the student newspapers and the journalism classrooms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, Else; Levinson, Daniel J.; and Sanford, R. Nevitt. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950.

Backstrom, Charles H. and Hursh, Gerald D. Survey Research. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Cattell, Raymond B. Factor Analysis. New York: Harper Brothers, 1952.

_____, Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1964.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. A Free and Responsible Press. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Committee on Modern Journalism, Modern Journalism. Edited by Seigfried Mandel. New York: Pittman Publishing Corp., 1962.

Cook, Lloyd and Cook, Elaine. School Problems in Human Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

Dorsen, Norman (ed.). The Rights of Americans: What They Are -- What They Should be. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.

Engelhart, Max D. Methods of Educational Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1972.

Erickson, Kenneth; Benson, George; and Huff, Robert. Activisits in the Secondary Schools: Analysis and Recommendations. Eugene, Ore.: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1969.

Farson, Richard. Birthrights: A Bill of Rights for Children. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Festinger, Leon and Katz, Daniel (eds.) Research Methods in Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1953.

Fish, Kenneth. Conflict and Dissent in the High School. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1970.

Gatti, Daniel J. and Gatti, Richard D. The Teacher and the Law. West Nyack, N. Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Gerbner, George. "Smaller Than Life: Teachers and Schools in the Mass Media." Skornia, Harry J. (ed.) Problems and Controversies in Television and Radio. Palo Alto: Pacific Books Publishers, 1968.

Hines, Paul D. and Wood, Leslie. A Guide To Human Rights Education. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1969.

Hudgins, H. C. The Warren Court and the Public Schools: An Analysis of Landmark Supreme Court Decisions. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1970.

Keniston, Kenneth. Youth and Dissent. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javonovich, Inc., 1971.

Lucas, Roy. "The Rights of Students." Dorsen, Norman (ed.) The Rights of Americans: What They Are -- What They Should Be. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.

MacIver, R. M. Academic Freedom in Our Time. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Mosteller, Frederick and Moynihan, Daniel P. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Nafziger, Ralph O. and White, David Manning (eds.) Introduction to Mass Communication Research. 2nd Ed. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.

Parker, Don; O'Neil R. M.; and Econopouly, N. Civil Liberties: Case Studies and the Law. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

President's Commission on Campus Unrest. The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Washington, D. C., 1970.

Selltiz, Claire, et. al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1966.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Stember, Charles Herbert. Education and Attitude Change. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. 3rd Ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Wolseley, Roland E. and Laurence Campbell. Exploring Journalism. 2nd Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Booklets and Pamphlets

Ackerly, Robert L. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority. Washington, D. C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.

American Civil Liberties Union. Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools. New York: ACLU, 1968.

Brennan, William J., Jr. Teaching the Bill of Rights. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, 1963.

Campbell, Laurence R. A Principal's Guide To High School Journalism. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Foundation, 1957.

_____. Journalism in Middle West High Schools in 1969. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Society, 1969.

_____. Student Press Copes with High School Unrest, 1970. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Society, 1970.

_____. Teenagers' Attitudes Toward the First Amendment. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Foundation, 1969.

_____. The High School Newspaper as a Medium of Good Will. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Society, 1968.

_____. The High School Newspaper as a Public Relations Medium. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Society, 1971.

_____. The Human Equation and the School Newspaper. Iowa City: Quill and Scroll Society, 1970.

Cuban, Larry. Youth as a Minority: An Anatomy of Student Rights. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1972.

Educational School Boards Association. Policies That Clarify Student Rights and Responsibilities. A school board policy development kit prepared by the ESBA. Waterford, Conn.: ESBA, October 1970.

Gaddy, Dale. Rights and Freedoms of Public School Students: Directions from the 1960s. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems in Education, 1971.

Gibbs, Annette. Ten Guidelines for Principals and a Free Student Press. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia School of Education, 1972.

Glasser, Ira and Levine Alan. New York Civil Liberties Union Student Rights Project Report on the First Two Years, 1970-1972. New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, September, 1972.

Human Relations Committee of the Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission. The Teacher and Improved Human Relations in the School. Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1966.

Human Relations: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972.

Kleeman, Richard P. Student Rights and Responsibilities: Courts Force Schools To Change. An Education U. S. A. Special Report. Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972.

National Education Association. Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Washington, D. C.: NEA Task Force on Student Involvement, 1971.

National School Boards Association. School Board Policies on Student Rights: Educational Policies Development Kit. Waterford, Conn.: Educational Policies Service, January, 1973.

