CONFLICT ON CAMPUS: EXAMINING MULTIPLE LEVELS OF INFLUENCE ON

INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM IN STUDENT NEWSPAPERS

by

WILL HEATH

WILSON LOWREY, COMMITTEE CHAIR
CORY ARMSTRONG
JAMES CAILLIER
GEORGE DANIELS
SCOTT PARROTT

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the College of Communication and Information Sciences
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2019

ABSTRACT

Community media is the media that is most immediate, as well as the media that is most trusted. In student media, journalists serve specialized communities in settings that can prove to be training grounds for the future of journalism. This research examined whether traditional measures that have been used in the study of communities — structural pluralism and social capital — can be applied to conflict-oriented role conceptions and role enactments of individuals working for student newspapers. The survey used a mixed-method approach, by surveying advisers and student editors to ask about social capital at multiple levels, and to ask which traditional journalistic role conceptions they believe are most important for journalists. The research then used a quantitative content analysis of the newspapers identified in the survey to analyze the stories for the presence or absence of conflict and investigation in the local news. Municipal structural pluralism emerged as a significant predictor of conflict reporting. Social capital between individuals working in student media and their administration negatively predicted conflict reporting, but social capital variables yielded little else that was statistically significant. Results indicated that level of pluralism of the school had no effect on the likelihood that campus media will embrace conflict roles or conflict reporting. Results also suggested that when student media are produced in in less pluralistic municipal communities (typically smaller towns), and where higher levels of social capital are reported, there is less likely to be an atmosphere in which student newspapers and those working for the papers embrace the reporting of conflict and investigation.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

a   Cronbach's index of internal consistency

d.f.   Degrees of freedom: number of values free to vary after certain restrictions have been placed on the data

M   Mean: the sum of a set of measurements divided by the number of measurements in the set

p   Probability associated with the occurrence under the null hypothesis of a value as extreme as or more extreme than the observed value

r   Pearson product-moment correlation

t   Computed value of t test

SD   Standard deviation *n* Number

<   Less than

>   More than

=   Equal to

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Investigative reporting has been defined as the process of exercising moral judgment about potential wrongdoing in society and then working to unearth and expose what has happened through the news media (Coleman & Wilkins, 2002; Berkowitz, 2007; Aucoin, 2008). Matheson (2009) noted that, among its many definitions, investigative journalism can be universally characterized as "moments when journalism steps outside its usual practices of tracking the debates amongst society's dominant voices or reproducing the material pre-produced for it by public relations" (p. 84). Investigative and watchdog journalism also typically requires reporting of conflict, which can be challenging to news organizations, journalists, and even to audiences (de Vreese, 2005) — and as explored in this dissertation, to student journalists as well, as they face the challenges of reporting conflict for the first time.

Some research has shown "a robust and steady tradition of investigative journalism, particularly at the local level, in newspapers of all sizes and in virtually every corner of the country" (Lanosga, 2014). However, this practice has ebbed and flowed over the years (Feldstein, 2006). For example, Weinberg (1996) found that the explosion in investigative "muckraking" at the turn of the 20th century was followed by 30 years of decline, in quality and quantity. Also, while a commitment to investigative reporting ideals is found across many kinds of journalists and journalism, reporters at small US dailies typically are typically less likely to undertake investigative projects, both because of their newsroom cultures and because of the constraints that surface from the economic pressures their organizations face (Berkowitz, 2007).

Today much of the debate over the future of journalism assumes that the volume and quality of investigative journalism is declining (Beecher, 2009; Scott 2009), even if little methodology has been established to test these claims (Cordell, 2009). The former head of the US Center for Public Integrity, Charles Lewis lamented the state of investigative journalism in 2007, citing research which showed a drop in the volume and the quality of journalism in newspapers in the US. This ought to be a concern for readers of US journalism, who are in need of a journalism that Ettema and Glasser (1998) described as the "fiercest of indignation" combined with the "hardest of fact" (p. 3).

Journalists often first experience the practices and norms of the profession at the local level — "reporters are self-conscious about their community information role," as Shaw and McCombs (1977, p. 22) say — and they become socialized to seeing events as important or unimportant news events "through either academic or on-the-job training (or both)." Journalism education plays an important role in this socialization, as it "perpetuates or modifies professional practices and molds the perceptions journalists have of the role and function of the media'' (Gaunt 1992, p. 1). The college newsroom is often the starting point for students, as it is where they learn the norms and mission of journalism, as well as the news-making process (Splichal & Sparks, 1994). The campus newspaper may be seen as "a training ground for the next generation of journalists," as Kanigel (2006) wrote (p. 5).

Today there is evidence that dedication to public service journalism at the student level remains reasonably strong, despite some normative shifts. For example, student news media and the practices and norms of student journalism have managed to remain stable, even as funding for campus news media tightens (Sanders et al, 2008; Kopenhaver, 2015). Student journalists are likely to be more engaged citizens than students not involved in journalism, taking interests in

current events and establishing free-expression literacy (Bobkowski, Goodman & Bowen, 2012). While journalism students have moved toward a market orientation in recent years, they are also increasingly expressing more interest in a journalism that serves the public (Andersson & Wadbring, 2015). In the absence of well-resourced commercial news media in some campus-area communities, "student journalists perceive that they serve both the campus and wider community," and they "see their role as increasingly important" (Saul, 2016, para. 5). Kanigel (2006) identified the role of campus newspapers as "a community forum where students, faculty, administrators and staff can debate issues of a common concern" as well as "a watchdog that barks when a cafeteria is cited for health code violations or athletes drive around with handicapped parking placards" (p. 5).

If the goal of campus media is indeed to provide a learning ground for those students before they become part of the workforce that practices journalism in communities large and small — or, to provide an example of how media interact with both readers and powerful sources in communities — researchers should explore what sort of job the campus media are doing in teaching those lessons, including the nature of investigative journalism and reporting of conflict at campus news outlets. Also, as community journalists, student journalists must learn about the journalist-audience relationship, which can be close, but often distant as well: The nature of that relationship can vary widely. Netzley and Banning (2011) surveyed student journalists on campuses across the nation, finding that many of them believe their news preferences differ greatly with their audiences. The community contexts in which campus journalism acts itself out are varied and complex, and the relationship between communities and the newspapers that serve them plays out in a unique way on a college campus.

The term "community' can apply to both campus and municipal communities, as well as to more abstract forms. Dahl (1968) defined community as an aggregation of individuals motivated by their self-interests, with individuals ultimately being the holders of power in communities. Byerly (1961) called community newspapers "the unifying force for the community" and said community journalism is about the newspaper and its journalists belonging with and to their community – an important function for journalism to play if communities are indeed aggregations of self-interested individuals. Today, community, or local, news remains especially influential. A 2016 Pew Research Center study found that citizens who are "civically engaged" are much more likely to "use and value" local news; a 2018 Pew study found most consumers of American journalism evaluate their local media fairly positively, and say it is important for local media to both understand their community's history, and to be personally engaged in the local area. This includes citizens who have stronger ties to their communities as well as those who are more likely to vote in local elections, and this finding held regardless of political affiliation. Local journalism and journalists, whether professionals or students, are in an extraordinary position to influence those around them; however, they are also likely to feel pressure from the public they serve, because working in a small local setting is likely to put them in more daily interactions with their community. Community journalists act most effectively when they "listen" to the community to bring to light its diverse, hidden components, issues and problems, and "lead" them toward realization and resolution (Lowrey, Brozana & Mackay, 2008). It is here that the idea of investigative news at the community level becomes both important but more challenging (and potentially less common) because of pressures. It is challenging to report conflict news in community settings, and it becomes even tougher with financial challenges to the news industry. So, it seems more important than ever for journalists to

be socialized to the norms and practices that encourage investigative/watchdog/conflict news at the community level — and campus journalism is a highly important part of that socialization, as it gives students the opportunity to practice investigative journalism within the varied pressures of the community context (Berkowitz, 2007).

The official structure of the university itself is another element of the complexity of the community in a campus context, and this element can bring support, but also tension and constraints. Stewart (2004) wrote that many regularly published student newspapers "read like press releases" owing to interference from the university. Just as there are different types of municipal communities, college campuses can vary in terms of the relationship between school officials and the student bodies, as well as in terms of the diversity and size of student populations.

A significant relationship exists between U.S. journalism students' college experience and their perspectives about journalism. Journalism education has been shown to increase a journalist's commitment to the job (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1996; Lowrey & Becker, 2004). Yet, journalism education also teaches future journalists certain realities about constraints over their work and the limits of their autonomy. The student journalist operates in a regulated context in which multiple players tend to share agreement about the appropriate nature of student journalism. For example, according to Files (1987), university administrators, advisers, publishers and commercial news editors all agree on four primary roles for a student newspaper: watchdog, university support, thorough news coverage, and commercial counterpart. Students may not perceive the control over their work. Perry (1968) said student journalists were overly optimistic, expecting "to work in a world — rather unreal — in which a substantial publication that has great power to affect the well-being of the whole campus is entrusted to their custody

with no strings attached" (p. 4). The plentiful research on student journalism censorship and control suggests there are many controlling strings, and that these derive from many and varied sources. This dissertation is an exploration of the origins of this control over student journalists, and particularly over their capacity to conduct "conflict-oriented" reporting and investigative work. The dissertation also examines role conceptions about conflict, to which journalists are socialized. Role conceptions help define what is appropriate practice for journalists, and what places journalism should occupy in the larger community (Mellado, 2015).

First, it is proposed that how pluralistic or diverse a community and its power structure (its institutions and officials) are will affect how much journalists are able to report conflict and their role conceptions about conflict. This "structural pluralism" of the community characterizes both the community's power structure and the potential sources of power, and research has shown this to be an important basis for the likelihood that journalists and their news organizations will report conflict within a community (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1980).

Second, it is proposed that the level of social capital between journalists and community members will affect how much conflict is reported, as well as journalists' role conceptions about conflict. Social capital, defined as a combination of social trust and network density, has frequently been employed in a variety of settings within the community, as both a predictor and an outcome. Social capital can promote cohesiveness, which may discourage the revealing of conflict, but it may also encourage risk-taking — which can be important to investigative reporting — because it promotes trust between parties. It is proposed that the level of conflict reporting in a student newspaper can be explained to some degree by perceived social capital, both inside a campus community and in a larger municipal community. Additionally, the level of social capital that exists inside the newsroom — that is, among the staff at the student paper —

will be examined. The social capital (conceptually close to social trust) between the university's administration and the student newspaper, will also be considered.

Next, literature on the major concepts in the dissertation will be presented, as well as literature on the relationships among these concepts. The literature review begins, however, with an overview of research on campus journalism, which is the case that is studied in this dissertation. Following the literature review, hypotheses and research questions that derive from the conceptual approaches will be presented. Finally, the methodology for the study will be explained, followed by study results and a discussion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Campus media and student journalism

The college campus media experience plays an important role in the journalist's socialization to the norms of the profession and news organization. Some context on student journalism and campus media is provided here. Campus newspapers existed even before formal journalism curricula were established in U.S. colleges and universities (Carey, 2000; Zempter, 2017) and have, for more than a century, provided consistent opportunities for young journalists to apply theoretical principles to real-world contexts. Ingelhart (1993) says that more than 90 percent of the 4,000 colleges and universities in the United States support a student newspaper, and that the nation's campus newspapers boast a circulation of more than 8 million. Duscha and Fischer (1973) identified three different campus newspaper types: house organ (under the direct control of university administration or the faculty members responsible to the administration); campus press (published either by a board or a student governing body and financed in part with university funds or from a student activity fee); and independent press (no direction from the administrators of the institution and with no funds from the university or student activity fees). Similarly, Click (1980) identifies four ways to organize a student publication on a public college campus. These include designating the publication as (1) a student activity, (2) a journalism laboratory or practicum, (3) an auxiliary enterprise (an agency of the school that receives income from the school in return for services it provides and pays its full expenses from that income), or (4) an independent operation.

Cook (1989) says about 1/3 of campus newspapers across the nation are housed in student affairs divisions; approximately 1/3 are connected to an academic program in journalism; about 12 percent of the nation's campus newspapers are independent; and the remaining are associated with the "president's office, the public relations office, or within a particular college" (p. 2). Most student newspapers receive funding from their sponsoring institutions (John & Tidwell, 1996), and Kopehnaver and Spielberger (1992) reported that only 12 percent receive more than 90 percent of their annual income from advertisers. Around 20 years ago, Bodle (1996) surveyed over 100 media advisers on different campuses around the country regarding their student news outlets' degree of independence from the university, and he developed the following scale for categorizing them: strongly independent; moderately independent; mixed; moderately curriculum-based; strongly curriculum-based (p. 20-21).

Campus media serve a variety of functions. Decades ago, Blackwell (1939) conceptualized the college newspaper as a representative of the university that supports it, noting that the college newspaper "was established and exists for the primary purpose of reporting the news of the institution to the students and faculty, and in some cases to the alumni and general public" (p. 243). Blackwell added that the paper's secondary functions are to reflect the views of the student body and to interpret the institution to the public. Files (1987) found that university presidents, journalism program administrators, student newspaper advisers, and commercial newspaper editors and publishers generally agree on four functions of the campus newspaper: freedom of expression, campus communication vehicle, instructional tool, and career training. That includes a defense of the First Amendment — according to Bickham and Shin (2013): "Intolerance of censorship at the collegiate level can lead to general appreciation for fair and balanced reporting in the professional realm" (p. 25).

Much of the research related to campus media has concerned its function either as an instructional tool or the likelihood that authorities on college and university campuses will attempt to censor the content (Bodle, 1994; Pasqua, 1971; Buss, 1988; Meyer, 1989; Kleiman, 1996; Wozniak, 2004; Robie, 2010; Dvorak & Dilts, 1992; Smith, 2002; Snyder 2002; Ryan & Martinson, 1986; Kasior & Darrah, 1996; Alsandor, 2005; Miller, 2008; Hapney, 2014). Regarding censorship, a substantial amount of research has focused on the Supreme Court's 1988 *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier* decision, which allowed school administrators to censor school publications that are not public forums if the censorship is related to "legitimate pedagogical concerns," as the justices phrased it. A variety of influences can result in the student newspaper being censored (Bickham, 2008). John and Tidwell (1996) analyzed campus newspapers and found that campuses with stronger journalism education and a greater influence from journalism faculty were more likely to subject their campus press to censorship.

Bodle (1994) reported that around 20 percent of student news publication advisers have been threatened with either job dismissal or pressured by administrators because they allowed, or considered allowing, the student press to print a news story that administrators did not want published. Bickham and Shin (2013) found that the existence of official governing rules made censorship less likely, though student editors still ranked censorship as a problem. Other research has explored ways to skirt administrative censorship at private institutions (Buzzelli, 2015). Student editors were more likely to self-censor content when they perceived a greater level of administrative control over the newspaper (Bickham & Shin, 2013; Farquhar & Carey, 2018).

Other research into college media assesses media for its use as a tool for instruction and career preparation (Spevak, 1971; Day, 1989; Hilt & Lipschultz, 1996; McClung, 2001; Magaw, 2014; Bockino, 2017). Research has found that student journalists are likely to be more engaged

10

citizens than students not involved in journalism, taking interests in current events and establishing free-expression literacy (Bobkowski, Goodman & Bowen, 2012). Rampal (1982) noted that a department-run campus newspaper has advantages for the journalism faculty and the students: "There is greater satisfaction from teaching under the 'real world' demands rather than strictly from the theoretical angle" (p. 50).

Other research into college media has examined the content produced by student journalists (Huffman, 2004; Payne & Mills, 2015). Bodle (1992) compared US campus papers with their respective general circulation community newspapers, and found them as "readable, interesting, and thorough" as those in general circulation, and "a readable and informative alternative to the community daily" (p. 34). Student newspapers have been shown to be preferable to community dailies in a number of situations (Bodle, 1996; Collins & Armstrong, 2008), though, in general, interest in reading news in student media has been found to be relatively low among students (Lipschultz & Hilt, 1999; Bressers & Bergen, 2002). Students' stories about elections have been shown to use more diverse sources, focus more on human interest, and strike a more neutral tone, than the professional newspapers in the same communities (Burch & Cozma, 2016). This would seem to be a positive sign for the future of the norms of professional journalism.

Conflict reporting

Conflict is an important part of every community, whether a campus or traditional community. Conflict is also an important part of journalistic reporting at the community level. The existence of conflict is inherent to any social system, if only because a plurality of social actors is competing continuously for limited resources (Eisenstadt, 1995). Tichenor, Donohue & Olien (1980) called conflict a principal ingredient of social change, as well as a stimulator of

11

both knowledge and opinion. According to their research, it also has a legitimizing function for specific opinions. Conflict in the media results in "sharpened debates, mobilized supporters, challenged inequities, and social involvement considered crucial to democratic functioning" (Hindman & Yamamoto, 2011, p. 853). Mass media such as newspapers contribute to this process without necessarily being advocates of change per se (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1980).

Conflict within communities tends to happen in multiple phases, according to Tichenor, Donohue and Olien (1980): initiation, definition, public, and legitimation. According to their definition, the press contributes mostly to the final action, legitimation, in which "groups or certain role incumbents label the issue, or some aspect of it, as worthy in terms of basic norms and values of the community" (p. 112). Questions of legitimacy often become central to a controversy, and media tend to accelerate conflict and legitimate it more than initiate it; that is, research has shown that newspapers can widen the scope of a particular conflict, but initiation begins with the organization of opposition groups. The news media's legitimating and scope widening of conflict is also constrained in different ways, depending on the social structure of the community (Tichenor et al, 1980).

Newspaper coverage of conflict is an essential element of why newspapers exist in the first place. "The ideal goal of traditional journalism," according to Entman (2005), "has been to make power accountable: to keep ordinary citizens apprised of what government is doing, and how it affects them both individually and with respect to the groups and values that they care about" (p. 48). Journalists have shown an interest in building a "conflict frame" in news reporting, even if they do not contribute to creating conflict directly (Bartholome et al, 2015; Hoxha & Hanitzsch, 2018), and research on news values has consistently held conflict as a key

factor in the news selection process (Bennett, 1996; McManus, 1994; Price & Tewksbury, 1997). In his study of frames that are used by audiences when discussing current affairs, Neuman (1992) developed the conflict frame, which he said was reflected by the journalistic routine of reporting stories of clashing interpretation, including the media's "'game interpretation' of the political world as an ongoing series of contests, each with a new set of winners and losers" (p. 64). Similarly, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) identified conflict as one of five news frames, one that emphasized conflict between individuals, groups, institutions or countries. de Vreese (2005) tested those indicators across countries, finding that the conflict frame was the one used the most in all stories across countries in their study.

Jeffres, Cutietta, Sekerka, and Lee (2000) found that, in an urban context, heterogeneity (diversity) of the population explains editors' goals about conflict reporting better than the structural pluralism of the community. Similarly, Berkowitz (2007) found that investigative reporting "encourages alternative interpretations that would be a potential threat to community harmony" (p. 552). Conversely, Funk (2016) portrayed reporting of conflict as reporting of "deviance," saying that journalists publicly highlight ideas as threatening to the community in order to maintain the community status quo. From this alternative perspective, local newspapers are less concerned with disrupting harmony or effecting social change, and more concerned with keeping things as they are.