New York Civil Liberties Union. Student Rights Handbook. New York: Student Rights Project, 1971.

Phi Delta Kappa Teacher Education Project on Human Rights. A Guide for Improving Teacher Education in Human Rights. Norman, Oklahoma: 1971.

Newspapers, Magazines, and Periodicals

Abbott, C. Michael. "Demonstrations, Dismissals, Due Process, and the High Schools: An Overview." The School Review, LXXVII (June 1969).

_____. "Due Process and Secondary School Dismissals." Case Western Reserve Law Review, 20 (Fall 1969): 378.

Ackerly, Doug. "An Activist Student Comments." The Bulletin of the NASSP, (February 1971): 13-19.

Ackerly, Robert L. "Reactions to 'The Reasonable Exercise of Authority'." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 352 (February 1971): 1-12.

"Administrator's Forum: Student Editor Charges Unfair Censorship." School Management, (December 1969): 14+.

Anrig, Gregory R. "Those High School Protestors: Can Boards Put Up with Much More?" American School Board Journal, 156 (October 1969): 20-24.

"As Rebellion Spreads to High Schools." U. S. News and World Report, 64 (May 20, 1968): 36-38.

Atwood, L. Erwin and MacLean, Malcolm S. Jr. "How Principals, Advisers, Parents and Pupils View Journalism." Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1967): 71-78.

Balk, Alfred. "Where Are Tomorrow's Journalists?" Saturday Review, (January 8, 1966): 105-106.

Bentel, Dwight. "College Press Also Should Have Freedom." Editor and Publisher, (April 14, 1956): 56.

Boyd, John A. "High School Journalism Instruction In Indiana." Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Autumn 1964): 586-587.

Boyd, William B. "Student Unrest in the University: Implications for the Secondary School." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 53 (May 1969): 19-34.

Broudy, Harry S. "What Can the Schools Say About Human Rights?" Phi Delta Kappan, SLVII (May 1966): 467-473.

Campbell, Laurence R. "Training Sponsors for High School Journalism." Journalism Quarterly, XVI (December 1939): 368.

"Censorship and Student Rights." College Law Bulletin, 2 (January 1970): 1-4.

Clark, Todd. "Academic Freedom in the Public Schools." Bill of Rights Newsletter, 3 (Spring 1969): 1-2.

_____. "Student Protest and the Law." Bill of Rights Newsletter, 3 (Fall 1969): 1-3.

Clute, Morrel J. "Rights and Responsibilities of Students." Educational Leadership (December 1968): 240-42.

Cranford, Robert J. "Where Are Career Choices for Journalism Made?" Journalism Quarterly, XXXVII (Summer 1960): 422-424.

Cutlip, James. "Symbolic Speech, High School Protest and the First Amendment." Journal of Family Law, 9 (1969): 119-125.

Deal, Elizabeth M. "Responsible Freedom for the Secondary School Press: A Cooperative Effort." English Journal, 60 (October 1971): 960-962.

"Developments in the Law: Academic Freedom." Harvard Law Review, 81 (1968): 1132.

Dietrich, D. J. "What News Is Fit To Print in the High School Press?" English Journal, 61 (February 1972): 296-301.

Frank, Ronald E.; Massy, William F.; and Morrison, Donald G. "Bias in Multiple Discriminant Analysis." Journal of Marketing Research, II (August 1965): 250-258.

"Freedom of Expression." College Law Bulletin, 2 (December 1969); 1-2.

Grieco, Marie. "Communications, the Undiscovered Country." Library Journal, XCII (February 15, 1967): 845-848.

"Guidelines for Students' Rights and Responsibilities." Intellect, 101 (September 1972): 79-80.

Haiman, Franklyn S. "Freedom of Speech and Its Relationship to Dissent." The Bulletin of the NASSP (December 1970): 22-29.

Hentoff, Nat. "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights." Saturday Review of Literature (May 22, 1971): 60-74.

Heussenstamm, F. K. "Activism in Adolsecence: An Analysis of a High School Underground Press." Adolescence, 6 (Fall 1971): 317-336.

"High School Students Are Rushing Into Print -- and Court." Nation's Schools, 83 (January 1969): 30-31.

Horine, Don. "How Principals, Advisers and Editors View the High School Newspaper." Journalism Quarterly (Summer 1966): 339-345.

"How Free Should the High School Press Be?" Today's Education (September 1969): 52-54+.

Howarth, Roy E. "On the Decline of In Loco Parentis." Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (June 1972): 626-628.

Hughes, C. "Underground Newspaper, What's It All About." Clearinghouse, 46 (November 1971): 155-157.

James, Max H. "Progranda or Education? Censorship and School Journalism." Arizona English Bulletin (October 1970): 37-41.

Johnson, T. Page. "The First Amendment and Distribution of Literature in High Schools: A Case of Advice Not Taken." The Bulletin of the NASSP (February 1971): 74-78.

Kidd, Gerald D.; Van Schuyver, Billye M.; and Scott, Lederle. "The Students Right to Freedom of Expression." Oklahoma Teacher (March 1973): 9-12.

Kimball, Penn T. and Lubell, Samuel. "High School Students' Attitudes Toward Journalism as a Career." Journalism Quarterly (Summer 1960): 413-422.

King, Leth S. "Defiant Students Keep the Underground Press Rolling." New York Times (May 19, 1969): 35.

Klahn, Richard P. "The Tinker Case: A Principal's View Two Years Later." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 352 (February 1971): 73.

Kneeland, Douglas E. "Youth Rebellion of 60s Waning." New York Times (October 21, 1971): 43.

Ladd, Edward T. "Civil Liberties: Yet Another Piece of Baggage for Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 20 (Summer 1969): 136-140.

_____. "Students' Rights and the Need for Change in School Laws." The Bulletin of the NASSP (February 1971): 20-27.

Lubell, Samuel. "High School Students' Attitudes

Toward Journalism as a Career." Journalism Quarterly, XXVI (Spring 1959): 199-203.

McKenna, Bernard. "Student Unrest: Some Causes and Cures." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 55 (February 1971): 54-60.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Educational Effects of Mass Media of Communication." Teachers College Record, LVII (March 1956): 400-410.

Mallios, Harry C. "Symbolic Expression: The New Battle Facing School Administrators." Intellect, 101 (September 1972): 117-118.

Manchikes, Alice. "The Role of the High School Newspaper: Problems and Solutions." Kentucky English Bulletin, 22, 1 (Fall 1972): 22.

Morrison, Donald G. "On the Interpretation of Discriminant Analysis." Journal of Marketing Research, VI (May 1969): 156-163.

Pearl, Arthur. "There is Nothing More Loco Than Loco Parentis." Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (June 1972): 629-631.

Perry, Murvin H. and Jackson, Rex. "Career Guidance Problems in Kansas High Schools." Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Autumn 1964): 587-588.

Plasco, Marvin R. "School, Student and Appearance Regulations." Cleveland-Marshall Law Review, 18 (January 1969): 143.

Rummel, R. J. "Understanding Factor Analysis." The Journal of Conflict Resolution, XI, 4 (December 1971): 444-480.

Schrader, Steven. "The Role of the Newspaper in a Disadvantaged School." Bulletin of the Columbia Scholastic Press Advisers Association, 26, 3 (January 1969): 3-5.

Snider, Glenn R. "Human Rights: A High Priority in Teacher Education." The Phi Delta Kappan (November 1971): 172-173.

Sullivan, R. J. "Reluctant Rebels: High School

Underground Newspapers." Parents Magazine, 46 (April 1971): 56-57+.

Tebbel, John R. "Journalism Education: Myth and Reality." Saturday Review (November 13, 1965): 92+.

Triezenberg, George. "How To Live With Due Process." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 352 (February 1971): 62.

Trump, J. Lloyd. "On Humanizing Schools: Point of View and Basic Issues." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 36 (February 1972): 9-16.

_____. and Hunt, Jane. "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism." The Bulletin of the NASSP, 53 (May 1969): 150-158.

"What's Wrong with the High Schools?" Newsweek, 75 (February 16, 1970): 65-69.

Unpublished Material

Bennett, David L. "The Status of Scholastic Journalism: An Analytical Survey of the Nature of and Attitude Toward Scholastic Journalism in Oklahoma." Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Oklahoma, 1969.

Dolce, Carl J. "A Sensible Assessment of Student Rights and Responsibilities." A paper presented at the 103rd annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators. Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 20, 1971.

Floyd, Harold W. "A Study of Student Rights and School Authority With Regard to Long-Term Suspensions." Unpublished Master's thesis. New Mexico State University, 1972.

Guilliams, John D. "Educators' Attitudes Concerning Rights of Students and Their Relationship to Teachers' Assessment of Student Classroom Behavior." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. University of Oklahoma, 1972.