Campus media and conflict reporting

College news readers are more likely to prefer their campus papers to a free commercial alternative (Collins & Armstrong, 2008), and readers on campuses with stronger communication programs are frequently rewarded with better hard news coverage (Payne & Mills, 2015). According to Payne and Mills (2015):

> While soft news stories were still more common than hard news stories, results ... suggest that detecting hard news stories and putting them in appropriate journalistic and stylistic format is a tool that communication students have in their skill set. And students who come from an environment of communication coursework are more likely to employ these skills in the newsroom than those without (p. 24).

However, certain topics of hard news and conflict can be emphasized at the expense of others; specifically, Schmidt (2014) found that campus papers tended to cover local events, while avoiding news and issues of political controversy: "If students do not learn to report on politics while writing for their campus newspaper, they may be disinclined, or unable, to cover important political news after graduation. … In a democratic society, the sharing of information is essential" (p. 23).

Journalists' professional role conceptions

The collegiate journalist's role can be shaped by a variety of factors. How a journalist perceives their professional role and the role of the organization within a community can help

explain how likely they are to report on conflict, or conduct investigative reporting, in the community.

Research on journalists' roles has been ongoing for some time. Decades ago, Cohen (1963) divided journalists into two roles: a neutral observer role and a participation role. Johnstone (1972) defined neutral as "nothing but the truth" and participant as "whole truth" and said most journalists who responded to his survey study adhered to some parts of both. Similarly, Janowitz (1975) wrote that the neutral orientation or, in his terms, the gatekeeper orientation, "emphasized the search for objectivity and the sharp separation of reporting fact from disseminating opinion" (p. 618), while the advocate-oriented journalist acts as "an advocate for those who are denied powerful spokesmen, and . . . must point out the consequences of the contemporary power imbalance." (p. 619).

More recently, Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014) proposed that journalists value public service, objectivity, autonomy, immediacy, and ethics. However, the journalistic role concept was most thoroughly developed by Weaver and Wilhoit (1986), who identified four journalistic roles: interpreter (investigate claims and statements made by the government, analyze complex problems and discuss national policy); disseminator (get information out quickly, concentrate on the widest possible audience); adversary (be skeptical of public officials and business leaders); and populist mobilizer (give "voice" to local communities). A majority of journalists are *pluralistic* in their views. That is, most journalists have strongly endorsed a combination of two, and sometimes three, of the core roles. At least superficially, then, most journalists saw themselves as serving seemingly contradictory functions. (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1992). As Linsky (1989) said, "At 9 o'clock it's adversary, at 10 o'clock it's symbolic, at 11 o'clock it's independent and at 12 o'clock the politicians are manipulating the press. It goes back and forth,

it's all over the place." This may cause ethical challenges, as journalists frequently adapt their role conception to the situation (Kay & Reilly, 2012).

Professional role conceptions may not only differ among journalists in a country or across countries, but also among generations of journalists, due to career changes, the workplace, or social, political, and technological changes in society (Becker, 1982; Hellmueller & Keel, 2013). Role conceptions can also vary across forms of media (Cassidy 2005) or across genders (Cassidy 2008), and research shows that conception of role affects the way the journalist feels about negative vs. positive news (Leung & Lee, 2015), how journalists interact with audiences to promote their work, or whether they interact at all (Grubenmann & Meckel, 2017), and whether they choose to present their work in an online format (Singer 2004; O'Sullivan & Heinonen, 2008). Chung (2009) found that online news audiences perceive the populist mobilizer role to be most prominent.

Role conceptions and conflict reporting

Roles must be both conceived and enacted (Biddle & Thomas, 1979). Role conceptions have been studied as predictors of journalistic "enactment" or content — for example, how the adoption of particular journalistic roles makes it more or less likely that journalists will report on conflict, or produce investigative stories — or conversely, will pursue non-political and non-confrontational content (Culbertson, 1983; Hanitzsch 2007). Graber (2002) predicted that journalists' news stories would vary based on their role conceptions. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) argued: "It seems clear that the way in which journalists define their jobs will affect the content they produce" (p. 101). However, a significant gap has been found at times between journalists' role conceptions and their actual role performance/enactment as assessed in content analyses (Ramaprasad & Rahman, 2006; Mellado & Van Dalen, 2014).

Tandoc, Hellmueller and Vos (2013) found that journalists who identify as populist mobilizers are more likely to enact both mobilizer and adversarial roles; that is, more likely to give voice to local communities and more likely to be skeptical of public officials and business leaders (and are more likely to report conflict within those circles than others). That study found few organizational influences; however, Hinnant, Jenkins & Subramanian (2015) interviewed journalists in the health reporting field, finding that journalists who were afforded more time to do investigative work perceived more of a responsibility to provide that work to their readers. In an experiment relevant to campus journalism, Starck and Soloski (1977) revealed that journalism students who saw themselves playing a more active role were more likely to include analysis and interpretation in their articles.

Role conceptions and campus media

Role conceptions have been studied at the campus media level, as socialization is important to the development of perceived roles. As Gaunt (1992) said, "journalism training perpetuates or modifies professional practices and molds the conceptions journalists have of the role and function of the media" (p. 1). Recent research has demonstrated that students' conception of the roles journalists play in society may serve as a predictor for their choice of journalism as a major in the first place (Carpenter et al, 2018). Career motivations for journalism majors include a talent for writing and a desire to travel — but also a desire to change society, suggesting early socialization to more active journalistic roles, beyond mere dissemination of news (Splichal & Sparks, 1994; Hanna & Sanders, 2007). Similarly, results from Bjørnsen, Ottosen, Willig, and Zilliacus-Tikkanen (2009) point to "a generation of journalism students who are motivated to make a difference by working in the picture of the classical fourth estate role of the press" (p. 154). Coleman, et al (2018) surveyed journalism students, finding that the

"investigative/interpretive" role was most important to them (p. 813), though they tended to see journalism's adversarial role as outdated. Tandoc (2014) found that journalism students tended to prefer the interpreter role, depending on their media consumption: Students recognized the four roles of reporters, but found that investigative/interpreter role is first; disseminator was second most important; populist mobilizer was third; and, as with Coleman, adversarial was considered outdated. Dillon (1990) said that "communicators" — students and professionals — are more likely to fit into adversarial and interpreter typologies.

Structural pluralism

Structural pluralism is arguably the framework most relevant to explaining the existence of conflict in journalism — in reporting or in journalists' role conceptions — from the community level of analysis. Community structures influence the ways local journalists see the community, its problems, and their roles in reporting these issues, all of which affect the way the press does its job in reporting conflict and conducting investigation. Conceptualized by Donohue, Tichenor and Olien at the University of Minnesota in the 1960s and 70s, structural pluralism describes the degree of differentiation in the social system, along institutional and specialized interest group lines (p. 16). Structural pluralism relates to the quantity of official sources of power in a community, and therefore relates to the complexity of the community. That differentiation makes it possible to identify the potential sources of organized official power — most often, political, commercial and cultural institutions in a community — and the extent to which one community is characterized by greater diversity of potential sources of power than another. This affects media organizations as much as any other factor: rather than the raw size of the community, the wealth of the media organization, or the routinization of journalistic work, the specific roles of the media organization are defined by the structure of the community. "As

community conditions change and as the world outside the community changes, newspaper content reflects the concerns of powerful groups within and beyond the community" (Hindman, 1996, p. 718). A community may have a pluralistic and (often) fragmented leadership structure, or conversely, an elite and unified leadership structure. The variables of community size and community pluralism are typically correlated positively, but they are not identical. It is possible to have a large concentration of population with little diversity; on the other hand, a small community near a diversifying metropolitan center may retain its small size and yet become increasingly pluralistic in terms of power – because it becomes increasingly urban in occupational patterns and in its general character.

Essentially, media are dependent on power relationships, rather than on simply individual agencies or powerful actors. Power relationships tend to maintain themselves, and media are part of this maintenance process. The theory is somewhat different from other media-related theories because it focuses on the effects of societal or community characteristics on media, rather than the impact of media on society or individuals (Nah & Armstrong, p. 858). In this conceptualization, newspapers (or other news outlets) are creations of the communities they serve. Their size, nature, scope, and content are shaped importantly by the characteristics of the surrounding town or city and the region in which that town or city exists. Pluralism of power affects citizen use of media, news media structure, and, most relevant to this dissertation, journalists' decision-making processes about news selection and reporting. In this context, saying that "newspapers mirror society" does not mean they give an accurate reflection of people's needs, but that they tend to reflect the conditions of that system, including power conditions, and power alignments. The logical consequence of these ideas is that the local news media will be affected by how pluralistic a community's power structure is — in other words,

how many "power players" there are and how intricate these relationships are. In less pluralistic communities, news media are less likely to report conflict and they tend to be more supportive of a homogeneous, cohesive group of powerholders, and therefore supportive of the status quo (Dunwoody & Griffin, 1999).

Pluralism was originally operationalized as some combination of population, number of businesses, number (or proportion) of voluntary groups, churches, and schools and educational centers (Tichenor et al, 1980); per capita income, percentage of labor and proprietors' income from manufacturing, percentage of labor and proprietors' income from farming (Donohue 1985); and distance from a major metropolitan area (Olien, 1989); or as one of these three measurement approaches. Researchers ranked each community on each of the measures, then aggregated in some way, to provide a ranking of level of community pluralism (Tichenor, 1980). More recently, Armstrong (2006) added leadership diversity, or the degree to which ethnic and minority leaders exist in communities, as a measure of pluralism, measured through the level of gender and racial diversity within the community leadership structure.

Structural pluralism and conflict reporting

According to the structural pluralism approach, the more pluralistic the media's community, the more likely the media are to report conflict. Media are products of the community they serve, and communities low on the pluralism scale are likely to make public decisions in ways that are based on tradition and conducted in an atmosphere of general consensus (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1980). When there is a low degree of differentiation in society, individuals who are socially powerful in one social sector tend to be powerful in others. Public decision making in homogeneous (i.e., less pluralistic) communities generally operates on an interpersonal basis among the power elite. Decision-making in a small community is

20

oligarchical; "getting things done" is an orientation toward execution of decisions. The local media are therefore more likely to avoid reporting conflict in the small, more traditional community in the interest of maintaining an outward image of tranquility and tranquility in fact. A local editor might be active in a statewide organization of journalists dedicated to increasing access of reporters to information from public agencies, yet that editor might justify editorially a local school board's defiance of an open-meeting law as essential for local harmony (Tichenor, Olien & Donohue, 1980).

Pluralistic communities are marked by greater diversity in sources of employment, interest groups, professional groups, educational and religious organizations, businesses, political associations, and public agencies and that diversity increases the sources of actual or potential power and influence (Tichenor, Olien & Donohue, 1980). These "power centers" are interdependent and are also more specialized than would be the case in a smaller community. The more complex, and therefore specialized, the community, the greater the need for knowledge of other parts by any one segment. The daily newspaper is in a position to help communicate this knowledge of different views across the community's specialized areas. Also, when a community's power structure is pluralistic, there is more likelihood of conflict among the power players, and this makes it more likely that powerful sources will seek to have their voices heard, or that negative information will be shared by one source about another (Dunwoody & Griffin, 1999). Reporting governmental conflict in the daily newspapers of larger and more pluralistic communities may have the dual functions of legitimizing social action about issues, and of maintaining political discourse among the many entities within the complex community.

Structural pluralism helps explain how conflict is reported in local media. In a series of case studies, Dunwoody and Griffin (1999) found that newspapers in less pluralistic

communities covered environmental risks in ways that downplayed linkages between the risks and potential health effects, and that privileged local government interpretations. "Structural pluralism, as a primary actor in the construction of media stories about risk, clearly seems to contribute to social control rather than social change [when pluralism is low]" (p. 156). Scholarship suggests that newspapers in less pluralistic communities are likely to adopt a "guard dog" role (protecting the powers that be), rather than the traditional "watchdog" role of the press (Tichenor, 1995). Tichenor, Donohue & Olien (1980) proposed that reporting conflict is part of the process of conflict management, and often has the consequence of "cooling out" the community groups involved. Along these lines, there is also potential dysfunction from community conflict reporting — it may further serve local social control by concentrating on relationships between the major powers in the system and drowning out marginalized groups.

Structural pluralism research has focused on a variety of outcomes. Pluralism has been a predictor in the nature of coverage of protests, as media in less pluralistic communities were found to be more likely to criticize protestors (Dardis, 2006). McCluskey (2009) found that newspapers in less pluralistic communities were more critical of protesters when local government was the target and were less likely to quote protesters in stories. High levels of pluralism have also been found to be predictors of the level of online journalism's interactivity with community residents, and therefore increase the likelihood of publishing online news (Lowrey, 2003). Community structural pluralism has been shown to be less effective as a predictor in certain situations: Ethnic diversity has been found to be a stronger predictor than structural pluralism (Kim & Abisaid, 2015), and McKenzie (2009) found that community power structure was less significant as a predictor of attention to online feedback than other, more economic/management factors.

Structural pluralism and campus media

Scholarship that links structural pluralism to campus media is sparse. Campus size — an element of pluralism at any level — can serve as a predictor of what type of newspaper covers the campus (Kopenhaver, 2015), with the greater percentage of dailies being housed on campuses larger than 25,000 students. University size has also correlated positively with how "readable" a story will be in a campus newspaper (Bodle, 1992), though the difference was not statistically significant. A student newsroom's diversity has long been a function of the size of the campus (Strentz & Adams, 1975), a significant factor since a more diverse newsroom is more likely to seek and report more diverse news. Conversely, university size has also been shown to account for greater inequity in sports coverage, as larger universities tend to put more into coverage of men's sports, over female sports (Wann, et al, 1998).

Bickham and Shin (2013) found that censorship of student newspapers is more likely to occur on campuses in which official guidelines did not exist; that is, at smaller, less bureaucratic and less pluralistic campuses (specifically at private institutions), with more institutional involvement in the production of the newspaper. Saul (2016) argued that the role of student journalism becomes more important in larger municipal communities, particularly as the community dailies that serve those communities suffer from declining resources. In those situations, student journalists see their roles as "increasingly important," particularly on issues such as sexual assault. In essence, student journalists in these situations see their role as "watchdog" in place of the professional journalists that once occupied that space.

Social capital and trust

A community's level of social capital can also help explain why and how conflict takes place within a community — or does not take place — and the likelihood that conflict will play

out in public, and more to the point, the likelihood that conflict and investigation will be reported in local news media.

First, what is meant by social capital? Social capital offers an important explanation for the behavior within communities. Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (p. 86). Fukuyama (1995) called it "an instantiated informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals" (p. 26). Social capital was popularized by Putnam (1995), who said the term "refers to connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (p. 67). As Nah (2011) noted, "various definitions indicate that social norms and values, such as social trust arising from social networks among individuals, organizations, and society at large, are core elements that comprise social capital" (p. 716).

These definitions all include the idea of trust, or suggest it, as with Bourdieu's concept of durable mutual acquaintance and Fukuyama's concept of norms promoting cooperation. For Putnam (1995), the concept of social capital begins with trust — that is, trust in others, as well as the degree to which one is trusted *by* others. Spontaneous cooperation is facilitated by social capital; it is ordinarily a public good, unlike conventional capital, which is ordinarily a private good. Social networks allow trust to become transitive and spread: I trust you, because I trust her and she assures me that *she* trusts you. Such "transitive" trust allows some prediction about the behavior of an independent actor, reducing uncertainty in social exchanges. Social trust comes from norms of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement. Norms are "inculcated and sustained by modeling and socialization" (Killerby & Wallis, 2002). Reciprocity is generally thought of as "balanced" (specific and transactional – I scratch your back, and you scratch mine)

or "generalized (diffuse and less transactional – a general sense of trust within a larger social setting, such as a community). One effective norm and outcome of generalized reciprocity is the emergence of an active network of social exchange.

According to Putnam, societies are characterized by networks of interpersonal communication, formal and informal. Some are horizontal, bringing together equivalent status and power. Others are vertical, linking unequal agents in asymmetric relations of hierarchy and dependence. Most real-world networks are mixtures of the two. Networks of civic engagement — neighborhood associations, choral societies, cooperatives, sports clubs, mass-based parties — are often characterized as "intense" horizontal interactions. The denser such networks are in a community, the more likely those citizens will be able to cooperate for mutual benefit. This density increases the cost for any potential defector; fosters robust norms of reciprocity; and eases communication and improves the flow of information about the trustworthiness of individuals. Additionally, there is growing evidence that increasing social capital is linked with better government, social integration, falling crime rates, better performance at school, personal benefits such as finding a job, and higher economic growth (MacGillivray & Walker, 2000). Many studies have found that increased perceptions of social capital were associated with positive personal and public health outcomes (Ball, et al. 2010; Davison, et al, 2012; Duke et al, 2012; Lee 2014; Lee & Kam 2015; Namkoong, et. al, 2016; Zoorob & Salemi, 2016).

Some scholars also argue that social capital may be measured at the organizational level, and findings suggest high levels of social capital can be beneficial for organizations. For example, research shows that the more social trust between coworkers, the more likely they are to be productive and happier at their jobs. Sankowska (2013) found that trust is an important mechanism facilitating transfer and creation of knowledge within a company, helping it to be

more innovative. Their model shows that "it is obvious that companies that enjoy a climate of trust can create a virtuous circle of knowledge transfer, creation and innovativeness" (p. 95). When coworkers create networks, the more likely they are to be productive and motivated at their jobs. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) concluded that firms with greater levels of social capital had an advantage in creating and sharing intellectual capital – findings particularly relevant for news organizations, which process information from the community for content creation. Lee, Bachrach and Lewis (2014) found that greater social network ties were positively related to memory related to transactions as well as group performance. In findings that echo literature on declining news staff satisfaction and news organization change (e.g., Gade, 2004; Beam, 2006), Parzefall and Kuppelweiser (2012) found that workload and organizational change negatively influence employees' social capital perceptions, and that job security has a positive relationship with perceived social capital.

Social capital, trust and conflict reporting

Those who have social capital tend to accumulate more — "them as has, gets" (Putnam, 1993, p. 169). In small, close-knit communities, trust is predicted by "thick trust," or the belief that rests on familiarity with an individual. In larger, more complex settings, a more impersonal or indirect form of trust is required. The strength of a social "tie" is generally defined by the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (or mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services (Granovetter, 1977). Granovetter (1977) has argued that "weak ties" are essential for diffusing new ideas because these ideas are more likely to pass over weakly connected social "bridges" (bridging social capital) than over tightly connected and highly familiar social "bonds" (bonding social capital) (Putnam, 1995).

Explaining the interaction of social capital within communities with the news media that serve those communities is challenging. Most research has tended to show that citizens' news use is positively associated with increased social capital and civic engagement in communities (Beaudoin & Thorson, 2004; Norris, 1996, 2000; Putnam, 2000; Shah, Kwak, & Holbert, 2001). Shah et al (2002) tested reciprocal paths between media use and various social capital indicators, finding that the main direction of influence was from media use to social capital – the higher the media use, the higher the social capital. Rosen and Merritt (1994) argued that news media can foster democratic communities, democratic discussion, and public life. Similarly, Newton (1999) explained that mass media offer information that mobilizes people, an important step in the development of social capital. This relationship suggests that in high social-capital communities, local audiences are more likely to be engaged with the local journalism, and this suggests there may be higher trust levels between audiences and journalists.

However, Putnam (1995) argued that the more time people devote to media — specifically, television — the less time they have to interact with others and participate in a society. In 2000, he reported a 10 percent reduction in civic participation as a result of each additional hour that people watch television per day. Brehm and Rahn (1997) partially supported Putnam's conclusions, finding that social capital is negatively associated with general and entertainment TV use; however, they found social capital is positively associated with newspaper and TV news use. While heavy consumption of certain types of media may erode both social trust and civic engagement, the bulk of the research finds that the overall relationship between social capital and media use tends to be positive (Romer, 2009).

Recent research on changing forms and uses of media has found positive relationships between social capital and media use in general, but this research has found more complexity and

nuance. For example, one study found that a higher degree of media freedom in a particular country can negatively impact bonding social capital, while positively affecting bridging capital (Lee, 2017). In virtual spaces, generally social media has been found to increase certain "pro-social" behaviors (Shah, 2002), while attachment to a community has also been demonstrated as a predictor in the use of certain online communities (Hunt, et al, 2013). Newspaper reading was among the strongest predictors of civic engagement among young adults, despite low levels of use, but the internet, because of its very heavy use among younger adults, appears to provide an even more potent opportunity for civic mobilization (Shah, 2002). Geber, et al, (2016) sought to understand online media's effect on the production of social capital, finding that both Internet use and informational media were positively related, and even finding that entertainment media might help strengthen online social networks. The emergence of social media has arguably changed the nature of social capital and the ways in which it is generated from social relationships (Williams, 2006). But research has continued to support the notion that the internet has a modest yet positive effect on spatial-based communities in terms of increased sociability, voluntary association membership, and increased political participation. Research has shown a direct relationship between social media use or social media news use and social capital (Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2012), while other studies have found that social media contribute to offline behavior that contributes to social capital (Hampton, Lee, & Her, 2011). New research has suggested that social media create a new form of social capital, with characteristics that are distinct from the social capital created in face-to-face relationships (Gil de Zuniga et al, 2017).

There is some research suggesting that higher levels of social capital encourage audiences to trust journalists. Go et al (2016) found that use of news websites influences users' trust in the press, as well as the credibility of online information, and Gil de Zuniga (2018) found that

audience engagement is predictive of lower levels of perceived journalistic bias. It seems to follow from these findings that this persistent environment in which audience social capital/trust correlates positively with their perceptions of news media would encourage social capital/trust on the part of journalists toward audiences – and this would in turn, shape the ways that journalists do their work. But there is little research on these points. Lewis et al (2014), while not citing social capital directly, identified journalists as community-builders, suggesting that reciprocity between journalists and audience members might lead to greater trust, connectedness, and social capital. "With the ethics of participation and reciprocity existing alongside each other, news organizations can help build stronger communities and further cement their own roles in those communities by considering the community's expectations as inextricably bound with their own" (p. 238). McManamey (2004) found that trust is a key factor linked to the establishment and increasing circulations of news publications at the community level. Nah and Chung (2011) surveyed community newspaper editors, finding that their own demographics were a strong predictor of their perceptions of social capital in their communities, and their own social capital. "For example, female editors tended to have trust in people and have more organizational affiliations than did male editors" (p. 41).

Social capital, trust and campus media

Some research on civic journalism — that is, public journalism focused on elevating community issues and greater interaction between journalists and citizens — shows that education in that area helps students experience the news production process in a different way than through traditional journalism (Rosen, 1999). After a semester-long instructional program aimed at helping students understand the positive and negative aspects of civic journalism and traditional journalism, Anyaegbunam and Ryan (2003) found that journalism students increased

29

their favorability toward objectivity (traditional journalism focus) while also increasing their favorability toward interacting more with readers. Similarly, Nah and Namkoong (2014) found that the practice of citizen journalism on campus (news produced by non-journalists) resulted in higher levels of trust, satisfaction, and engagement among students.

Even if all campus stakeholders agree on the functions of the college press, interaction and trust (a close concept to social capital) between students and administration often remains problematic (Altabach & Cohen, 1990). Childress' (1993) research found that if students had a personal relationship with administrators, then they would not print information that could be considered unfavorable to the university. Childress (1993) also pointed out that student newspapers often cause problems for universities due to the relationship, or lack thereof, between student editors and administrators.

Advisers, social capital, and campus media

The student news organization can be subject to clashing internal norms and goals, as can the university that encompasses it, and these too can shape decisions about reporting. The student news outlet can have different normative orientations, according to Blackwell (1939). According to a model created by Duscha and Fischer (1973), most of these organizations fall into the category of *campus press*, meaning they have dueling influences – they accept some funding from the university, but they typically cede little editorial control.

Advisers are key figures in these conflicted organizations, and like managers in traditional organizations, can be important in setting the cultural tone for the student news organization. However, advisers are hardly autonomous. They typically play the very challenging role of intermediary between the university's administration and the student media staff. Kopenhaver (1983) found that half of journalism department administrators advocate

complete independence for the student press because of increased institutional efforts to control it. Jasinski's (1994) study found a common belief among administrators: that the campus newspaper is only as strong as the adviser who works daily with the students. Small wonder, then, that when Bodle (1993) surveyed newspaper advisers, he found that many would prefer a different job.

Recent research into the role of the adviser shows that a changing media landscape has led those in the role to use more creative, innovative teaching techniques, while also encouraging them to return to the basics of journalism education This research also shows that an unconventional, more participatory management style can result in higher levels of satisfaction in employees (Wilderman, 2017). This idea is consistent with the general research on organizational culture. For example, de Vries (1993) asserted that organizational culture depends on the psychological contract that exists between its leaders and followers — the contract between the adviser and the student journalists would seem to be an example.

HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Hypotheses and research questions are grounded in the review of the literature on the impact of predictor variables on two different outcome (dependent) variables: the role conceptions of student journalists, and the level of investigative/conflict reporting in student media.

In their original conceptualization of structural pluralism, (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, (1980) found that more pluralistic communities — those with a more diverse power structure — were more likely to provide more sources for conflict and so encourage the reporting of conflict in the local newspaper. Additionally, those communities were more likely to have a greater need for information across communities, which would lead to more investigation and reporting of conflict. Research on this subject has held somewhat consistently that this is still the case in community news, though there has been little research on structural pluralism and student news. The following hypothesis was proposed about the relationship between the pluralism of the wider municipal community and conflict reporting in student journalism:

H1a: Student newspapers in more pluralistic municipal communities are more likely to engage in conflict-oriented reporting.

While scholarship does not directly draw a correlation between the pluralism of a community and the journalists' role conceptions at newspapers in those communities, literature on role conceptions has held that reporters who identify strongly with the adversarial or interpretive

roles are more likely to report conflict than journalists who embrace other roles. Since it is expected that more pluralistic communities are more likely to produce more conflict reporting, it follows that reporters working in highly pluralistic communities are more likely to identify strongly with the roles that require more conflict reporting, and to feel they are able to exercise these roles. Additionally, Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) suggest that reporters who embrace the interpretive or adversarial roles are more likely to work in larger media companies, in larger (or more pluralistic) communities. Therefore, the following additional hypothesis was proposed to explain the role conceptions of student reporters in pluralistic municipal communities, particularly the conflict-oriented roles -- interpretive and adversary roles:

H1b: Individuals working in student newspapers working in student media organizations in more pluralistic municipal communities will identify more strongly with conflict-oriented journalistic roles.

Structural pluralism as a concept has not been applied to campus communities, though Kopenhaver (2015) and Bodle (1992) both used campus size as a predictor of various elements of content in student newspapers. For purposes of this study, it is proposed that measures of campus pluralism, such as enrollment and number of academic departments, may be a predictor of reporting conflict in student newspapers. Academic units, non-academic units and student organizations serve as sources for student reporters just as businesses, government offices and volunteer organizations serve as sources for professional reporters. It should follow that pluralism of campus source organizations will influence student reporting in a similar way to the influence of community source organization pluralism, for the reasons provided for H1a and

H1b. That is, when there are relatively few official entities, or "power centers" that serve as sources (when there is low campus pluralism), it is more likely that these officials will be united in their positions relative to the issues that journalists will report, which would make it less likely student journalists would have the "raw material" that allows for reporting of conflict on campus. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H2a: Student newspapers in more pluralistic campus communities are more likely to engage in conflict-oriented reporting.

It was further hypothesized that pluralism in campus communities will affect the degree to which student journalists perceive their roles as journalists:

H2b: Individuals working in student media organizations in more pluralistic campus communities will identify more strongly with conflict-oriented journalistic roles.

As previously established research has shown, social capital has been measured in a variety of ways, including broad social trust. For purposes of this study, the focus will be on social trust. While social capital has been shown to have an effect on the overall health of a community, the extent to which the overall level of social capital affects the way community media operates has been the subject of very little scholarship to this point. There is ample scholarship to suggest that the presence of social capital within communities is more likely to bind together community members, making it more difficult for conflict to be reported. Some of the literature also suggests that the presence of social capital could create a higher level of social trust, creating less

perceived risk for providing information about conflict to the local newspaper, and less perceived

risk by journalists in reporting the conflict. Because there are conflicting possible outcomes, the

following two research questions, rather than hypotheses, were proposed regarding the effects of

social capital in the campus and municipal communities on conflict reporting:

RQ1a: What is the relationship between level of social capital of campus community and

conflict-oriented reporting?

RQ1b: What is the relationship between level of social capital of campus community and

the identification with conflict-oriented roles?

RQ2a: What is the relationship between level of social capital of the municipal

community and conflict-oriented reporting?

RQ2b: What is the relationship between level of social capital of the municipal

community and the identification with conflict-oriented roles?

Social capital within organizations has been demonstrated to be an important factor in the overall

well-being of the organization (Sankowska, 2013; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In studies of

news production, social capital has largely been used as an outcome variable, so the net effect of

that social capital within student newspapers is difficult to predict, either on the conflict

reporting or on how that social capital affects how student journalists perceive their roles. Also,

it is expected that the conflicting consequences of high social capital, as described above for the

research questions about campus and community, will also be relevant within the social context

of the newsroom. Therefore, the following research questions, rather than hypotheses, were

proposed:

RQ3a: What is the relationship between the level of social capital of the newsroom and conflict-oriented reporting?

RQ3b: What is the relationship between the level of social capital of the newsroom and identification with conflict-oriented roles?

Bodle (1994) considered the extent to which student newspapers are influenced by administrators, and how often that happens. While nearly half of all advisers reported being subject to pressure from administrators, few had experienced more than one, and fewer still complied with such requests. Other studies that have looked at administrative influences on student media (e.g., Reed, 2004; Snyder, 2002) have not considered the impact of trust between administrators and student journalists on the student journalists' role perceptions or the conflict reported in student newspapers. Bickham and Shin (2013) found that while advisers perceived no administrative interference in their newspapers, student editors reported perceptions of censorship as a problem; they also found that student editors were more likely to self-censor content when they perceived a greater level of administrative control, suggesting that lower level of social capital could lead to less conflict reporting and a weaker embrace of roles that embrace more conflict reporting. In essence, higher social capital between student newspapers and administration could suggest they are more sympathetic to one another, and therefore the student newspaper is less likely to report anything that could negatively impact that relationship. Again, it is expected that the conflicting consequences of high social capital, as described above for the research questions about campus and community, will also be relevant for the context of student newspapers and upper administration. Therefore, the following research questions, rather than

hypotheses, were proposed regarding the impact of social capital, or trust, between

administrators and student journalists on role perceptions and conflict reporting:

RQ4a: What is the relationship between the level of social capital with university

administration conflict-oriented reporting?

RQ4b: What is the relationship between the level of social capital with university

administration and identification with conflict-oriented roles?

METHOD

To test hypotheses and answer research questions, the following three distinct methodologies were used. (1) First, a broad-based, nationwide survey of college media advisers and editors of student newspapers was conducted, with the goal of measuring the following variables:

- perceived journalistic roles in each student media organization;

- perceived level of overall social capital in the campus community;

- perceived level of overall social capital in the municipal community;

- perceived level of overall social capital among journalists in newsrooms;

- perceived level of social capital between administrators and student journalists,

- demographic variables, such as year in position, gender, experience (in their current role and overall), and age.

(2) The pool of survey respondents served as the basis for the sample used in the second method, a quantitative content analysis of student newspapers in the U.S. Only papers represented in the survey responses were examined in the content analysis. The content analysis measured the level of conflict-oriented and investigative reporting in these student media, which also represents the enactment of journalistic roles, as discussed by Mellado (2014).

(3) Third, data to determine structural pluralism were gathered from existing databases for two community contexts: the surrounding municipality (town or city) and the campus community.

Structural Pluralism data

For municipalities, data on structural pluralism were gathered through the ReferenceUSA database, which provides data on communities by city limits, metropolitan area and county limits and measures number of businesses, number of churches, number of voluntary organizations, and number of schools and educational centers. Campus data were gathered from the database provided by the National Center for Education Statistics, which provides data on enrollment, academic departments and leadership diversity (gender and ethnic diversity). Information about non-academic departments — such as the school counseling centers, career centers or recreation departments —came from Delta Cost, a project of the American Institute for Research. This project also added Donohue, Olien and Tichenor's (1989) measure of proximity to urban areas by marking the distance from a major metropolitan area in miles. Their research suggests that community complexity increases near urban areas. This 1989 methodology defined "major metropolitan area" as any municipality greater than 60,000 citizens; to update it, population was multiplied by the percentage of population growth in the past 30 years (0.32). That yields a figure of 187,500; therefore, it was determined that "major metropolitan area" for this study will be defined as a municipality of 180,000, or 3 times greater than 60,000. Data for each measure were collected for each municipal community and each campus community in the sample. The data were converted to standardized "z scores" and then aggregated to provide measures of both types of structural pluralism.

Survey

Variables

A survey was created to measure student newspapers' advisers' and student editors' perceptions of their campus communities, municipal communities and news organizations.

Concepts measured include journalistic roles; levels of perceived social capital in the campus community; levels of perceived social capital in the municipal community; levels of overall social capital among student journalists in the newsroom; and levels of perceived social capital between administrators and student journalists. Additionally, for purposes of control, demographic variables such as year in position, year in school, major, gender and age were collected through the survey for both advisers and student editors. Survey items were built using previous literature on those concepts, and so as much as possible, they relied on already-designed scales (See Appendix A).

Sample

First, approval to conduct human subjects research was obtained through UA's Institutional Review Board (Appendix C). Then the survey was distributed via email to the adviser and top student editors at each media organization in the first wave. A second and third wave of email solicitations followed, and phone calls to solicit completion of the online survey were required to increase response rate.

Subjects responded to an invitation to participate in the surveys that were distributed through the College Media Association's listserv; the list includes 670 members from 600 student newspapers across the country. Additionally, invitations to participate were emailed directly to advisers and student editor survey as follow-ups. Qualtrics recorded a total of 220 responses to both surveys: 183 responded to the campus media adviser survey, and 37 responded to the student editor survey. That represents 32.84% of the CMA membership. However, data cleaning yielded 144 usable surveys, or 21.49% of CMA membership — 118 advisers, 21 student editors, and 5 who did not indicate their role — from 118 different campus newspapers. Three of those identified newspapers were not able to be used in the final content analysis,

40

because their archives were inaccessible (see description below). This meant that 115 newspapers were used in the content analysis (19.17% of the CMA member newspapers). Additional descriptive statistics for the survey samples are available in tables 3 and 4 in the Findings chapter.

The sample size for the survey complied with previously established sampling methodology for multiple regression analysis (VanVoorhis & Morgan, 2007). This procedure calls for a minimum sample size of 104 + k, in which "k" equals the number of predictors; in this case, the hypotheses and research questions stipulate 10 predictors of reporting conflict. This indicated a minimum of 114 papers was needed. The low response rate suggests the final sample may not be representative of the population, which suggests that use of parametric statistics (significance testing) may not be relevant. However, significance was reported, serving at least as a conventional indication of a substantive finding.

For cases in which the editor and adviser for the same paper responded, responses from the adviser and student editor from each newspaper were averaged to produce an aggregated single score on each variable for analyses involving content analysis results. Results on variables from the hypotheses (e.g., means) were analyzed separately for each group (editors vs. advisers), to compare for possible systematic differences; no significant differences were detected. For most of the newspapers in the sample (92%), only one response — either adviser or editor — was received, and in those cases only that survey response was used to represent the newspaper.

A pre-test of the survey was conducted. Dillman (2007) provided a framework for pretesting survey research, describing a pilot study in which procedures for the main study are emulated, and which "frequently result[s] in substantial revisions being made in the survey design" (p. 147). The use of 10 percent of the sample size is a generally accepted rule of thumb

for the survey pilot test (Dillman, 2007, p. 140). The procedure for this survey was a pilot test in two phases. First, the survey was administered in-person on campus at the offices of *The Crimson White* — Alabama's student newspaper — to the adviser and student editor. Administering the survey in-person allowed respondents and the researcher to interact in a more meaningful way about any confusing aspects of the survey. After the first test, the pilot survey was sent to 40 different student organizations, requesting that those respondents note any questions they did not understand (because of wording, for example) or questions with inadequate choices. This pilot questionnaire was administered in the same way as for actual data collection. No substantive changes were made to the survey question wording after pilot test administration. However, the four questions about the newspaper's relationship were moved to the later part of the survey, as this was requested by a number of respondents.

Content analysis

Variables

Once survey responses were in hand, a quantitative content analysis was conducted to judge the level of conflict reporting within the campus newspapers' local news content. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) defined content as "the complete quantitative and qualitative range of verbal and visual information distributed by the mass media" (p. 4). The quantitative content analysis also served as an indicant of role performance or "enactment"; that is, the degree to which journalists, through the creation of news content, actually enacted the roles they perceived themselves to be filling (Mellado & Van Dalen, 2014). By using the measures of conflict-oriented reporting — both conflict and investigative reporting — as measures of role performance, the accuracy of student journalists' role conceptions was assessed (See Appendix B for the coding protocol).

Sample

The sample for the content analysis was determined by survey responses. Among the 144 survey respondents, 123 disclosed their university, representing 111 different universities. Seven additional universities were added to the list for content analysis using other data gathered from survey respondents, such as emails, for a total of 118 identifiable newspapers for the content analysis. Three of the newspapers identified in the survey proved inaccessible for research purposes (one has only print archives which were not mailed in a timely fashion; one put archives in a format that was impossible to navigate; a third was shut down during the time period used for the analysis). That left a total of 115 student newspapers for use in the content analysis.

Newspaper content came from a variety of different sources. As often as possible, the researcher attempted to find online archives of the printed paper for each newspaper in the sample, by looking through the newspaper's website. When those could not be located, sampling came from the America's News Database, which allows users to search for "College & University Newspapers." If the archive of that newspaper was not available through this database, content was sampled through the newspaper's web content.