Maynard, Honor E. "A Study of Pupil Human Relations Within the School as Influenced by the Principal's Pattern of Behavior." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. University of Florida, 1955.

Nelson, Gordon. "Aspects of the Legal Relationship Between Students and the Public School." Unpublished paper prepared for the Consultative Center for Equal Education Opportunity. University of Oklahoma, 1971 (mimeographed).

Trager, Robert. "Freedom of the Scholastic Press: Landmark Legal Cases." Unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism. Washington, D. C., August, 17, 1970 (mimeographed).

Westin, Alan F. "Civic Education in a Crisis Age." Paper delivered at the Conference on the School and the Democratic Environment. April 10, 1969 (mimeographed).

Windhauser, John W. and Click, J. William. "High School Journalism Courses: Teachers and Perceived Professional Needs in Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania." A paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism conference. Carbondale, Illinois: August 1972 (mimeographed).

Court Cases

Antonelli v. Hammond, 308 F. Supp. 1329 (D. Mass. 1970).

Aquirre v. Tahoka Independent School District, 311 F Supp. 664 (N.D. Texas 1970).

Blackwell v. Issaquena County Board of Education, 363 F. 2d. 749 (5th Cir. Miss. 1966).

Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. Ed. 873 (Kansas 1954).

Brown v. Greer, 296 F. Supp. 595 (Miss. 1969).

Brown v. Louisiana, 383 U.S. 131, 141-142 (1966).

Burnside v. Byars, 363 F. 2d 744 (5th Cir. Miss. 1966).

Byrd v. Gary, 184 F. Supp. 388 (S.C. 1960).

Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education, 272 F. Supp. 613 (U.S. Dist. Ct. Ala. 1967).

Dixon v. Alabama, 294 F. 2d 150 (5th Cir. 1950).

Einhorn v. Maus, 300 F. Supp. 1169 (Pa. 1969).

Esteban v. Central Missouri State College, 277 F. Supp. 619 (W.D. Mo. 1967).

Ferrel v. Dallas Independent School District, 261 F. Supp. 545 (Tex. 1966); aff'd, 392 F. 2d 697 (1968); cert. denied, 393 U.S. 856 (1968).

Griffin v. Tatum, 300 F. Supp. 60 (Ala. 1969).

Guzick v. Drebus, 305 F. Supp. 472 (Ohio, 1969).

Hernandez v. School District Number One, 315 F. Supp. 289 (Colo. 1970).

In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (Ariz. 1967).

Karr v. Schmidt, 401 U.S. 1201 (Black, Cir. Justice Feb. 11, 1971), rehrg. denied, 91 S. Ct. 1248 (1971).

Lander v. Seaver, 32 Vt. 114 (1859).

Leonard v. School Committee of Attleboro, 212 N.E. 2d 468 (Mass. 1965).

Madera v. Board of Education of the City of New York, 386 F. 2d 778, 783 (CA2 1967).

Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167 (1961).

Pugsley v. Sellmeyer, 158 Ark. 247, 250 S.W. 538 (1923).

Schwartz v. Schuker, 298 F. Supp. 238, 242 (U.S. Dist. Ct. N.Y. 1969).

Scoville v. Board of Education, 425 F. 2d 10 (7th Cir. Ill. 1970), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 826 (1970).

Sullivan v. Houston Independent School District, 307 F. Supp. 1328 (Tex. 1969).

Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 512-513 (Iowa 1969).

Turley v. Adel Community School District, et. al., 322 F. Supp. 402 (Iowa 1971).

Vought v. Van Buren Public Schools, 306 F. Supp. 1388 (Mich. 1969).

West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) 637.

Zucker v. Panitz, 299 F. Supp. 102 (S.D. N.Y. 1969).

APPENDIX A

Instrument Used to Determine Attitudes
of Advisers and Principals

IMPORTANT: THE ASSUMPTION HERE IS THAT ALL STUDENTS SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN ABOUT THE VALUES AND RIGHTS PRIZED BY OUR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY. HOWEVER, IT IS ALSO ASSUMED THAT THE RIGHT OF FREE EXPRESSION, WHICH INCLUDES FREE PRESS, HAS CERTAIN SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS WHICH MUST ALSO BE LEARNED. IN PARTICULAR, THIS INCLUDES THE AREAS OF LIBEL OBSCENITY AND PRIVACY. KEEP IN MIND WHEN RESPONDING, THAT THESE ASSUMPTIONS ARE BEHIND EACH ITEM.