Constructed time frames

The "constructed week" method was used in creating the content analysis sample – specifically, one week from the 2017-2018 school year was constructed. Constructed week sampling involved identifying all days of the week on which the publication publishes, selecting a time frame to which the researcher can generalize, and then randomly selecting one Monday, Tuesday, etc., to "construct" a week, or multiple weeks, that ensures each day of publication is represented equally (Lacy et al, 2014). Riffe, Austin and Lacy (1993) determined that one

constructed week is generalizable to six months of daily newspaper coverage. Because some student media operate only during the school year (or at least summer content is less thorough and less frequent) — and since school years begin and end at varying times, and must account for fall and spring breaks — it was determined that the sample should derive from papers published October 2017 through April 2018, inclusively, constituting a six-month sample.

Data with regard to publication schedules for each of the newspapers included — frequency of publication and day(s) of the week — was collected from the survey. Literature on constructed week sampling for daily and weekly newspapers guided decisions about sampling. Riffe (1993) said that for a daily, when generalizing to 6 months, one constructed week is as efficient as four (p. 139); Riffe, Lacy and Fico (2014) affirmed this approach (p. 86). For weeklies, scholarship recommends a randomly selected month to generalize to 6 months of coverage (Lacy et al, 1995). Using methodology provided by Andsager (2011), the following method for selecting issues from a wider range of publication schedules was used in order to generalize to 6 months:

- A 5-day-per-week paper: 1 constructed week (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday)

- A 3 or 4 issues-per-week paper: 1 constructed week (one issue randomly sampled for each of the 3 or 4 days)

- Weekly paper: 1 randomly constructed month (1 issue randomly selected from first week of all months, then 1 issue randomly selected from second week of all months, and continue for weeks 3 and 4, so you have 4 total issues for each weekly paper)

- 2 issues per week: a constructed month (randomly sampling one of the two issues for each of the four weeks in a constructed month)

- Bi-weekly paper (every other week): 1 randomly constructed month consisting of only two papers total.

Stories were selected from the "news" or "local" sections. The researcher eliminated stories within that sample if they did not touch on public/societal issues or interest. National stories were excluded, but locally generated stories about local (off-campus) matters were included. That ultimately yielded a total of 1,533 articles for the analysis (n=1,533).

Intercoder reliability

Five coders were trained to use the established content coding protocol (Appendix B). The coders participated in three different informal training sessions, before independently coding a reliability sample of 168 articles. According to the equation for reliability analysis sample sizes provided by Lacy and Riffe (1996), this number is sufficient, given the large population (more than 1,500).

Table 1

Reliability levels for all content analysis items (n=168)

Conflict		Krippendorf's Alpha (Percent Agreement)
Q1	Does the news story reflect disagreement between parties/individuals/groups/countries?	0.78 (96.01%)
Q2	Does one party/individual/group/country reproach another?	0.71 (96.41%)
Q3	Does the story refer to two sides or to more than two sides of the problem/issue?	0.65 (93.21%)
Q4*	Does the story emphasize the achievements and/or actions of an individual/party versus the achievements and/or actions of another individual/party?	-0.02* (83.63%)
Q5	Does the article report the event in terms of the consequences/effects it will have on an individual or group institution?	0.65 (92.42%)
Investigative		Krippendorf's Alpha (Percent Agreement)
Q6	Is the target (or subject) of the story a public figure and/or a person or group in a position of power (can be collective)?	0.75 (87.62%)
Q7	Is the information revealed about that target in the public interest?	0.89 (95.61%)
Q8**	Did the journalist seek to pursue the issue beyond allegation and denial?	0.40** (92.42%)
Q9**	Does the story reveal new information and/or bring together information that is already in the public domain in a way that is revelatory?	0.05** (94.81%)
Q10**	Does the story alert the reader to systemic failures and/or point out where society is failing/or falling short of purported standards?	0.12** (90.42%)

*Removed from analysis

**Remained in analysis following post-hoc test of sample that included more varied responses, which revealed improved alphas of .75 for Q8, .77 for Q9 and .69 for Q10

Reliability tests were conducted using Krippendorf's Alpha for each of the 10 questions (See Table 6); each item yielded high percent agreement (over .90) and an alpha level of at least .65 with the exception of four items: Q4 ("Does the story emphasize the achievements and/or actions of an individual/party versus the achievements and/or actions of another individual/party?"), Q8 ("Did the journalist seek to pursue the issue beyond allegation and denial?") Q9 ("Does the story

reveal new information and/or bring together information that is already in the public domain in a way that is revelatory?"), and Q10 ("Does the story alert the reader to systemic failures and/or point out where society is failing/or falling short of purported standards?"). For Q4, percent agreement was 83.63%, so that question was eliminated from the analysis. For Q8, Q9 and Q10, percent agreement between coders was high — 92.42% for Q8, 94.81% for Q9, and 90.42% for Q10 — but alpha numbers still fell short of acceptability. This is most likely owing to a lack of variability in responses in the reliability analysis (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2014), since for each item, the coders agreed on "0" or "no" on more than 90 percent of the stories. In the sample, total percentage of "0" or "no" responses accounted for more 92 percent of answers for Q8, Q9, and Q10. The researcher therefore hand selected responses that showed variability, and then conducted a post-hoc reliability analysis for Q8, Q9 and Q10, covering an additional 80 stories, or more than 5% of the analysis. Those stories were coded for reliability, an analysis that yielded alphas of 75 for Q8, .77 for Q9 and .69 for Q10. It was decided, therefore, to keep these variables in the analysis. Additional description of the campus newspapers examined in this study is provided in Table 4.

Concepts

Structural pluralism

Using the measurement established by Tichenor, et al (1980), pluralism was operationalized in studies of municipal communities as a combination of resident population, number of businesses, number of voluntary groups, churches, and schools and educational centers. These data came from the ReferenceUSA database. To determine the pluralism of a college campus, it was determined that pluralism could be operationalized as total enrollment combined with number of academic units (both from the National Center for Education

Statistics), and number of non-academic units (from the Delta Cost Project, as noted above).

Essentially, any organizational unit that may likely be a source for campus newspaper stories

was counted in the measure of pluralism (consistent with the use of businesses, schools, etc. in

Tichenor's measure). Additionally, two measures that appeared in later studies of structural

pluralism were included: distance from a major metropolitan area (Donohue, Olien, & Tichenor,

1989) — i.e., miles from an area of 180,000 citizens or greater (updated from 60,000, using the

percent change in population in the past 30 years as noted above) — and leadership diversity

(Armstrong, 2008), which is operationalized as both gender and ethnic diversity of the

community power structure. As noted earlier, proximity to urban areas tends to lead to greater

community complexity (Donohue, Olien & Tichenor, 1989). Armstrong (2008) operationalized

diversity by using a proportion of non-white non-males in each community's leadership structure

(e.g., the city council); for purposes of this study, a similar assessment was made for each

institution's faculty and staff diversity through the NCEC iPEDS database, using Armstrong's

(2006) method of measuring ethnic and gender diversity (percent that is both non-male and non-

white). Descriptive statistics for each measure are listed in the table below.

Table 2
Means for Campus Pluralism variables (n=115)

	Mean (SD)
Campus pluralism	
Number of degree programs	29.97 (11.37)
Total enrollment	12,801.47 (10,458.87)
Locale*	2.51 (.52)
Faculty Diversity (percent who are not male and not white)	.59 (.08)
Student Services (total spending)	15,300,696.42 (12,966,160.83)
* - 1=Rural; 2=Town; 3=City	
Municipal pluralism	
Population	303,279.28 (891,401.62)
Businesses	91,302.03 (173,496.63)
Churches	1,607.16 (2,835.95)
Voluntary organizations	302.02 (779.68)
Schools and educational centers	1,659.45 (2,990.14)

Data for each measure for all 115 campus and municipal communities were standardized and

aggregated to provide an overall pluralism score for each municipal and campus community.

Role conceptions

Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman (1972) measured role conceptions with 8 questions

about the functions of media and society. Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) built on that study by

adding 4 additional questions, for a total of 12, and their measures have been used frequently in

the literature since; that questionnaire was adopted for purposes of this study. Each question was

rated by the survey respondent for importance on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being "not at all

important" and 5 being "extremely important" (See survey questionnaire in Appendix A).

According to the literature, those journalists who place greater importance on different

journalistic activities are classified as follows:

- Interpreters are more likely to place importance on investigating claims and statements

  made by the government, analysis of complex problems and discussion of policy.

- Adversaries are more likely to place more importance on being skeptical of public officials and business leaders.

- Disseminators place a higher importance on getting information out quickly and neutrally, and concentrating on the widest possible audience.

- Populist mobilizers are more likely to place importance on setting the political agenda and giving voice to the community.

Social capital

The survey also assessed campus media based on the level of social capital that student journalists and advisers perceive from their audiences in the campus community and municipal community; social capital that respondents perceive of their newsrooms; and social capital that respondents perceive of the administration. The Social Capital Benchmark Survey (2000) provided the social capital measures used in this study (See survey questionnaire in Appendix A). Perceived social capital is measured with six questions, with respondents answering on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7):

Generally speaking, would you say . . .

1. People can be trusted?

2. People try to take advantage of you if they get the chance?

3. People try to be fair?

4. You can't be too careful dealing with people?

5. People try to be helpful?

6. People are just looking out for themselves?

The preamble to these six questions was adapted in order to make them relevant for measuring social capital in the varied contexts: campus and municipal communities, as well as among journalists in the newsroom, and between journalists and the university administration.

Also, to measure the perceived neighborhood associations in the municipal community — another measure of social capital — four questions from the SCCBS were added (Ruef & Kwon, 2016), to measure trust in neighbors, sociability with neighbors, cooperation with neighbors, and impact on community. For purposes of this survey, questions were altered into the form of statements that could be measured on scales of "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7). It was decided these neighborhood associations did not translate as measures of *campus* community social capital/trust. Two of the questions from the literature on neighborhood association social capital were adapted to the newsroom questions, for the measures of association between individuals in student newspapers (i.e., social capital among staffers at the newspaper organization) (Ruef & Kwon, 2016).

Finally, a set of questions from the literature was added to assess in more detail the structure of the administrative relationship between the newspaper newsroom and the university (Xie & Simon, 2012; Bodle, 1994).

Conflict

Neuman et al (1992) defined the conflict frame as "the journalistic practice of reporting stories of clashing interpretation" (p. 64). Using that definition, deVreese (2001) measured conflict in content analysis using the following four questions:

1. "Does the news story reflect disagreement between parties/individuals/groups/countries?"

2. "Does one party/individual/group/country reproach another?"

3. "Does the story refer to two sides or to more than two sides of the problem/issue?"

51

4. "Does the story emphasize the achievements and/or actions of an individual/party versus the achievements and/or actions of another individual/party?"(p. 56).

Additionally, a fifth question from deVreese, et al (2005), measures individuals and institutions:

5. "Does the article report the event in terms of the consequences it will have on an individual or group institution?"

Items were added to create a score for each story, and then the mean was obtained across scores for all stories for each paper. . (See survey questionnaire in Appendix A).

Cordell (2009) measured investigative reporting with five items, building on the work of Ettema and Glasser (1998), de Burgh (2008), Spark (1999), and Fleury (1997) :

1. The target of the story must be a public figure and/or a person or group in a position of power (can be collective), and the information revealed about that target must be in the public interest;

2. The story must reveal information that someone wants suppressed and/or is for other reasons concealed from the public that would only have been uncovered through the journalist's initiative;

3. The journalist must seek to pursue the issue beyond allegation and denial;

4. The story must reveal new information and/or bring together information that is already in the public domain in a way that is revelatory;

5. The story must alert us to systemic failures and/or point out where society is failing/or falling short of purported standards.

Other definitions of investigative journalism (e.g., Bennett & Serrin, 2005) are consistent with this operationalization. As with conflict reporting, scores for each newspaper's story were averaged to produce the final score for investigative reporting for each paper.

Both deVreese's (2001) and Cordell's (2009) operationalizations were used in the content analysis. Because Question No. 2 in Cordell's (2009) methodology likely requires interviews with the journalists who wrote the stories, that question was removed for this study. Therefore, five questions measured the presence of conflict (deVreese, 2001), and five questions measured the presence of investigative reporting (Cordell, 2009) (however, one of these five measures of conflict reporting dropped out because it did not correlate well with other measures, as discussed in the findings chapter). These two sets of measures were assessed separately.

Analysis

To test hypotheses and assess research questions, bivariate correlation and multiple regression analysis were used. T-tests were also used to assess the four structural pluralism hypotheses. Scaled variables with multiple measures were tested for inter-item reliability, and summed in order to create single, aggregated variables. These included the measures for social capital and the dependent variables role conceptions and conflict-oriented reporting. Structural pluralism items were aggregated in indices. Indices do not require inter-item reliability, as individual items are conceptualized as partial components of the concept to be aggregated, rather than as different (but holistic) dimensions of the concept.

Outcome variables are degree of conflict-oriented reporting and role conception scales. Independent variables used in the analyses relate to structural pluralism and social capital, as stated in the hypotheses and research questions. Control variables were also included. Data were tested for regression assumptions. Then, independent variables were entered in blocks, hierarchically. The demographic control variables were entered first, then structural variables, and then social capital variables.

Variable relationships were also explored in bivariate relationships in the bivariate correlation analysis. Alpha levels were set at .05.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This study involved an analysis of the structural pluralism of campus and municipal communities; a survey of advisers and student editors that focused on their conceptions of journalistic roles; and a content analysis of campus newspapers that focused on their role enactments, through analysis of news story content.

This chapter will first provide descriptive statistics on the survey and content analysis samples, followed by descriptive statistics for the variables. Next, results will be presented from analyses of hypotheses that propose explanation for conflict reporting (from the content analysis of newspapers), followed by analyses of hypotheses that propose explanation for role conceptions (from the survey of advisers and student editors).

Descriptive statistics

See descriptive statistics for the survey sample in Table 3. These measures were used as control factors in regression analyses. Aggregated measures were created for two separate control measures: experience in current role (in the student survey), and overall experience (either advising or on the staff of your newspaper).

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Sample

Characteristics	$N = 144$	%
Position with newspaper		
Advisers	118	84.9
Student editors	23	15.97
No response	3	2.08
Age		
18-30	28	20.4
31-40	18	13.1
41-50	33	24.1
51-60	22	16.1
61 or over	18	13.1
No response	18	13.1
$M = 43.70$		
Gender		
Female (1)	65	45.1
Male (0)	63	43.8
No response	16	11.1
Race and ethnicity		
White (non-Hispanic)	113	78.5
Non-White	17	11.8
Hispanic, regardless of race	13	9.0
No response	14	9.7
Experience In Current Role (advisers & student editors)		
Less than one year	24	16.7
1 year or more, but less than 2 years	9	6.3
2 years or more, but less than 3 years	5	3.5
3 years or more	80	55.6
No response	21	14.6
Total experience (advisers & student editors)		
Less than one year	7	4.9
1 year or more, but less than 2 years	7	4.9
2 years or more, but less than 3 years	10	6.9
3 years or more	93	64.6
No response	25	17.4

Below is descriptive information on the newspapers assessed in the content analysis (Table 4).

56

Table 4

Characteristics of newspaper sample for content analysis (n=115)

Region of country	Number	Percentage of sample
West	25	21.74%
Midwest	40	34.78%
Northeast	10	8.70%
Southeast	40	34.78%
Frequency of publication		
Weeklies	70	60.87%
Dailies	5	4.35%
Three times per week	4	3.45%
Twice per week	14	12.17%
Bi-weeklies (every other week)	22	19.13%
Administrative independence		
Controlled by the university	5	3.47%
Supported by the university, but not controlled by it	125	86.81%
Completely independent of the university	13	9.03%

Descriptive statistics on the key survey and content analysis variables are provided in Table 5, including means, standard deviations and *Cronbach's Alpha* coefficients for scale reliability. Reliability tests were conducted to verify that the scale items could be aggregated reliably into single variables. Reliability coefficients (*Cronbach's Alpha*) for all variables were greater than 0.70, with the exception of the control variable *administrative control* from the survey ($a=0.56$) and the in*vestigative reporting* variable from the content analysis ($a=.50$). Dropping items from the administrative control variable did not increase the alpha. For the investigative reporting variable, the alpha level improved (from $a=.50$ to $a=.59$) when two items, which correlated relatively weakly, were dropped. However, the regression for the revised investigative reporting variable did not result in any change to statistical significance for any of the predictors. Therefore, the decision was made to include this variable in the analysis with all

five measures as these provide a more thorough measure of the concept, but caution is warranted in interpreting findings for these variables. For the disseminator role, alpha levels improved (a=0.66, from a=.39) after one measure, which correlated weakly with the other measures — "In your opinion, how important is it for student media to stay away from stories where the factual content cannot be verified?" — was removed from the scale. For the populist mobilizer role, the alpha coefficient for responses to these two questions was very low (a=0.24). Because populist mobilizer is not a conflict-oriented role, the determination was made to drop it from the analysis. Structural pluralism variables are aggregated indices rather than scales, and so reliability tests were not relevant and were not conducted.

Table 5

Means for all Variables

Dependent variables	Mean (SD)	Cronbach's Alpha
Conflict reporting (content analysis)	.78 (.57)	.77
0=Absence of conflict;4=High presence of conflict		
Investigative reporting (content analysis)	1.29 (.48)	.50
0=Absence of investigative reporting;		
5=High presence of investigative reporting		
Interpreter role	4.47 (.57)	0.73
1=Not at all important; 5=Very important		
Adversary role	2.57 (1.13)	0.90
1=Not at all important; 5=Very important		
Disseminator role	3.80 (.88)	0.66
1=Not at all important; 5=Very important		
Independent variables		
Campus Social Capital	4.85 (1.01)	0.84
1=Strongly disagree; 7=Strongly agree		
Municipal Social Capital	4.68 (.84)	0.87
1=Strongly disagree; 7=Strongly agree		
Newsroom Social Capital	5.96(.80)	0.78
1=Strongly disagree; 7=Strongly agree		
Administrative Social Capital	4.45 (1.37)	0.91
1=Strongly disagree; 7=Strongly agree		
Newsroom Turnover	4.45 (1.51)	0.74
1=Strongly disagree; 7=Strongly agree		
	-----	0.56

Structural pluralism, conflict reporting and role conceptions (H1and H2)

H1a predicted that student newspapers in more pluralistic municipal communities would be more likely to include conflict-oriented reporting. First, bivariate correlations were computed for all variables (See Table 6). Municipal pluralism measures showed minimal correlations with both conflict reporting and investigative reporting, and neither were statistically significant.