RATING KEY: 1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Neutral
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagree

PART A Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements, by circling the appropriate number.

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. Students should be encouraged to voice their views on anything they wish, in the high school newspaper, within a few basic guidelines.	1	2	3	4	5
2. High school students should have freedom of the press with a few basic guidelines.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The high school newspaper should seek out disadvantaged groups in the school and give them a voice.	1	2	3	4	5
4. An important function of the high school newspaper is to foster better human relations within the school.	1	2	3	4	5

5.	Racial relations within the high school should be discussed in the student newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The student newspaper should cover faculty meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	High school students should have the right of privacy.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The high school newspaper should cover student council meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	A good high school newspaper adviser should encourage staff members to explore any aspect of school life that does not violate the privacy and basic human rights of others in the process.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	An important criterion for withholding information from the high school newspaper is the principal's judgment regarding its potential damaging effects.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	High school students are not adults and therefore do not have the same constitutional rights.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	High school newspapers should be made to stick primarily to printing the school news.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Portraying a positive picture of the high school is an important function of the student newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Underground newspapers should not be allowed to exist within the high school grounds.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Student staff members should be encouraged to exercise their right of free press by experimenting with the school newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	High school students should have the right to dissent.	1	2	3	4	5

17.	Freedom of expression cannot be learned responsibly without the opportunity to practice it.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The ability to maintain control of the newspaper is an important competency for a high school newspaper adviser.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	High school journalists should be tightly controlled because they are still immature and need to learn responsibility first.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	High school students need to have the opportunity to express their views on controversial matters because it is a valuable learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The high school newspaper should seek to represent all groups within the school.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	The high school newspaper should be prohibited from reporting on discipline problems within the school.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	A high school newspaper adviser invites trouble if he allows staff members to function on their own without his control.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	All high school students generally should have the right to a voice in the student newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Providing for and encouraging free and open expression among all individuals and groups in the high school is one way of helping equal educational opportunity.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Many conflicts between student groups should be discussed in the high school newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5

27. Some conflicts between students and administrators should be discussed in the high school newspaper. 1 2 3 4 5

PART B - The following are possible high school problem situations. Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you believe each situation should be explored and discussed responsibly in the high school newspaper.

	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. Six American Indian students have been suspended by the principal for refusing to cut their long hair. It is a direct violation of school grooming rules. The Indians claim their cultural pride is at stake. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes.	1	2	3	4	5
29. A girl has been suspended for being in the sixth month of pregnancy. That exceeds the school board's regulation governing pregnancies. The girl's parents officially protested to the board that she should be allowed to finish the remaining two months of school. They were turned down. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes.	1	2	3	4	5
30. A black student and a white teacher got into an inclass argument and exhanged blows as a result. The student was suspended on the spot for two weeks, by the principal. There have since been arguments floating around about who was at fault in the incident. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes.	1	2	3	4	5

31. Teachers are unhappy with their salaries and are talking about starting professional negotiations over the matter. They are now planning a three-day work stoppage, calling it a professional workshop. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

32. For several weeks now, there have been rumors and informal accusations concerning the smoking of marijuana, by both faculty and students, during offschool hours. In fact, some have said that certain teachers are inviting students into their homes to do it. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

33. Students have been complaining that they do not have enough input into the decision-making processes of the high school. Recently a delegation of 37 students approached the principal on the matter. This was promptly followed by a delegation of parents who insisted that the principal should run the school and not the students. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

34. Locker searches have been a practice in your high school for a long time, mostly for keeping them in order. Unexpectedly, a group of students protest these actions. They say it is an invasion of their privacy. If this

happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

35. A recent Vietnam POW spoke to the student body in an assembly. He gave a stirring talk, supporting U.S. efforts to stop communism in Southeast Asia. A rather large number of students subsequently demand that a speaker offering an opposing point of view should be invited to speak also. They contend that it is fair to offer equal time. The principal refuses. If this happened in your high school the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

36. Five teachers have been complaining in classes that the principal is dogmatic and unfair because they have nothing to say about major policy matters. It has aroused the students, so the president of the student council privately talks with the principal, who confirms this but contends that he was hired to make those decisions and not pass the buck to the faculty. Furthermore, the student council president discovers that faculty-principal dissension is growing. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

37. The other day, a student wanted to see his personal record folder because he was fearful that certain teachers were writing damaging statements about him and entering them in his file. The principal denied him permission to do so because the boy was a known troublemaker.