Table 6

Bivariate correlations for all key variables (n=144)

		Outcome variables					Social structure						Social capital			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Outcome variables																
1.	Conflict reporting	-	.63**	-.10	-.05	-.03	.10	.23*	-.05	.04	.10	.12	-.12	.03	.01	-.24*
2.	Investigative		-	-.03	-.03	.07	.08	.13	-.16	.03	.14	.05	-.02	.09	-.02	-.12
3.	Interpreter			-	.21*	.48**	.34	.09	.07	-.07	.10	.00	-.01	.13	.20*	.03
4.	Adversary				-	.13	.02	-.04	.00	.21*	.12	.03	-.13	-.18*	-.07	-.13
5.	Disseminator					-	.05	.04	-.06	-.05	-.01	.09	.05	.03	.29*	.13
Social structure																
6.	Print edition						-	.13	-.08	.09	.13	.03	-.07	-.11	-.10	-.08
7.	Admin independence							-	-.12	-.00	.18*	-.01	-.12	.20*	.01	-.09
8.	Admin Control								-	.12	.02	-.06	-.21*	.00	.12	-.32**
9.	Newsrm Turnover									-	.10	-.07	-.26*	-.20*	-.21	-.25**
10.	Campus Pluralism										-	.02	-.11	.04	.09	.00
11.	Municipal Pluralism											-	.09	-.07	.02	.11
Social capital																
12.	Campus Soc Capital												-	.41**	.19*	.69**
13.	Muni Soc Capital													-	.26**	.37**
14.	Newsrm Soc Capital														-	.19*
15.	Admin Soc Capital															-

** p<.01, * p<.05

Figures are Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficients

To further test the relationship, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare conflict and investigative reporting in high and low pluralism conditions. The sample was divided at the sample at the median for municipal pluralism (See Table 7). There were no significant differences for conflict reporting for either municipal or campus pluralism.

Table 7

T-tests for mean differences in conflict reporting across levels of pluralism. (n=115)

	Municipal pluralism		Campus pluralism	
	Low	High	Low	High
	M (SD)	*M* (SD)	*M* (SD)	*M* (SD)
Conflict	.70 (1.10)	.65 (1.12)	.66 (1.07)	.61 (1.11)
Investigative	.91 (.97)	1.26 (1.18)	.98 (1.06)	1.18 (1.10)

*p<.05, **p<.01

Regression analyses were also conducted in order to control for other independent variables (See tables 8-9). Municipal pluralism yielded a positive statistically significant coefficient for

conflict reporting (*B*=.26, *p*<.05), but it was not statistically significant for investigative

reporting when controlling for other factors. Considering bivariate, t-test and regression analyses,

results indicate partial support for H1a.

Table 8
Conflict reporting regressed on all predictor and control variables (n=115)

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß
Demographics									
Age	-.02	.03	-.05	-.02	.04	-.06	-.03	.04	-.09
Gender	-.04	.21	-.07	-.15	.21	-.07	-.05	.11	-.04
Current job experience	.03	.07	.05	.05	.07	.08	.04	.06	.07
Total experience	-.01	.01	-.14	-.01	.01	-.12	-.01	.01	-.14
Social structure									
Print edition				.13	.24	.05	.14	.24	.05
Admin structure				.41*	.17*	.23*	.32	.19	.18
Administrative Control				.12	.27	.04	-.17	.29	-.06
Newsroom Turnover				.01	.04	.03	.01	.04	.02
Campus Pluralism				-.01	.09	-.01	.02	.10	.02
Municipal Pluralism				.14*	.06*	.23*	.16**	.06**	.26**
Social capital									
Campus Social Capital							.05	.07	.10
Municipal Social Capital							.02	.08	.04
Newsrm Social Capital							.05	.08	.07
Admin Social Capital							-.14**	.05**	-.35**

Dependent Variable: Conflict			
R²	.04	.14	.20
Adjusted R²	-.02	.04	.08
ΔR²	.04	.10	.07
F for change in R²	.67	2.09	2.09

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 9

Investigative reporting regressed on all predictor and control variables (n=115)

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß
Demographics									
Age	.00	.03	.01	.01	.03	.04	.00	.03	.01
Gender	.08	.09	.09	.05	.10	.05	.04	.10	.04
Race	-.13	.18	-.07	-.18	.19	-.10	-.21	.19	-.11
Current job experience	.00	.00	-.08	.00	.00	-.09	-.01	.00	-.13
Total experience	.03	.06	.06	.03	.06	.06	.02	.06	.04
Social structure									
Print edition				.04	.21	.02	.05	.21	.03
Admin Independence				.17	.15	.12	.13	.17	.09
Administrative Control				-.25	.24	-.11	-.48	.25	-.20
Newsroom Turnover				.02	.03	.06	.03	.03	.09
Campus Pluralism				.00	.05	.00	.01	.05	.03
Municipal Pluralism				.06	.08	.08	.07	.09	.09
Social capital									
Campus Social Capital							.07	.06	.14
Munic Social Capital							-.03	.07	-.05
Newsrm Social Capital						-	.12	.07	.18
Admin Social Capital							-.11*	.05*	-.30*

Dependent Variable: Investigative			
R^2	.03	.07	.13
Adjusted R^2	-.02	-.03	-.01
ΔR^2	.03	.04	.06
F for change in R^2	.62	.74	1.75

*p<.05, **p<.01

H1b predicted that individuals working for student newspapers in more pluralistic municipal communities would be more likely to identify with conflict-oriented journalism *role conceptions*. First, bivariate correlations were conducted on the survey responses (See Table 6), yielding non-significant correlations between municipal pluralism and the interpreter and adversary roles.

To further test the proposed relationship, a t-test was conducted on the sample, dividing the sample at the median for municipal pluralism (See Table 10). There was a significant difference in the scores for the interpreter role in high municipal pluralism (*M*=4.58, *SD*=.50) and low

municipal pluralism (*M*=4.39, *SD*=.59) conditions; t (134)=-2.00, p=.05. Mean differences for the adversary role between high and low pluralism conditions were statistically non-significant. This suggests that individuals working in student newspapers in municipal communities that are more pluralistic are more likely to identify with the interpreter role than those in less pluralistic communities.

Table 10
T-tests for mean differences in role conceptions across levels of pluralism. (n=144)

	Municipal pluralism		Campus pluralism	
	Low	High	Low	High
	M (SD)	*M* (SD)	*M* (SD)	*M* (SD)
Interpreter	4.39 (.59)*	4.58 (.50)*	4.47 (.59)	4.48 (.56)
Adversary	2.63 (1.13)	2.51 (1.14)	2.64 (1.17)	2.51 (1.09)
Disseminator	3.78 (.90)	3.81 (.87)	3.80 (.85)	3.80 (.92)

Additionally, when controlling for other factors in a multiple linear regression (See tables 11–12), beta coefficients for conflict-oriented roles were minimal and statistically non-significant. These results show a minimal amount of support for H1b.

H2a predicted that student newspapers in more pluralistic campus communities would be more likely to engage in conflict reporting. Bivariate correlations showed small non-significant positive relationships with conflict and investigative reporting (Table 6). T-tests showed minimal and non-significant difference between groups divided at the sample median (Table 7). Beta coefficients all showed some small and non-significant positive correlations when controlling for other factors (Tables 8-9). These results indicate a lack of support for H2a.

H2b predicted that individuals working in student newspapers in more pluralistic campus communities would be more likely to identify with conflict-oriented journalism role conceptions. Bivariate correlations showed a slight negative but non-significant relationship with the

interpreter role, and a slight positive and non-significant relationship with the adversary role

(Table 6). T-tests showed a statistically non-significant mean difference (Table 10). In multiple

regression analysis, standardized beta coefficients for the interpreter role and for the adversary

role were both not significant (See Tables 11-12). These results indicate a lack of support for

H2b.

Table 11
Interpreter role conception regressed on all predictor and control variables (n=144)

	Model 1			**Model 2**			**Model 3**		
	B	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß	**B**	SE	ß
Demographics									
Job (Adviser or Editor)	-.10	.14	-.07	-.10	.14	-.07	-.07	.14	-.05
Age	.05	.03	.15	.04	.03	.14	.04	.03	.12
Gender	-.22*	.10*	-.21*	-.24*	.10*	-.23*	-.23*	.10*	-.21*
Race	-.32*	.16*	-.20*	-.30*	.16*	-.19*	-.28*	.17*	-.17*
Hispanic	.14	.17	.07	.16	.18	.08	.13	.18	.06
Current job experience	-.10	.07	.03	-.08	.07	-.17	-.06	.07	-.12
Total experience	.02	.09	.03	-.03	.09	-.04	-.05	.09	-.06
Social structure									
Print edition				.39	.25	.14	.43	.25	.15
Admin Independence				.09	.14	.05	.06	.15	.04
Admin Control				.21	.24	.08	.11	.26	.04
Newsroom Turnover				-.03	.03	-.07	-.02	.03	-.05
Campus Pluralism				.15	.12	.11	.12	.12	.09
Municipal Pluralism				-.02	.06	-.03	-.01	.06	-.02
Social capital									
Campus Social Capital							-.04	.07	.07
Munic Social Capital							.05	.07	.08
Newsrm Social Capital							.10	.07	.13
Admin Social Capital							.00	.05	.00

Dependent Variable: Interpreter			
R^2	.09	.14	.16
Adjusted R^2	.05	.05	.04
ΔR^2	.09	.04	.02
F for change in R^2	2.02*	1.07	.78

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 12
Adversary role conception regressed on all predictor and control variables (n=144)

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	SE	ß	B	SE	ß	B	SE	ß
Demographics									
Job (Adviser or Editor)	-.07	.27	-.03	-.10	.27	-.04	-.19	.27	-.07
Age	-.06	.06	-.10	-.04	.06	-.06	-.01	.06	-.02
Gender	.17	.19	.08	.09	.19	.04	.05	.19	.02
Race	-.15	.31	-.04	-.23	.31	-.07	-.25	.31	-.08
Hispanic	.24	.34	.06	.38	.36	.10	.45*	.18*	.33*
Current job experience	.17	.13	.17	.14	.14	.14	.10	.14	.11
Total experience	-.47**	.17**	-.32**	-.49**	.18**	-.34**	-.48**	.18**	-.33**
Social Structure									
Print edition				.41	.49	.07	.32	.50	.06
Admin Independence				-.19	.28	-.06	-.15	.30	-.05
Admin Control				-.18	.46	-.03	-.32	.51	-.06
Newsroom Turnover	.			.14*	.06*	.19*	.12	.07	.15
Campus Pluralism				.34	.23	.13	.36	.24	.13
Municipal Pluralism				-.02	.11	-.02	-.03	.11	-.02
Social capital									
Campus Social Capital							.00	.13	.00
Munic Social Capital							-.15	.13	-.11
Newsrm Social Capital							-.00	.13	-.00
Admin Social Capital							-.09	.10	-.10
Dependent Variable: Adversary									
R^2		.07			.13				.16
Adjusted R^2		.02			.05				.04
ΔR^2		.07			.06				.03
F for change in R^2		1.45			1.55				.96

*p<.05, **p<.01

In sum, across these four hypotheses, there was no support in this analysis for the proposition that community structural pluralism affects level of conflict in the work of student journalism. Greater pluralism of the school's municipal area predicted a higher level of conflict reporting and a significantly higher mean for investigative reporting, but other relationships between pluralism and conflict variables were not significant.

Social capital and conflict reporting (RQ1a – RQ4a)

RQ1a, RQ2a, RQ3a, and RQ4a asked about relationships between the dependent variable level of conflict reporting (from the content analysis) and the predictors of campus social capital, municipal social capital, newsroom social capital, and administrative social capital (measured in

the survey). Bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess relationships between social capital variables and the dependent variables, conflict and investigative reporting.

For the regression analysis, standardized skewness scores were within +/- 3 for all of the outcome variables (conflict reporting, investigative reporting, interpreter role conception, and adversary role conception). The regression models' Durbin-Watson statistics ranged between 1.5 and 2.5 for all variables, providing evidence of uncorrelated residuals (and so standard error is not likely to be underestimated). For all regression analyses, there was no evidence of multicollinearity between predictors. Campus social capital is highly correlated with administrative social capital, at .69. However, this correlation is not high enough to indicate multicollinearity, and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each regression analysis was within acceptable limits (*VIF*≤5), adding further evidence that multicollinearity is not a problem.

In the regression analyses for the conflict and investigative reporting dependent variables, Model 1 includes only the demographic variables (age, gender, race, experience advising and experience in their current position). Model 2 adds social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, administrative control and newsroom turnover, and municipal pluralism and campus pluralism; Model 3 includes demographic variables, social structure and all of the social capital variables.

In the regression model in which conflict reporting is regressed on predictors (Table 8), the block of demographic variables explained 3.5% of the overall model. Demographic and social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, administrative control and pluralism) were shown to explain 13.8% of the overall model. All three blocks of variables — demographics, structure, and social capital — explained 20.4% of the overall model. In the

regression model for investigative reporting (Table 9), the block of demographic variables explained 3.3% of the overall model. Demographic and social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, administrative control and pluralism) were shown to explain 7.2% of the overall model. All three blocks of variables — demographics, social structure, and social capital — explained 13.2% of the overall model.

Research questions were assessed next. RQ1a asks what the relationship is between social capital in the campus community and the dependent variables conflict and investigative reporting. Bivariate correlations (Table 6) showed a positive non-significant relationship between campus social capital and conflict reporting, and a slight negative and non-significant correlation with investigative reporting. When controlling for other factors in the regression, campus social capital showed non-significant positive relationships with conflict reporting (Table 8) and with investigative reporting (Table 9).

RQ2a asks what the relationship is between social capital in the municipal community and conflict/investigative reporting. Bivariate correlations showed non-significant positive correlations between municipal social capital and both conflict and investigative reporting (Table 6). When controlling for other factors, municipal social capital showed a non-significant positive relationship with conflict reporting (Table 8) and a non-significant negative relationship with investigative reporting (Table 9).

RQ3a asks what the relationship is between social capital in the newsroom and conflict/investigative reporting. Bivariate correlations showed non-significant negative relationships between newsroom social capital and both conflict and investigative reporting (Table 6). When controlling for other factors, newsroom social capital showed non-significant positive relationships with conflict reporting (Table 8) and with investigative reporting (Table 9).

RQ4a asks what the relationship is between administrative social capital and conflict/investigative reporting. Bivariate correlation analysis (Table 6) showed a negative and statistically significant correlation between administrative social capital and conflict reporting (r=-.24, p<.05). Administrative social capital remained significant in the regression analysis, when controlling for other factors (See Tables 8-9), showing a moderately strong negative relationship with conflict reporting (B=-.35, p<.01) and a moderately strong negative relationship with investigative reporting (B=-.30, p<.05).

Overall, social capital did not prove to be highly important in explaining level of conflict in the reporting, with the exception of administrative social capital, which negatively affects the reporting of conflict and the degree of investigation in the reporting for student journalism.

Survey results: Social capital and role conception

RQ1b, RQ2b, RQ3b, and RQ4b asked about the relationships between campus, municipal, newsroom, and administrative social capital (independent variables) and conflict-oriented role conceptions among student media outlet advisers and student staff. All data used to assess these research questions derived from survey results and data appear in the bivariate and regression analyses discussed above. As mentioned, there were no problems with multicollinearity. There were some concerns about normality in the interpreter role variable because of its high mean. A Shapiro-Wilks test of normality showed abnormality (p<.01), so the researcher conducted a square root transformation test of the variable to achieve more normal results. Results from regression analysis resulted in no changes in the significance for any of the variables in this analysis, and so the original untransformed data were used.

RQ1b asked about the relationship between the level of social capital in the campus community and conflict-oriented role conceptions for individuals working in student newspapers. Campus social capital showed some slight negative but non-significant bivariate correlations (see Table 6) with both the interpreter and the adversary role. When controlling for other factors (Tables 11-12), campus social capital showed a slight positive but non-significant standardized coefficient with the interpreter role and no relationship with the adversary role.

RQ2b asked about the relationship between social capital in the municipal community surrounding a college or university campus and the identification of individuals working in student newspapers with conflict-oriented roles. In the bivariate analysis (Table 6), municipal social capital was negatively associated with the adversary role (r=-.18), a correlation that was statistically significant (p<.05). It was positively but not significantly correlated with the interpreter role. When controlling for other factors in the regressions (Tables 11-12), municipal social capital showed non-significant results: a positive standardized coefficient with the interpreter role and a slight negative relationship with the adversary role.

RQ3b asked about the relationship between the newsroom social capital in student newsrooms and the identification of individuals working in student newspapers with conflict-oriented roles. In the bivariate analysis (Table 6), newsroom social capital showed a positive correlation with the interpreter role, which was statistically significant (r=.20, p<.05). The adversary role showed a negative but non-significant correlation with newsroom social capital. When controlling for other factors in regressions (see Tables 11-12), newsroom social capital showed a positive but non-significant standardized coefficient with the interpreter role and no relationship with the adversary role. Newsroom social capital did show a positive statistically

significant coefficient ($B=.32$, $p<.01$) with the disseminator role (see Table 13), which is not conflict-oriented. That analysis is detailed below.

RQ4b asked what the relationship is between administrative social capital and the identification of individuals working in student newspapers with conflict-oriented roles. In the bivariate analysis (Table 6), administrative social capital showed a small positive but non-significant correlation with the interpreter role. The measure also showed a positive but non-significant relationship with the adversary role. When controlling for other factors in the regressions (Tables 11-12), administrative social capital showed no relationship with the interpreter role and a somewhat negative but non-significant relationship with the adversary role.

A few control variables did show statistically significant coefficients in relationship to the role conceptions in question. Gender maintained a negative relationship with the interpreter role (see Table 11), even when controlling for all other factors ($B=-.21$, $p<.05$), suggesting that male respondents were less likely to identify with the interpreter role. Race ($B=-.17$, $p<.05$) was also statistically significant and negative for interpreter, suggesting that white respondents were less likely to identify with the interpreter role conception. In the adversary model (Table 12), total experience in journalism — either on staff or as an adviser — showed a negative and statistically significant coefficient ($B=-.33$, $p<.05$).

In the regression model in which the interpreter role is regressed on predictors (Table 11), Model 1 includes the demographic variables (age, gender, race, experience advising and experience in their current position); Model 2 adds social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, administrative control, newsroom turnover and pluralism); Model 3 includes demographic variables, social structure and all of the social capital variables. In Model 1 of the interpreter role regression (Table 11), demographic factors explained 9% of the

overall model. In Model 2, demographic variables and social structure variables accounted for 14% of the overall model. In the final model, demographics, social structure and social capital explained 16% of the overall model. The adjusted R-square (which accounts for the number of predictors) for Model 3 is low, at .04, indicating that other important variables are unmeasured in this model.

In the regression model in which the adversary role is regressed on predictors (Table 12), Model 1 includes the demographic variables (age, gender, race, experience advising and experience in their current position); Model 2 adds social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, administrative control, newsroom turnover and municipal and campus pluralism; Model 3 includes demographic variables, social structure and all of the social capital variables. In Model 1, demographic factors explained 7% of the overall model for the adversary role. Demographic variables and social structure variables accounted for 13% of the overall model. In the final model, demographics, social structure and social capital explained 16% of the overall model. Adjusted R-square (which accounts for the number of predictors) for Model 3 is low, at .04, indicating that other important variables are unmeasured in this model (Table 12).

Disseminator role

Finally, a regression was conducted that predicted the disseminator role (Table 13). This is one of the four traditional journalistic roles and so findings are presented for it, though it is not included in any hypotheses or research questions.

Table 13
Disseminator role conception regressed on all predictor and control variables (n=144)

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	SE	ß	B	SE	ß	B	SE	ß
Demographics									
Job (Adviser or Editor)	-.28	.21	-.13	-.29	.21	-.13	-.18	.21	-.08
Age	.04	.05	.09	.03	.05	.06	.01	.05	.02
Gender	-.43**	.15**	-.26**	-.44**	.15**	-.26**	-.41**	.15**	-.25**
Race	-.09	.24	-.03	-.14	.25	-.05	-.04	.24	-.01
Hispanic	-.07	.27	-.02	-.12	.28	-.04	-.24	.28	-.08
Current job experience	-.13	.10	-.17	-.12	.11	-.16	-.04	.11	-.05
Total experience	-.05	.13	-.05	-.08	.14	-.07	-.14	.14	-.13
Social structure									
Print edition				.48	.39	.11	.55	.38	.12
Admin Independence				.03	.22	.01	.10	.23	.04
Administrative Control				-.25	.37	-.06	-.34	.39	-.08
Newsroom Turnover				-.03	.05	-.05	.00	.05	.01
Campus Pluralism				.06	.18	.03	-.03	.18	-.01
Municipal Pluralism				.07	.09	.07	.06	.09	.06
Social capital									
Campus Social Capital							-.04	.10	-.05
Munic Social Capital							-.08	.10	-.08
Newsrm Social Capital							.36***	.10**	.32**
Admin Social Capital							.07	.08	.11
Dependent Variable: Disseminator									
R²	.09			.11			.20		
Adjusted R²	.04			.02			.09		
Δ R²	.09			.02			.09		
F for change in R²	1.85			.58			3.55**		

*p<.05, **p<.01

Model 1 includes the demographic variables (age, gender, race, experience advising, and experience in current position. Model 2 adds social structure variables (print edition, administrative independence, newsroom turnover, administrative control and pluralism variables). Model 3 includes demographic variables, social structure and the social capital variables. Demographic variables explained 9% of the entire model for the dissemination role (Table 13). Demographic variables and social structure explained 11% of the overall model. In

the final step of the model, Newsroom social capital showed a positive, statistically significant coefficient ($B=.32$, $p<.01$). Gender was also negative and significant ($B=-.25$, $p<.01$). No other predictors were significant in the final model. Demographics, social structure and social capital explained 20% of the overall model.

In sum, there was some support in this sample for the proposition that newsroom social capital can affect the roles individuals working in student newspapers conceive for themselves, but no support for the effects of other forms of social capital. Also, the only role that was predicted by newsroom social capital was the disseminator role, which is not a conflict role – therefore there was no support that social capital affected conflict-oriented roles.

DISCUSSION

Journalism, specifically investigative journalism, is something of a public service, and essential to the operation of a free society. In a society in which investigative journalism is increasingly disappearing, especially at the community level, it would seem the education and training of young journalists — specifically in the university setting — is essential to the future of that society. It is therefore worth studying how the practice of journalism in university settings prepares students for working in community journalism. In university communities, student journalists experience the unique pressures that professional journalists feel when they serve local communities, which is why Kanigel (2006) referred to campus newspapers as the training ground for the next generation of journalists. It would follow, then, that many of the factors that have been shown to affect the way journalism is practiced at the community level would apply within the university community as well.

Summary of findings

This study explored those factors at the campus-community level, municipal-community level and organizational level, while also accounting for perceptions of the administration's role in the newspaper's operation. Specifically, this study explored to what degree structural pluralism — within the campus community and the municipal community — and social capital — within the campus community, the municipal community, the newsroom, and with the school's administration — would affect the way those within campus media organizations see their roles as journalists, and to what degree those roles are enacted in practice – specifically, in the reporting of conflict. The findings of this project can be summarized as follows.

First, it is notable that the means for both conflict reporting and investigative reporting in actual news stories were low — the mean for conflict reporting across 115 student newspapers was less than 1 on a scale of 1 to 4 (in which 4 was the highest), while the investigative reporting mean was only 1.3, on a scale of 1 to 5 (in which 5 was highest). This indicates that relatively little conflict reporting is taking place in student newspapers, and only slightly more depth, or investigative, reporting. The low means for reporting stands in opposition, at least in part, to findings related to role conceptions — the mean for the interpreter role, which emphasizes investigating claims and statements made by the government, analysis of complex problems, and discussion of policy (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1986), was nearly 4.5, on a scale in which 5 indicated "strongly agree." That mean was nearly two points higher than the next conflict-oriented role, adversary, though the adversary role still scored above the mid-point of the scale. Disseminator, which is not conflict-oriented, fell between these. Consistent with previous research on student journalists and role conceptions (Coleman, 2018; Tandoc, 2013), this indicates that student journalists are more likely to believe that a journalist's role is most closely identified with interpretation. Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) stated that a majority of journalists are "pluralistic" in their views; positive correlations between the three journalistic roles suggest this is true for student journalists as well. Lowrey and Daniels (2017) found a similar gap between the ideals of recently graduated community journalists and the work they produce: "Aspirations are high, but reality constrains" (p. 347). The gap between the conflict roles and the actual reporting of conflict suggests evidence for a similar gap in this study of campus news, though it should be noted that the disseminator role scores fairly high, and it is a neutral, non-interpretive role.

Second, results from the analysis are consistent with the notion that community complexity is at least somewhat positively associated with the conflict reporting taking place in those

communities. Municipal community pluralism — the more traditional measure established by Tichenor, Donohue, and Olien (1980) — positively predicted both conflict reporting and investigative reporting in regression models (as noted previously, caution is warranted in interpreting findings for the investigation variable owing to low alpha level for scale reliability). The means for conflict and investigative reporting were hardly high — as reported in the previous paragraph, neither mean was higher than 1.3 — but it at least indicates that more conflict and depth reporting are taking place in pluralistic communities than in communities with lower levels of pluralism.

Third, campus pluralism — an experimental measure created for purposes of this analysis — yielded nothing of significance in this analysis. Nothing in the measurement of conflict reporting or investigative reporting were significant in the findings, and role conceptions were virtually the same across campus communities regardless of pluralism levels. It is possible that student journalists' relationships with sources is likely to be less substantive, less meaningful, more fleeting, than professional journalists' relationships with sources. Perhaps university officials are not likely to go to student journalists to air their grievances against other university officials – and no degree of pluralism is going to change that. Campus outlets lack the legitimacy of professional news outlets. On the other side of this, student journalists are here today, gone tomorrow – they are less likely to invest the time in trying to establish relationships with university sources to dig up dirt – less likely than professional journalists who have more long-term jobs (and depend on doing well in the jobs for their livelihood).

However, the reason for null findings may also relate to the power of school administration, as suggested by past literature: Those within student newspapers are less likely to be critical of those structures, either for fear of sanction or in the interest of maintaining campus community

76

harmony (Farquhar & Carey, 2018). Also, university officials who might provide information that is conflict-oriented may fear reprisal from their supervisors and higher administration, given the hierarchical nature of university bureaucracy.

Fourth, research questions about the effects of social capital at all levels and the findings on conflict reporting and conflict-oriented roles yielded mixed results. The two forms of social capital that showed the most relevance were (1) newsroom social capital (which showed a positive bivariate correlation with the interpreter role -- a conflict-oriented role conception -- but which lost its significance in multiple regression, and showed a positive beta coefficient with the disseminator role -- not conflict-oriented) and (2) administrative social capital. Newsroom social capital was only predictive for the disseminator role, which places the greatest emphasis on distributing news quickly in a neutral and non-interpretive way, to the widest possible audience, and avoiding news that cannot be verified. None of the variables that assess level of administrative influence over the papers tested as predictors of conflict in content or perceived role. Neither *administrative independence* — a control variable that assesses relative autonomy in the newspaper's structure relative to school administration — nor *administrative control* — assessing the administration's level of involvement in newspaper content — were significant variables in this analysis.

Administrative social capital's predictive power was most strongly related to the content produced by student newspapers in this analysis; specifically, models suggest administrative social capital is negatively related to both conflict reporting and investigative reporting. This suggests that individuals working in student newspapers are less likely to report conflict in the newspaper in campus communities where levels of trust between the administration and the newspaper are higher.

Fourth, the model that was best explained by the total regression analysis was the adversary role, indicating that all the variables in combination helped explain journalists' identification with a role that is skeptical of officials in the world of government and business. The mean of the adversary role was the lowest among the three role conceptions — and nearly two points lower than the interpreter role — and its correlations with both conflict and investigative reporting are both negative and statistically non-significant. Therefore, it appears that individuals working in student media identify least with the notion that journalism is to be skeptical of public officials and business leaders — consistent with established research (Coleman, 2018) — though respondents did score it above the midpoint – in other words, they were more likely to say it is important than to say it is unimportant.

Certain control variables did prove statistically significant during the analysis. Gender showed negative relationships with both the interpreter and disseminator roles, suggesting that male advisers were less likely to identify with those roles than their female counterparts. The interpreter role also had a negative relationship with race and Hispanic ethnicity. Since respondents in the sample were sorted into white (0) and non-white (1), this seems to suggest that the non-white respondents are more likely to identify with this role conception than the white respondents. It is possible that non-white, non-male respondents are more likely to embrace roles that emphasize the expression of social justice in their approach to journalism; another possibility is that white male respondents are more likely to be socialized to university administration, and thus less likely to identify with roles that challenge authority.

Additionally, total experience — as either an adviser or a student journalist — showed a statistically significant negative coefficient with the adversary role. It is possible to infer from this that those who spend more time in journalism — either as an adviser or as a member of a

student newspaper staff — become socialized to the university's power structure, and become less likely to embrace a style of journalism that emphasizes conflict with that same power structure. As much of the literature on conflict in community media has established, community newspapers tend to become part of the local power structure, which makes it more difficult to be critical of that same power structure. The evidence from this study offers some evidence that this is the case for student media, as well.

Implications

This project was designed to investigate to what degree the community and organizational contexts of campus journalism might affect the ways individuals who work for campus news media both think of the role journalists should play in society, and the degree to which they enact those roles.

Structural pluralism and college media. First, the data in this study indicate that municipal structural pluralism has an impact on role enactment among student journalists, specifically in their likelihood to produce journalism that reflects conflict in the community. This finding is consistent with Tichenor, Donohue and Olien's (1980) original theory — that the diversity of the community power structure will result in a greater presence of conflict in the newspaper for that community. This analysis does not consider how much of the conflict reporting in these newspapers took place in municipal settings, and how much was about conflict between actors on campus.

Contrary to Bodle (1992) and Kopenhaver (2015), this research found little apparent link between the size of the campus and the journalism produced on those campuses, given that campus pluralism is strongly related to campus size. Campus pluralism, while an experimental measure, even seems to have little correlation with municipal pluralism. The reasons for this are

myriad — each college and university campus is its own self-contained community, with different characteristics and structures, and this may contribute to problems in adapting the structural pluralism approach to campus journalism. It is also possible that the measures used for campus pluralism in this analysis need to be differently drawn.

What the significance of the control variables — specifically, the negative coefficients for race, gender, and experience — suggests, however, is that the notion of the relationship between older, whiter college media advisers and the power structure in a particular university is at least somewhat affirming of the principles of structural pluralism (Armstrong, 2006). The original literature regarding structural pluralism said that newspapers in smaller communities were less likely to be critical of the power structure because they become part of the power structure; this research suggests that is less likely to be true in the case of greater diversity in the leadership of the student newspaper.

Social capital and student newspapers. Social capital's role in this study came from the notion that the degree of trust within a community — within the campus, within the municipality, within the newsroom, and between the administration and the student newspaper — would have an effect on the way the journalism is done within those communities and the ways journalistic roles are conceived. Established research suggests that social capital can be a public good, though its presence could also limit the ability of journalists to report conflict within a community. This research has at least somewhat established social capital as a limiting factor for student journalists. Specifically, trust between administrators and individuals working in student newspapers appears to negatively affect the amount of conflict those newspapers are willing to report. The negative relationship between administrative social capital and both conflict reporting and investigative reporting is also telling — essentially, in campus

communities where trust between the administration and student media is high, conflict reporting and investigative reporting decreases.

One of the main research questions at the beginning of this project was what the relationship would be between social capital and the conflict orientation of a student newspaper. Putnam (1995) described of social capital as a community feature that "greases the wheels that allow communities to advance smoothly" (p. 288). The finding related to administrative social capital appears to prove the opposite. Instead, since reporting of conflict within a community can be seen as an act of deviance — one that defies community norms — what these findings appear to show is that student newspapers which report higher degrees of social capital with their administration are less likely to commit those acts. This is consistent with Childress' (1993) findings, about close relationships between administrators and student journalists, but runs somewhat counter to the conventional wisdom established by social capital. Since previously established research on student media (Bodle, 1994; Bickham & Shin, 2008; Farquhar & Carey, 2018) shows the administration to be the greatest threat to the student press' conflict orientation, established relationships with the administration seems like an important facet for those journalists. For newsroom communities, however, social capital between themselves and the administration has proven a hindrance to conflict reporting, rather than an advantage.

Additionally, this research suggests that increased social capital in the newsroom lends itself to the disseminator role conception. The emphasis of the disseminator role is on distributing news quickly, and to the widest possible audience — it also suggests reporters should remain neutral, staying away from interpretive claims that cannot be verified. This fits with the description of social capital as an element of community building — in newsrooms where a great deal of social capital already exists, it follows that the individuals working in those organizations

are more likely to emphasize "unbiased" information sharing above all else. That the sample was mostly advisers —specifically, advisers with more than 3 years of journalism experience — may help explain what sort of journalism students are learning within student media organizations. In newsroom communities where higher levels of trust are reported, media outlets will place a higher emphasis on journalism that is likely to not reflect dissension within the local community.

The relationship between campus and municipal social capital and conflict reporting is apparently somewhat more complicated. It is entirely possible that those working in student newspapers do not value relationships within their campus and municipal communities in the same way professional journalists at community newspapers and other media organizations must in order to perform their jobs on a regular basis. There is a common thread between the finding that administrative social capital correlates with safer kinds of reporting (or it correlates negatively with aggressive kinds of reporting), as well as the finding that the "safer" role of dissemination corresponds with higher newsroom social capital, where there is a more cohesive, trusting newsroom community. These findings seem to point to the idea that safe, trusting relationships correlate with "safer" less conflict-oriented approaches toward journalism and news content. This stands in opposition to the idea that social capital may create a kind of safety net that enables or encourages risk-taking.

The original theory of structural pluralism relies on the notion that media are dependent on power relationships, and play an important role in maintaining those relationships, and they are therefore less likely to report conflict, and more likely to be supportive of the powerholders (and therefore supportive of the status quo). Essentially, the more organizations located in a community, the more likely for divisiveness to occur, and the more opportunities will exist for journalists to report dissent within a community. This notion bore itself out in this study on the

municipal level. One potential implication for campus media is that many of the norms professional journalists are adapting to report on their communities may be learned in their student newspapers — that is, student journalists working in more diverse municipal communities can better learn how to navigate the centers of power in those municipal communities, and they bring those skills with them into the professional realm. Another potential implication of this finding is that student newspapers in these pluralistic communities may be capable, and should be pushed, to enter the turf of the local professional journalist and cover their surrounding municipal communities, in addition to their campus communities, reaffirming findings from previous research on the subject (Bodle 1992; Bodle, 1996; Collins & Armstrong, 2008; Burch & Cozma, 2016). For media advisers and student editors, this is at once complimentary and challenging — student media can be capable of practicing the same standards of journalism as those in professional media, but that means readers may expect the same standard of journalism as they expect from other forms of professional media.

What this research suggests, however, is that this framework is different inside a campus community. Pluralism on campus appears to have little bearing on the level of conflict reporting in the newspaper, or the identification with conflict-oriented role conception. No matter how pluralistic the university, it does not appear to impact the willingness of sources to air grievances with campus media. The implications of this for those working in student media are threefold. First, university communities are not built in the same way that municipal communities are. While a diversity of sources can still exist on a college or university campus, power is not as evenly distributed among many of those structures; that is, a professor or employee in student services knows that airing a grievance through the press — student or otherwise — could affect their employment (as opposed to a municipal community, where various structures are less likely

to be interdependent). Second, the credibility of the student newspaper may be at issue among those employees — student newspapers, even those completely independent from the campus, are still staffed by students, and still learning their craft. Potential sources may be unwilling to bring issues to the attention of the student newspaper for fear of being misrepresented, or simply because they are less willing to make themselves vulnerable to students. Further, the transient nature of the student newsroom is such that building relationships with those sources is made more difficult in campus communities. Third, and related to the first two, is that, regardless of the administrative independence, is the notion that the leadership of the university can still exert control over the student newspaper. Terry Mattingly, a syndicated religion columnist, speaking at the 2018 College Media Association fall conference, noted that this is especially tricky on college campuses. "It's hard to cover a war when the generals sign your paychecks," he said. Even at more pluralistic institutions, the administration of the school may still be able to affect publication of the newspaper. Farquhar and Carey (2018) noted that student journalists are more likely to self-censor based on fear of sanction from authority, and this research seems to suggest that this is true regardless of the pluralism on campus. It may be that the most important figure in this equation is the campus adviser, who can cultivate relationships with the administration and other potential sources on campus, while also shielding the student journalists from any recrimination from the power structure. Advisers can also help build the credibility of the student newspaper on campus, to make it more appealing to potential sources.

How cozy that relationship is, however, is something of a cautionary finding from this study. Put simply, this study seems to suggest that, in order for journalists to report conflict and value conflict as a journalistic practice, some tension probably ought to exist. Award-winning coverage that came from the *Flor-Ala* at the University of North Alabama in 2018 also resulted in the

dismissal of the university's media adviser, as well as the subsequent censuring of the university by the College Media Association ("University of North Alabama President addresses censure over ousted student media adviser"). This story, along with others from campus media around the nation, suggests that where tension exists between student media and the administration, better journalism results. This dovetails with the findings of this research, which suggests that individuals in student media who report a higher level of trust with their administration are less likely to pursue conflict or investigative reporting. To borrow Putnam's (1995) definition of social capital, it makes sense that those individuals are less likely to risk creating a hazard to the "smooth advancement" of your community, particularly when they have to live in and be a part of that community. Further, the fact that newsroom social capital appears to lend itself to a role that emphasizes information distribution may also indicate that advisers — particularly advisers who have spent lots of time in their jobs (per the negative correlation between years of experience and embrace of the adversary role) — are emphasizing a journalism that is less likely to make anyone, particularly those in power, uncomfortable.

It is therefore suggested by this research that the adviser has to walk a fine line: While the amount of time spent on campus and in advising overall may help them build relationships that allow them to shield student journalists and make sources available, there is some suggestion in these findings that those relationships could be a hindrance to the production of watchdog journalism. College media advisers must therefore take care to avoid becoming too socialized to their administrations, and establish their own credibility that will allow them to empower the students working for their newspapers.

Limitations and ideas for future research

   The study may be limited in several ways. First, the statistical power of the findings from the survey was limited by the low response rate to the survey. The original target for the survey was 250 responses, which would have represented 35-50 percent of the potential sample represented in the accessible databases. While 144 responses and 115 papers are enough to draw conclusions from multivariate analysis (VanVoorhis & Morgan, 2007), a higher response rate would have yielded more in terms of statistical conclusions. Additionally, the respondents were overwhelmingly advisers (over 84% of the sample), and, among those who disclosed their age, 75% were over 40 years old. The advisers' perceptions are important of course, given the important role they play in shaping the work at the publication Kopenhaver, 1983; Jasinski, 1994), but it is worth wondering how much this kind of sample will represent the overall social capital on a college campus in a way that accurately reflects the student body, or even the student newsroom. Many of the results about what role journalism should play in society, as well as the social capital both on campus and in the municipal community, may have been different and yielded different results if the sample were more balanced among advisers and student journalists.