As it turned out the principal was correct because the boy "blasted" it all over school, claiming his rights had been violated. If this happened in your high school, the student newspaper should explore the situation and write an article if it wishes. 1 2 3 4 5

Advisers' Supplementary Questionnaire Rating Items on the Contents of the High School Newspaper

PART C Please circle the appropriate number which indicates the extent to which articles concerning the following topics appear in the school newspaper.

RATING KEY:
1 - Always
2 - Frequently
3 - Occasionally
4 - Rarely
5 - Never

		A	F	O	R	N
1.	Sports events.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Student feelings toward the school.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	School social events.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Problems between student groups.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Student-teacher relations.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Sexual standards and behaviors of students.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Administration's performance.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Rights of students.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Drama and music activities.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Quality of the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Board of education's actions.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	School discipline policies.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Strengths of the school system.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Student grievances.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Student academic performances.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Student government actions.	1	2	3	4	5

17.	Teacher-administration relations.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Quality of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Student-administration relations.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Community problems.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Teacher grievances.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Administrative problems.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	School spirit.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Achievements of students.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	School sponsored clubs and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Career opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5

Advisers' Supplementary Questionnaire Rating Items on the Contents of High School Journalism Coursework

---

PART D — Please indicate the degree of in-class instructional emphasis placed on each area of journalism, by circling the appropriate number at the right of each item.

RATING KEY:
1 - Chief Emphasis
2 - High Emphasis
3 - Moderate Emphasis
4 - Little Emphasis
5 - No Emphasis

		CE	HE	NE	LE	NE
1.	Democratic values.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	News writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Editorial writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Representing all groups in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Feature writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Giving minority groups a voice.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Editing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Protection of news sources.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Responsibilities concomitant with free expression.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Human rights.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Makeup and design techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Ethics of reporting.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Headline writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Public opinion formation.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Freedom of press.	1	2		4	5

16.	Libel and slander.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Interviewing techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Social responsibility of the press.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Forms of censorship.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Mass media and society.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Slanting and stereotyping the news.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

Table 50

Raw Scores of Advisers with Regard to Six Attitude Factors

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1	2	31	8	6	14	18	15
2	3	2	37	5	4	13	22	6
3	3	2	38	6	8	10	24	9
4	2	2	28	10	7	10	29	11
5	3	2	25	7	5	8	32	7
6	1	2	11	5	2	4	30	5
7	2	1	22	8	6	6	23	8
8	4	1	17	6	5	9	28	7
9	4	1	43	7	14	20	12	16
10	3	1	27	9	8	7	24	9
11	1	1	34	11	7	15	32	8
12	4	1	37	10	10	13	18	17
13	4	2	47	11	8	13	18	17
14	4	1	29	10	10	10	18	10
15	3	2	47	11	8	16	25	21
16	2	1	28	7	7	12	25	14
17	2	2	40	8	8	11	25	9
18	3	2	31	5	8	9	25	11
19	3	2	35	10	9	15	15	11
20	3	1	41	9	12	12	23	17
21	3	1	31	11	9	11	26	9
22	4	2	54	9	10	14	20	10
23	1	1	38	9	5	8	23	8
24	1	1	19	9	4	8	30	7
25	1	1	34	5	4	8	31	8
26	4	2	29	15	7	11	25	7
27	4	2	45	6	10	13	18	17
28	3	1	45	8	7	14	22	10
29	2	2	46	6	8	16	11	9
30	3	2	21	10	8	9	33	7
31	3	2	32	11	8	9	26	8
32	3	2	21	7	6	4	32	5
33	3	2	38	15	7	9	20	13
34	4	1	32	9	7	12	27	10
35	2	1	40	8	8	15	16	12
36	4	1	36	7	4	11	18	13
37	4	2	28	10	7	8	28	10

Table 50 - Continued

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
38	1	2	32	8	6	10	26	10
39	1	2	31	10	6	7	30	10
40	3	1	22	5	4	5	26	7
41	2	2	38	10	10	12	24	10
42	3	2	23	5	9	8	18	8
43	4	1	50	10	15	14	13	20
44	2	2	30	10	11	9	29	12
45	1	1	17	7	4	6	30	5
46	1	1	25	9	8	8	28	9
47	1	2	40	5	13	17	15	5
48	2	1	27	9	8	9	21	10
49	3	1	33	5	4	7	19	11
50	4	1	44	5	6	12	28	8
51	3	1	33	9	8	9	22	8
52	1	1	29	11	8	8	31	9
53	4	1	29	10	8	10	21	10
54	1	2	38	6	5	8	22	6
55	1	2	16	10	5	6	32	7
56	1	2	34	7	5	7	28	8
57	1	2	15	11	7	7	34	7
58	2	2	21	8	4	4	30	6
59	1	2	24	7	6	6	29	8
60	1	2	35	10	11	11	21	11
61	1	2	36	5	4	10	30	12
62	2	2	16	6	4	10	16	9
63	3	1	36	8	8	10	21	13
64	3	2	35	8	7	11	24	12
65	2	2	13	5	3	10	32	7
66	3	2	27	11	8	8	27	12
67	4	2	47	5	8	14	15	9
68	1	1	24	7	9	9	29	10
69	1	1	23	6	7	6	20	9
70	1	1	23	7	6	7	29	7
71	3	2	48	7	7	19	17	9
72	1	2	34	7	7	10	18	10
73	4	1	25	8	8	10	24	10
74	2	2	14	8	5	8	27	7
75	2	1	38	6	8	14	18	12
76	4	1	27	13	8	10	28	10
77	2	2	34	5	4	4	22	5
78	4	1	17	8	5	10	30	8
79	3	2	23	11	9	10	32	9
80	1	1	15	7	4	4	32	5

Table 50 - Continued

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
81	1	2	25	5	7	1	13	2
82	1	2	27	12	8	9	24	11
83	1	1	25	8	4	4	39	5
84	1	2	13	10	4	6	29	7
85	1	2	26	10	6	7	35	8
86	1	2	25	7	7	6	33	6
87	3	2	30	7	8	13	31	11
88	2	1	18	5	6	10	18	9
89	2	2	38	12	10	14	19	13
90	2	2	14	7	5	8	31	6
91	4	1	12	9	7	8	29	7
92	3	2	44	5	9	18	18	13
93	3	1	27	7	5	8	14	7
94	3	2	32	9	8	10	24	12

Table 51

Raw Scores of Principals with Regard to Six Attitude Factors

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2	2	4	15	11	14	21	15
2	3	2	38	2	4	9	0	8
3	2	2	23	10	8	11	27	12
4	1	2	28	7	6	9	26	7
5	2	1	23	10	10	8	22	10
6	4	1	43	9	6	9	21	18
7	4	1	40	6	10	14	18	15
8	3	1	34	11	10	8	15	12
9	3	1	22	7	8	8	26	14
10	1	2	31	11	6	11	19	17
11	4	1	39	12	11	13	21	14
12	4	2	25	7	7	5	22	7
13	3	2	44	15	18	15	13	13
14	4	2	44	12	8	16	21	16
15	4	1	27	10	10	10	18	10
16	3	1	51	8	10	14	16	13
17	3	2	40	11	10	16	23	18
18	2	1	55	11	16	18	9	25
19	3	1	21	14	5	20	23	22
20	3	1	24	24	16	9	28	19
21	1	1	38	12	8	8	26	12
22	4	2	48	12	8	15	21	16
23	1	1	44	8	5	4	13	16
24	4	1	30	9	9	14	22	10
25	1	1	43	9	8	10	20	12
26	4	2	55	9	7	8	24	12
27	4	2	40	8	8	15	21	14
28	4	2	43	9	16	17	15	15
29	4	2	33	10	9	10	19	15
30	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
31	2	2	42	11	11	12	18	17
32	3	2	35	10	10	12	21	12
33	3	2	55	5	16	20	12	25
34	3	2	37	9	4	8	14	21
35	4	1	36	11	12	17	14	19
36	2	1	43	10	9	17	23	17
37	4	2	55	8	14	16	12	19