   Second, the measure for campus pluralism may need to be re-assessed in future studies. This research sought to approximate measures of municipal pluralism by adapting similar measures: enrollment (for community population), number of degree programs (for schools and educational centers), and spending on student services (businesses, agencies and volunteer organizations). The fact that it yielded no significant results suggests the campus journalism environment may not work well with campus journalism, as discussed above. However, it could also be that the measure may need to be revised in future studies. Specifically, the measure was

not able to truly get at the number of non-academic departments on a college campus; the amount of spending on student services was the most approximate measure that was available. The use of gender and ethnic diversity and the relative distance to urban areas was an effort to strengthen the measure.

Third, the research did not consider some of the factors that can affect the way a student newspaper operates — specifically, in which department the newspaper is housed, or the relative traditional "strength" of the journalism program or the student newspaper on campus. Results did yield significance for the newspaper's "category" — that is, the independence (or lack of it) from the university — and its relationship to conflict-oriented role conceptions. That does not, however, account for all factors that shape the way a student newspaper does its job. Further, the research did not consider where the department is housed. Cook (1989) says about 1/3 of campus newspapers across the nation are housed in student affairs divisions; approximately 1/3 are connected to an academic program in journalism; about 12 percent of the nation's campus newspapers are independent; and the remaining are associated with the "president's office, the public relations office, or within a particular college" (p. 2). While it's not clear what this variable would predict, it may be beneficial if future research included this consideration in assessing journalism on campus, at least as a control.

Lastly, the research focused on outcomes related to conflict reporting, and conflict-oriented role conception, only as ends unto themselves. Reporting of conflict, and the role of journalism as both interpretive and adversarial, are all important functions of community journalism. However, emerging studies in the field of journalism and mass communication have focused on how the communities respond to those problems. Specifically, some research has focused on "solutions journalism," defined as "critical reporting that investigates and explains

credible responses to social problems" (Curry & Hammonds, 2014, p. 5). Solutions journalism

has precursors in public and civic journalism from the 1990s. Such journalism is not good news

just for good news' sake, but rather focuses on what is working, why it is working, or how it

could be repaired. This type of reporting should "identify social ills and potential remedies to

them. They need to include the voices of people who have seen those remedies at the ground

level. They must include evidence about whether the remedies work, and report any caveats or

limitations associated with them" (Dyer, 2015, p. 16). Recent research has revealed that this type

of journalism can result in more favorable attitudes toward the news media, though it may not

change behavior (McIntyre, 2019). Future research might explore the extent to which individuals

working in student journalism consider this type of reporting relevant to their role on campus,

and the extent to which they enact this conception.

REFERENCES

Alsandor, D. J. (2005). The first amendment rights of student publications in higher education: A look into policy implications of the student press. In *University of Georgia Education Law Consortium Forum 1*, 1-10).

Altbach, P. G., & Cohen, R. (1990). American student activism: The post-sixties transformation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *61*(1), 32-49.

Amend, E., Kay, L., & Reilly, R. C. (2012). Journalism on the Spot: Ethical dilemmas when covering trauma and the implications for journalism education. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, *27*(4), 235-247.

Andersson, U., & Wadbring, I. (2015). Public interest or self-interest? How journalism attracts future journalists. *Journal of Media Practice*, *16*(2), 126-138.

Anyaegbunam, C., & Ryan, L. B. (2003). Students as citizens: Experiential approaches to reflective thinking on community journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *58*(1), 64-73.

Armstrong, C. L. (2008). Exploring a two-dimensional model of community pluralism and its effects on the level of transparency in community decision making. J*ournalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *85*(4), 807-822.

Armstrong, C. L., & Collins, S. J. (2009). Reaching out: Newspaper credibility among young adult readers. *Mass Communication and Society*, *12*(1), 97-114.

Ball, K., Cleland, V. J., Timperio, A. F., Salmon, J., Giles-Corti, B., & Crawford, D. A. (2010). Love thy neighbour? Associations of social capital and crime with physical activity amongst women. *Social science & medicine*, *71*(4), 807-814.

Bartholomé, G., Lecheler, S., & de Vreese, C. (2015). Manufacturing conflict? How journalists intervene in the conflict frame building process. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *20*(4), 438-457.

Beam, R. A. (2006). Organizational goals and priorities and the job satisfaction of US. Journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *83*(1), 169-185.

Beam, R. A., Brownlee, B. J., Weaver, D. H., & Di Cicco, D. T. (2009). Journalism and public service in troubled times. *Journalism Studies*, *10*(6), 734-753.

Beaudoin, C. E., & Thorson, E. (2004). Social capital in rural and urban communities: Testing differences in media effects and models. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *81*(2), 378-399.

Becker, L. B. , Fruit, J. W. , & Caudill, S. L. (1987). *The training and hiring of journalists*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Beecher, E. (8 April 2009). Democracy and the near death of public trust journalism. Retrieved from https://www.crikey.com.au/2009/04/08/democracy-and-the-near-death-of-public-trust-journalism/.

Bennett, W. L. (1996) An Introduction to Journalism Norms and Representations of Politics, *Political Communication 13*, 373–84.

Bennett, W. L., & Serrin, W. (2005). The watchdog role. *The press*, 169-188.

Berkowitz, D. (2007). Professional views, community news: Investigative reporting in small US dailies. *Journalism*, *8*(5), 551-558.

Bickham, S. B. (2008). *Toward a free collegiate press: An analysis of influences that can lead to censorship at college newspapers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

Bickham, S. B., & Shin, J. H. (2013). Organizational influences on student newspapers. *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal*, *28*(1), 1-30.

Blackwell, R. E. (1939). The college newspaper. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *10*(5), 243-248.

Bobkowski, P. S., Goodman, M., & Bowen, C. P. (2012). Student media in US secondary schools: Associations with school demographic characteristics. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *67*(3), 252-266.

Bockino, D. (2018). Preparatory journalism: The college newspaper as a pedagogical tool. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *73*(1), 67-82.

Bodle, J. V. (1992). Are student newspapers as readable, interesting, and thorough as community newspapers? A content analysis of student and community daily newspapers, presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal, 1992. Quebec, Canada. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.libdata.lib.ua.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED349571&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Bodle, J. V. (1993). Why newspaper advisers quit: Stress and professional prestige. *The Journalism Educator*, *48*(3), 32-37.

Bodle, J. V. (1994). Measuring the tie between funding and news control at student newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, *71*(4), 905-913.

Bodle, J. V. (1996). Assessing news quality: A comparison between community and student daily newspapers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *73*(3), 672-686.

Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital.(1986). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, *1*, 81-93.

Brehm, J., & Rahn, W. (1997). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American journal of political science*, 999-1023.

Bressers, B., & Bergen, L. (2002). Few university students reading newspapers online. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *23*(2-3), 32-45.

Burch, A., & Cozma, R. (2016). Student election stories use more diverse news sources. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *37*(3), 235-248.

Buss, W. G. (1988). School Newspapers, Public Forum, and the First Amendment. *Iowa L. Rev.*, *74*, 505.

Buzzelli, N. (2015). Rebel Reporting: A College Journalist's Guide to Circumventing Administrative Censorship (Unpublished master's thesis). Robert Morris University, Moon Township, Pa.

Byerly, K. R. (1961). *Community journalism*. Chilton Co., Book Division.

Carey, J. W. (2000). Some personal notes on US journalism education. *Journalism*, *1*(1), 12-23.

Carpenter, S., Hoag, A., & Grant, A. E. (2018). An Examination of Print and Broadcast Journalism Students' Personality Traits. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *73*(2), 147-166.

Cassidy, W. P. (2005). Variations on a theme: The professional role conceptions of print and online newspaper journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *82*(2), 264-280.

Cassidy, W. P. (2008). Traditional in different degrees: The professional role conceptions of male and female newspaper journalists. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *16*(2), 105-117.

Childress, J.T. (1993). Student press at public universities: Impact of significant United States court cases from 1967-1993. (Doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.

Chung, D. S. (2009). How readers perceive journalists' functions at online community newspapers. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *30*(1), 72-80.

"Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits." Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (2016 November 1). https://www.journalism.org/2016/11/03/civic-engagement-strongly-tied-to-local-news-habits/

Click, J. W. (1980). *Governing college student publications*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Coleman, R., & Wilkins, L. (2002). Searching for the ethical journalist: An exploratory study of the moral development of news workers. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, *17*(3), 209-225.

Coleman, R., Lee, J. Y., Yaschur, C., Meader, A. P., & McElroy, K. (2018). Why be a journalist? US students' motivations and role conceptions in the new age of journalism. *Journalism*, *19*(6), 800-819.

Cook, B. B. (1989). *The Administrator and the College Press: Strategies for a Successful Relationship*. Orlando, FL: National Seminar on Successful College Administration.

Cordell, M. (2009). What Is Happening to Investigative Journalism?: A Pilot Study of ABC's Four Corners. *Pacific Journalism Review*, *15*(2), 118.

Culbertson, H. M. (1983). Three Perspectives on American Journalism. *Journalism Monographs*, *83*,1-33.

Curry, A. L., & Hammonds, K. H. (2014). The power of solutions journalism. *Solutions Journalism Network*, *7*, 1-14.

Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who governs? : Democracy and power in an American city. : Yale studies in political science*,: New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Dardis, F. E. (2006). Marginalization devices in US press coverage of Iraq war protest: A content analysis. *Mass Communication & Society*, *9*(2), 117-135.

Davison, K. K., Nishi, A., Kranz, S., Wyckoff, L., May, J. J., Earle-Richardson, G. B., & Jenkins, P. L. (2012). Associations among social capital, parenting for active lifestyles, and youth physical activity in rural families living in upstate New York. *Social science & medicine*, *75*(8), 1488-1496.

Day, L.A. & Butler, J.M. (1989). The teaching of ethics and moral reasoning in scholastic journalism: The pedagogical imperative, presented at the meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Boston, Ma., 1991.

De Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal & Document Design*, *13*(1).

de Vries, M. F. K. (1993). The dynamics of family controlled firms: The good and the bad news. *Organizational dynamics*, *21*(3), 59-71.

Demers, D. K. (1998). Structural pluralism, corporate newspaper structure, and news source perceptions: Another test of the editorial vigor hypothesis. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *75*(3), 572-592.

Dicken-Garcia, H. (2006). The Evolution of American Investigative Journalism. *American Journalism*, *23*(3), 110–112.

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys* (2. ed., 2007 update ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Dillon, J. (1990). Career values as predictor of the perceived role of media. *Journalism Quarterly*, *67*(2), 369-376.

Donohue, G. A., Olien, C. N., & Tichenor, P. J. (1985). Reporting conflict by pluralism, newspaper type and ownership. *Journalism Quarterly*, *62*(3), 489-499.

Donohue, G. A., Olien, C. N., & Tichenor, P. J. (1989). Structure and constraints on community newspaper gatekeepers. *Journalism Quarterly*, *66*(4), 807-845.

Donohue, G. A., Tichenor, P. J., & Olien, C. N. (1995). A guard dog perspective on the role of media. *Journal of Communication*, *45*(2), 115-132.

Duke, N. N., Borowsky, I. W., & Pettingell, S. L. (2012). Parent perceptions of neighborhood: relationships with US youth physical activity and weight status. *Maternal and child health journal*, *16*(1), 149-157.

Duscha, J. & Fischer, T. *The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility*. Washington, D . C : American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973.

Dvorak, J., & Dilts, J. P. (1992). Academic freedom vs. administrative authority. *The Journalism Educator*, *47*(3), 3-12.

Dyer J (2015) Is solutions journalism the solution? *Nieman Reports*, 11 June. Available at: http://niemanreports.org/articles/is-solutions-journalism-the-solution/

Eisenstadt, S. N., & Aizenshtadt, S. N. (1995). *Power, trust, and meaning: Essays in sociological theory and analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of communication*, *57*(1), 163-173.

Ettema, J. S., & Glasser, T. L. (1998). *Custodians of Conscience : Investigative Journalism and Public Virtu*e. New York: Columbia University Press.

Farquhar, L. K& Carey, M. C. (2018). Self-Censorship Among Student Journalists Based on Perceived Threats and Risks. Journalism and Mass Communication Educator. https://doi-org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/10.1177/1077695818815276

Files, J. A. (1987). *Academic and professional perceptions of the roles and functions of the student newspaper* (Doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

"For Local News, Americans Embrace Digital but Still Want Strong Community Connection." Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (26 March 2019). https://www.journalism.org/2019/03/26/for-local-news-americans-embrace-digital-but-still-want-strong-community-connection/

Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: Social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Funk, M. (2016). The CxP Typology: A new understanding of normative deviance, gatekeeping, and community journalism. *Journalism Studies*, *17*(1), 122-140.

Gade, P. J. (2004). Newspapers and organizational development: Management and journalist perceptions of newsroom cultural change. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, *6*(1), 3-55.

Gaunt, P. (1992). *Making the newsmakers: international handbook on journalism training*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Geber, S., Scherer, H., & Hefner, D. (2016). Social capital in media societies: The impact of media use and media structures on social capital. *International communication gazette*, *78*(6), 493-513.

Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 319-336.

Graber, D. (1993). *Mass media and American politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Granovetter, M. S. (1977). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78(6),* 1360-1380.

Griffin, R. J., & Dunwoody, S. (1997). Community structure and science framing of news about local environmental risks. *Science Communication*, *18*(4), 362-384.

Grubenmann, S., & Meckel, M. (2017). Journalists' Professional Identity: A resource to cope

with change in the industry?. *Journalism Studies*, *18*(6), 732-748.

H. De Vreese, Jochen Peter, Holli A. Semetko, C. (2001). Framing politics at the launch of the Euro: A cross-national comparative study of frames in the news. *Political communication*, *18*(2), 107-122.

Hampton, K. N., Lee, C. J., & Her, E. J. (2011). How new media affords network diversity: Direct and mediated access to social capital through participation in local social settings. *New media & society*, *13*(7), 1031-1049.

Hanitzsch, T. (2007). Deconstructing journalism culture: Toward a universal theory. *Communication Theory*, *17*(4), 367-385.

Hanitzsch, T., & Hoxha, A. (2014). News production: Theory and conceptual framework generic and conflict influences on the news production process. *http://www. infocore. eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Theoretical-Framing_WP1_News-Productions. pdf*

Hapney Jr, T. L., & Lucas, D. (2014). Issues of Editorial Control, Prior Restraint, and Prior Review Facing Student Newspapers on Public University Campuses in Ohio: Administrative, Faculty, and Student Perspectives. ASJMC Insights, 10-17.

Hindman, D. B. (1996). Community newspapers, community structural pluralism, and local conflict with nonlocal groups. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *73*(3), 708-721.

Hindman, D. B., & Yamamoto, M. (2011). Social capital in a community context: A multilevel analysis of individual-and community-level predictors of social trust. *Mass Communication and Society*, *14*(6), 838-856.

Hinnant, A., Jenkins, J., & Subramanian, R. (2016). Health journalist role conceptions: Existing and emerging professional identities. *Journalism Practice*, *10*(6), 763-781.

Hovden, J. F., Bjørnsen, G., Ottosen, R., Willig, I., & Zilliacus-Tikkanen, H. (2009). The Nordic journalists of tomorrow. *Nordicom Review*, *30*(1), 149-165.

Huffman, S., Tuggle, C. A., & Rosengard, D. S. (2004). How campus media cover sports: The gender-equity issue, one generation later. *Mass Communication & Society*, *7*(4), 475-489.

Hunt, D. S., Atkin, D. J., & Kowal, C. J. (2013). Community attachment affects use of online, interactive features. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *34*(2), 64-77.

Ingelhart, L. E. (1993). *Student publications: Legalities, governance, and operation*. Iowa State Press.

Jae H., & Abisaid, J. (2015). The influence of community structure on crime news coverage: structural pluralism, ethnic diversity, and local crime news. *Communication & Society*,

97–113.

Janowitz, M. (1975). Professional models in journalism: The gatekeeper and the advocate. *Journalism Quarterly*, *52*(4), 618-626.

Jasinski, J. (1994). As They See It.... College Newspapers May Not Look the Same to Campus Administrators. *College Media Review*, *33*(2), 8-11.

Jeffres, L. W., Cutietta, C., Sekerka, L., & Lee, J. W. (2000). Newspapers, pluralism, and diversity in an urban context. *Mass Communication & Society*, *3*(2-3), 157-184.

John, J. A., & Tidwell, J. (1996). Links between professional education and the penalized campus press. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *51*(2), 15-24.

Johnstone, J., Slawski, E., & Bowman, W. (1976). *The news people: A sociological portrait of American journalists and their work*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Johnstone, J. W., Slawski, E. J., & Bowman, W. W. (1972). The professional values of American newsmen. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *36*(4), 522-540.

Kanigel, R. (2006). *The Student Newspaper Survival Guide*. Ames, Iowa: Blackwell.

Kaisor, S., & Darrah, E. (1996). Censorship of the collegiate presses. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 2,* 111-123.

Killerby, P., & Wallis, J., 2002. Social capital and social economics. *Forum for Social Economics, 32*(1), 21-32.

Kirkpatrick, R. (2001). Are community newspapers really different? *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, *1*(10), 16-21.

Kleiman, H. M. (1996). Student electronic media and the First Amendment. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *51*(2), 4-14.

Kopenhaver, L. L. (2015). Campus media reflect changing information landscape amid strong efforts to serve their communities. *College Media Review*, *52*(1), 38-55.

Kopenhaver, L. L., & Spielberger, R. E. (1992). Small media operations predominate on campuses. *College Media Review*, *31*(1), 29-34.

Kopenhaver, L. L., Martinson, D. L., & Ryan, M. (1984). How public relations practitioners and editors in Florida view each other. *Journalism Quarterly*, *61*(4), 860-884.

Kovach, B. & Rosenstiel, T. (2001) *The Elements of Journalism*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Lanosga, G. (2014). New views of investigative reporting in the twentieth century. *American*

Journalism, *31*(4), 490-506.

Lee, C. J., & Kam, J. A. (2015). Why does social capital matter in health communication campaigns? *Communication Research*, *42*(4), 459-481.

Lee, E., Kim, Y. J., & Ahn, J. (2014). How do people use Facebook features to manage social capital? *Computers in Human Behavior*, *36*, 440-445.

Lee, J. Y., Bachrach, D. G., & Lewis, K. (2014). Social network ties, transactive memory, and performance in groups. *Organization science*, *25*(3), 951-967.

Lee, S. (2017). Media freedom and social capital. *Journal of Media Economics*, *30*(1), 3-18.

Leung, D. K., & Lee, F. L. (2015). How journalists value positive news: The influence of professional beliefs, market considerations, and political attitudes. *Journalism Studies*, *16*(2), 289-304.