Table 51 - Continued

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
38	4	1	43	9	9	14	21	14
39	4	2	41	1	4	13	0	4
40	3	1	43	10	8	11	18	12
41	1	2	17	5	5	3	22	6
42	1	2	21	10	7	8	26	8
43	2	2	38	10	10	12	23	10
44	4	1	40	10	11	15	20	15
45	2	2	32	12	8	10	26	11
46	1	1	29	9	12	12	25	10
47	1	1	5	2	6	15	0	6
48	3	2	36	10	7	14	22	10
49	3	1	54	9	8	16	18	20
50	2	1	54	10	14	10	14	14
51	3	1	44	10	10	14	22	18
52	1	1	23	8	6	4	28	9
53	4	1	55	6	13	11	9	20
54	1	2	4	8	8	1	15	10
55	1	2	45	10	8	10	21	11
56	1	2	33	13	8	11	23	10
57	1	2	45	9	8	13	19	10
58	2	2	20	9	6	8	27	10
59	1	2	25	11	8	8	27	12
60	1	2	31	10	11	11	18	12
61	2	2	43	9	12	9	16	10
62	2	2	47	10	12	11	19	13
63	3	1	36	10	8	9	23	12
64	2	2	32	15	2	10	13	9
65	4	1	27	9	7	8	30	8
66	4	1	53	14	12	12	14	16
67	3	2	29	11	14	10	22	10
68	1	1	9	10	2	4	16	17
69	3	1	36	8	10	10	19	15
70	4	2	53	10	8	15	15	10
71	3	2	24	10	8	10	23	12
72	3	1	41	11	10	11	18	11
73	1	1	10	2	4	8	0	4
74	1	2	34	10	8	8	21	11
75	4	1	46	10	13	9	22	15
76	2	2	28	10	6	8	20	10
77	2	1	49	11	8	15	15	13
78	4	1	29	10	10	13	22	15
79	2	2	33	6	10	8	20	6

Table 51 - Continued

Subject Number	Enrollment Group	Racial Group	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
80	3	2	45	10	10	12	18	16
81	4	1	26	14	10	10	19	12
82	3	2	44	8	10	13	14	16
83	1	1	31	6	9	9	20	17
84	2	2	11	5	4	6	28	5
85	4	1	38	9	8	11	21	13
86	1	2	36	13	11	11	21	12
87	1	2	32	12	9	9	22	12
88	1	1	27	10	9	8	23	14
89	1	2	26	8	8	8	25	10
90	1	2	30	11	5	8	20	9
91	3	2	31	11	10	11	19	12
92	2	1	18	11	10	10	20	10
93	4	1	45	9	14	17	14	18
94	4	2	44	10	16	16	17	18
95	4	1	50	8	8	18	14	17
96	3	1	44	9	14	17	13	20
97	3	2	25	10	8	10	25	10
98	3	1	32	9	10	13	19	11

Table 52

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 1: Reporting Human Relations Problems in the Newspaper (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
30	.8488
31	.7864
36	.7712
29	.7703
37	.7583
32	.7336
28	.7031
35	.6769
34	.6519
33	.6345
6	.5085

Table 53

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 2: Basic Human Relations Beliefs (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
21	.6486
9	.6287
8	.5020
4	.4869
13	.4209

Table 5

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 3:
Basic Human Rights Beliefs
(See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
16	.6147
15	.5733
24	.4268
7	.4143

Table 55

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 4:
Conflict and Intergroup Relations Reporting
(See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
26	.6264
25	.5149
27	.4721
5	.4248

Table 56

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 5: Censorship and Control of the Student Newspaper (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
18	.6317
19	.6055
14	.5930
22	.5907
11	.5723
23	.5697
12	.5241
10	.4517

Table 57

Factor Loadings for Each Item in Factor 6: Basic Freedom of Expression and Press Beliefs (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
1	.7196
2	.6463
20	.4971
3	.4784
17	.4136

Table 58

Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Reporting of Human Relations and Human Rights Problems in the Student Newspaper (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
22	.8070
6	.7543
11	.7401
21	.7387
7	.7379
12	.7287
5	.7132
2	.7100
4	.7027
17	.6965
8	.6865
19	.6851
20	.6741
10	.5915
18	.5593
13	.5042
14	.4840

Table 59

Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Reporting of Student Activity News in the Student Newspaper (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
1	.7250
15	.7235
25	.6561
9	.6366
24	.6281
26	.6237
23	.6051
16	.5778
3	.5502

Table 60

Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Mass Media Issues and Problems in the Journalism Classes (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
19	.7298
20	.6834
16	.6797
15	.6742
18	.6428
21	.5954
14	.5620
8	.4125

Table 61

Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Newspaper Skills in the Journalism Classes (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
11	.8004
13	.7019
7	.6677
12	.5905
5	.5449
2	.5339
3	.4920
17	.4868

Table 62

Factor Loadings for Each Item in the Factor Concerning the Teaching of Human Rights Concepts in the Journalism Classes (See Appendix A)

Item Number	Factor Loading
6	.7521
1	.6663
4	.6291
10	.5577
9	.4418