Lewis, S. C., Holton, A. E., & Coddington, M. (2014). Reciprocal journalism: A concept of mutual exchange between journalists and audiences. *Journalism Practice*, *8*(2), 229-241.

Lipschultz, J. H., & Hilt, M. L. (1999). Predicting newspaper readership on the campus community. *Psychological reports*, *84*(3), 1051-1053.

Lowrey, W. (2003). What influences small newspapers to decide to publish online news?. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *24*(3), 83-90.

Lowrey, W., Brozana, A., & Mackay, J. B. (2008). Toward a measure of community journalism. *Mass Communication and Society*, *11*(3), 275-299.

Lowrey, W., Daniels, G. L., & Becker, L. B. (2005). Predictors of convergence curricula in journalism and mass communication programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *60*(1), 31-46.

MacGillivray, A., & Walker, P. (2000). Local social capital: Making it work on the ground. *Social capital: Critical perspectives*, 197-211.

Magaw, T. "Evolution of College Newspapers: What Does It Mean for Future of Journalism Programs?" *Crain's Cleveland Business*. June 22, 2014.

Matheson, D. (2009) What the blogger knows. In Papacharissi, Z. (ed.), *Journalism and Citizenship: New Agendas*, 151-165. London and New York: Routledge.

McClung, S. (2001). College radio station web sites: Perceptions of value and use. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *56*(1), 62-73.

McCluskey, M., Stein, S. E., Boyle, M. P., & McLeod, D. M. (2009). Community structure and

social protest: Influences on newspaper coverage. *Mass Communication and Society*, *12*(3), 353-371.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1977). Agenda-setting and the political process. *The emergence of American political issues: The agenda-setting function of the press, edited by Donald L. Shaw and Maxwell E. McCombs*, 149-56.

McIntyre, K. (2019). Solutions journalism: The effects of including solution information in news stories about social problems. *Journalism Practice*, *13*(1), 16-34.

McKenzie, C. T., Lowrey, W., Hays, H., Chung, J. Y., & Woo, C. W. (2011). Listening to news audiences: The impact of community structure and economic factors. *Mass Communication and Society*, *14*(3), 375-395.

McManamey, Rosie. 2004. *The Relationship between Community Newspapers and Social Capital: The Power to Empower*. (PhD thesis). University of Tasmania, Tasmania, Australia.

Mellado, C., & Van Dalen, A. (2014). Between rhetoric and practice: Explaining the gap between role conception and performance in journalism. *Journalism Studies*, *15*(6), 859-878.

Mellado, C., Márquez-Ramírez, M., Mick, J., Oller Alonso, M., & Olivera, D. (2017). Journalistic performance in Latin America: A comparative study of professional roles in news content. *Journalism*, *18*(9), 1087-1106.

Meyer, N.J. (1989). Assuring Freedom for the College Student Press After Hazelwood. *Valparaiso University Law Review, 24(1),* 53-76.

Miller, James Edward, "Just Another Day at the Office: An Investigation Into How Public College Administrators Balance the First Amendment Rights of the Student Press and the Broader Interests of Their Campuses. " (PhD diss). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Sage Publications.

Nah, S., & Armstrong, C. L. (2011). Structural pluralism in journalism and media studies: A concept explication and theory construction. *Mass Communication and Society*, *14*(6), 857-878.

Nah, S., & Chung, D. S. (2011). News Editors' Demographics Predict Their Social Capital. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *32*(1), 34-45.

Nah, S., Namkoong, K., Van Stee, S. K., & Record, R. A. (2014). Unveiling the effects of citizen journalism practice on college students' social capital. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *69*(4), 366-385.

Nah, S., Namkoong, K., Van Stee, S. K., & Record, R. A. (2014). Unveiling the effects of citizen journalism practice on college students' social capital. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *69*(4), 366-385.

Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 242-266.

Netzley, S. B., & Banning, S. A. (2011). Tomorrow's Journalists: In-Groups, Out-Groups, and News Topic Preference. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *66*(1), 39-53.

Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge. News and the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Newton, K. (1999). Mass media effects: mobilization or media malaise? *British Journal of Political Science*, *29*(4), 577-599.

Norris, P. (1996). Does television erode social capital? A reply to Putnam. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *29*(3), 474-480.

O'sullivan, J., & Heinonen, A. (2008). Old values, new media: Journalism role perceptions in a changing world. *Journalism Practice*, *2*(3), 357-371.

Parzefall, M. R., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2012). Understanding the antecedents, the outcomes and the mediating role of social capital: An employee perspective. *Human Relations*, *65*(4), 447-472.

Pasqua, T. (1971). 'We're Censored,' J-Students Think. *The Journalism Educator*, *26*(1), 15-18.

Payne, L. L., & Mills, T. (2015). What's in the Pages? *College Media Review*, *15*.

Perry, M. H. (1968). Protect Freedom of Press, but Enforce Responsibility. *The Journalism Educator*, *23*(3), 4-6.

Pöyhtäri, R., & Ojala, M. (2018). Watchdogs, advocates and adversaries: journalists' relational role conceptions in asylum reporting. *Media and Communication*, *6*(2), 168-178.

Price, V., & Tewksbury, D. (1997). News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing. *Progress in communication sciences*, 173-212.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In *Culture and politics* (pp. 223-234). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Ramaprasad, J., & Rahman, S. (2006). Tradition with a twist: A survey of Bangladeshi journalists. *International Communication Gazette*, *68*(2), 148-165.

Rampal, K. R. (1982). Department-run campus newspaper has definite educational advantages. *The Journalism Educator*, *37*(1), 48-50.

Reed, K. T. (2004). Student media; the price of true independence; newsroom staffs often at mercy of administration. *NABJ Journal*, *22*(1), 25.

Riffe, D., Aust, C. F., & Lacy, S. R. (1993). The effectiveness of random, consecutive day and constructed week sampling in newspaper content analysis. *Journalism Quarterly*, *70*, 133-139.

Robie, D. (2010). Pacific freedom of the press: Case studies in independent campus-based media models. *Pacific Journalism Review*, *16*(2), 99.

Romer, D., Jamieson, K. H., & Pasek, J. (2009). Building social capital in young people: The role of mass media and life outlook. *Political Communication*, *26*(1), 65-83.

Rosen, J., & Merritt, Jr., D. (1994). *Public journalism: Theory and practice*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Ruef, M., & Kwon, S. W. (2016). Neighborhood associations and social capital. *Social Forces*, *95*(1), 159-190.

Ryan, M., & Martinson, D. L. (1986). Attitudes of college newspaper advisers toward censorship of the student press. *Journalism Quarterly*, *63*(1), 55-60.

Sanders, K., Hanna, M., Berganza, M. R., & Sánchez Aranda, J. J. (2008). Becoming journalists: A comparison of the professional attitudes and values of British and Spanish journalism students. *European Journal of Communication*, *23*(2), 133-152.

Sankowska, A. (2013). Relationships between organizational trust, knowledge transfer, knowledge creation, and firm's innovativeness. *The Learning Organization*, *20*(1), 85-100.

Saul, S. (2016, December 2). Campus press vs. colleges: Kentucky suit highlights free-speech fight. *The New York Times*.

Saul, S. (2016, September 6). Campuses cautiously train freshmen against subtle insults. *The New York Times*.

Schmidt, H. C. (2015). Student Newspapers Show Opinion Article Political Bias. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *36*(1), 6-23.

Schofield Clark, L., & Monserrate, R. (2011). High school journalism and the making of young citizens. *Journalism*, *12*(4), 417-432.

Scott, D. B. (2009). *Labor's New Deal for journalism—the Newspaper Guild in the 1930s*.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of communication*, *50*(2), 93-109.

Seminar, S. (2000). *Social capital community benchmark survey*. TNS Intersearch.

Shah, D., Schmierbach, M., Hawkins, J., Espino, R., & Donavan, J. (2002). Nonrecursive models of Internet use and community engagement: Questioning whether time spent online erodes social capital. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *79*(4), 964-987.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1996). *Mediating the Message*. White Plains NY: Longman.

Singer, J. B. (2003). Who are these guys? The online challenge to the notion of journalistic professionalism. *Journalism*, *4*(2), 139-163.

Smith, S. E. (2002). Who Owns Academic Freedom: The Standard for Academic Free Speech at Public Universities. *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.*, *59*, 299.

Snyder, M. D. (2002). Academic freedom and student newspapers. *Academe*, *88*(4), 79.

Sparks, C., & Splichal, S. (1989). Journalistic education and professional socialisation: Summary of a survey study in 22 countries. Gazette: *International Journal for Communication Studies*, *43*(1), 31–52.

Spevak, J. E. (1977). Most ACEJ schools are not connected with campus papers. *The Journalism Educator*, *32*(1), 52-53.

Starck, K., & Soloski, J. (1977). Effect of reporter predisposition in covering controversial story. *Journalism Quarterly*, *54*(1), 120-125.

Stewart, P. (2004). On campus; HBCU student journalists are feeling the heat. *NABJ Journal*, *22*(1), 30.

Strentz, H., & Adams, S. (1975). Most J-Schools do not Actively Recruit Minority Students. *The Journalism Educator*, *30*(3), 3-5.

Tandoc Jr, E. C. (2014). The roles of the game: The influence of news consumption patterns on the role conceptions of journalism students. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *69*(3), 256-270.

Tandoc Jr, E. C., Hellmueller, L., & Vos, T. P. (2013). Mind the gap: Between journalistic role conception and role enactment. *Journalism Practice*, *7*(5), 539-554.

Thomas, E. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1966). The nature and history of role theory. *Role theory: Concepts and research*, 3-19.

Tichenor, P. J., Donohue, G. A., & Olien, C. N. (1980). *Community conflict and the press* (Vol. 8). Beverly Hills: Sage.

V. Shah, Nojin Kwak, R. Lance Holbert, D. (2001). "Connecting" and" disconnecting" with civic life: Patterns of Internet use and the production of social capital. *Political communication*, *18*(2), 141-162.

VanVoorhis, C. W., & Morgan, B. L. (2007). Understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *3*(2), 43-50.

Wann, D. L., Schrader, M. P., Allison, J. A., & McGeorge, K. K. (1998). The inequitable newspaper coverage of men's and women's athletics at small, medium, and large universities. J*ournal of Sport and Social Issues*, *22*(1), 79-87.

Watson, B. R. (2014). When critical voices should speak up: Patterns in news coverage of unofficial sources during the BP oil spill. *Journalism Practice*, 8(6), 842-854.

Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1992). Journalists—Who Are They, Really? *Media Studies Journal*, *6*(4), 63-80.

Weaver, D. H. and G. C. Wilhoit (1996). *The American Journalist in the 1990s: US News People at the End of an Era*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weaver, D., Drew, D., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1986). US television, radio and daily newspaper journalists. *Journalism Quarterly*, *63*(4), 683-692.

Weeks, B. E., Ardèvol-Abreu, A., & Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2017). Online influence? Social media use, opinion leadership, and political persuasion. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *29*(2), 214-239.

Weinberg, S. (1996). Can "content-providers" be investigative journalists? C*olumbia Journalism Review*, *35*(4), 36.

Wilderman, M. (2017). Budget cuts in scholastic media: A focus group study of Oklahoma journalism advisers' survival skills, presented to the AEJMC Annual Conference, Scholastic Journalism Division, Boston, Massachusetts.

Williams, D. (2006). On and off the Net: Scales for social capital in an online era. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, *11*(2), 593-628.

Wozniak, K. (2004). Assessing the Level of Administrative Censorship and Control in Student Newspapers in Ontario. *The McMaster Journal of Communication*, *1*, 5-23.

Zempter, C. (2017). Creating Journalistic Identity: An Ethnography of a College Newsroom. Paper presented to the Scholastic Journalism Division of the Association for Education in

Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Conference, Chicago, Ill., August 9, 2017.

Zoorob, M. J., & Salemi, J. L. (2017). Bowling alone, dying together: the role of social capital in mitigating the drug overdose epidemic in the United States. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, *173*, 1-9.

Zúñiga, H. D., Diehl, T., & Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2018). When citizens and journalists interact on Twitter. *Journalism Studies*, *19*(2), 227-246.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY

Publication characteristics

1. Does your newspaper produce a print publication?

2. (IF YES) How often does your newspaper publish in print?

    a. Daily

    b. Four times a week

    c. Three times a week

    d. Twice a week

    e. Weekly

    f. Bi-Weekly (every other week)

    g. Other

3. What day(s) does it publish? (select all that apply)?

    a. Sunday

    b. Monday

    c. Tuesday

    d. Wednesday

    e. Thursday

    f. Friday

    g. Saturday

4. (IF YES to #1) How much of the newspaper's online content also appears in the print

    issue?

Campus level social capital

Campus social trust

Please answer the following questions, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

Generally speaking, would you say that:

1. People on your campus can be trusted?

2. People on your campus try to take advantage of you if they get the chance?

3. People on your campus try to be fair?

4. You can't be too careful in dealing with people on your campus?

5. People on your campus try to be helpful?

6. People on your campus are just looking out for themselves?

Community level social capital (municipal community)

Community social trust

Please answer the following questions, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

Generally speaking, would you say that:

1. People in your city or town can be trusted?

2. People in your city or town try to take advantage of you if they get the chance?

3. People in your city or town try to be fair?

4. You can't be too careful in dealing with people in your city or town?

5. People in your city or town try to be helpful?

6. People in your city or town are just looking out for themselves?

Neighborhood association (measures of social capital as trust)

Please respond to the following statements, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

Generally speaking, would you say that:

7. I can trust people in the community area near my campus.

8. I talk to or visit with my immediate neighbors in the community every day.

9. I can work with others to get people in the community around our campus to work together to fix or improve something.

10. I and people like me can have a big impact in making our community a better place to live.

Newsroom social capital

Newsroom social trust

Please answer the following questions, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

Generally speaking, would you say that:

1. People in your campus news organization can be trusted?

2. People in your campus news organization try to take advantage of you if they get the chance?

3. People in your campus news organization try to be fair?

4. You can't be too careful in dealing with people in your campus news organization?

5. People in your campus news organization try to be helpful?

6. People in your campus news organization are just looking out for themselves?

Organizational association

Please respond to the following statements, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

7. I can trust my coworkers in our campus news organization.

8. I frequently talk to or visit with my coworkers in our campus news organization.

Social capital with administration

Social capital between the university's higher administration (e.g., President, Provost, Dean) and the newsroom (both adviser and student editor respond)

Please answer the following questions, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree":

Generally speaking, would you say that:

1. People in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) can be trusted?

2. People in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) try to take advantage of you if they get the chance?

3. People in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) try to be fair?

4. You can't be too careful in dealing with people in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff)?

5. People in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) try to be helpful?

6. People in your school's administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) are just looking out for themselves?

   Administrative control (additional questions related to social capital/trust with administration)

Administrative independence

1. Which of the following would you say best describes your paper's relationship to your college or university?

   Controlled by the university

   Completely independent of the university

   Supported by the university, but not controlled by it

Administrative control

Please respond to the following statements, where 1 is "Yes" and 0 is "No."

1. The administration of our college or university (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) is very influential on the newspaper's operation.

2. During the past year, the administration of our college or university (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) has requested the newspaper not publish a story or photograph, or not to report on an issue.

3. During the last year, our newspaper has complied with a request from administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) not to publish a story or photograph, or not to report on an issue.

4. During the last year, the administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) of our college or university has requested the newspaper publish a story or photograph, or to report on an issue.

5. During the last year, our newspaper has complied with a request from administration (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) to publish a story or photograph, or to report on an issue.

6. I have personally been threatened with job dismissal because our newspaper ran — or considered running — a news story administrators (for example, the President of the university and the President's staff) said they did not want printed.

Newsroom turnover

Please respond to the following statements, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 7 is "Strongly Agree."

1. Staff turnover is common at our student media organization.

2. The amount of turnover in our student media organization has caused a problem for the way we do journalism.

Journalist role conceptions

In your opinion, how important is it for student media to perform the following functions?

Interpreter

1. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Investigate claims and statements made by the government

   Investigate claims and statements made by the university administration

2. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Provide analysis and interpretation of complex problems

3. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Discuss policy while it is still being developed

   Disseminator

4. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Get information to the public as quickly as possible

5. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Concentrate on news which is of interest to the widest possible public

6. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Stay away from stories where the factual content cannot be verified

   Adversary

7. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Serve as adversary of government

   Serve as adversary of university administration

8. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Serve as adversary of business

   Populist mobilizer

9. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

   Set the political agenda

10. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

    Let people express views

11. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

Develop intellectual and cultural interests of the public

12. 12. 1=Extremely important, 5=Not at all important

Provide entertainment and relaxation

<u>Demographic questions</u>

Paper name:

University:

Students only

What is your major?

What is your year in school?

- Freshman

- Sophomore

- Junior

- Senior

- Graduate student

- Other (please specify)

How many years you been on staff at the campus newspaper?

- _____ (number of years entered)

How long have you been in your current role with the campus newspaper?

- _____ (number of years entered)

For advisers only

How much experience do you have as an adviser (in your current role and at other

campuses)?

- _____ (number of years entered)

What is your age in years?

- _____

What is your gender?

- Male

- Female

- Other (Please specify) _____

- Prefer not to answer

Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin?

- No

- Yes

How would you describe your race or ethnicity?

- White

- Black or African-American

- American Indian or Alaskan Native

- Asian

- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander

- Multiple

- Other (please specify) _____

APPENDIX B: CONTENT ANALYSIS CODEBOOK

Instructions: For each story, click the link either to the printed newspaper in which the story is contained, or to the text of the story online. Do not attempt a "too close" reading of the story; instead, read the headline and the first few paragraphs to answer the questions below. Do not spend more than 3-4 minutes on one article. As much as possible, code the stories in an environment as free from distractions as possible, since distractions will make processing these articles more difficult and consume more time. Code no more than 10 articles in one sitting. Feel free to note any questions you might have.

VARIABLES

SOURCE

Definition: Designates the outlet in which the news story was published.

Procedure: Each newspaper within the dataset will be assigned a number.

Newspapers

1. American University
2. Anoka-Ramsey Community College
3. Appalachian State Univ.
4. Auburn University
5. Baylor University
6. Biola University
7. Bowling Green State University

8. Bradley University

9. Cal State Fullerton

10. Clackamas Community College

11. Columbus State University

12. CUNY John Jay College of Criminal Justice

13. Del Mar College

14. Doane University

15. East Tennessee State University

16. Eastern Illinois University

17. Elmhurst College

18. Emporia State University

19. Fayetteville State University

20. Ferris State University

21. Florida Atlantic University

22. Florida International University

23. Florida Southern College

24. Fox Valley Technical College

25. Gannon University

26. Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus

27. Georgia Southern University

28. Georgia State University

29. Harding University

30. Henderson

31. Henderson State

32. Illinois Institute of Technology

33. Indiana University

34. Indiana University Southeast

35. Iowa State University

36. Kansas State University

37. Keene State College

38. Kennesaw State University

39. Kent State University

40. Knox College

41. Lawrence University

42. Louisiana Technical University

43. Loyola University New Orleans

44. Marshall University

45. Metropolitan State University of Denver

46. Michigan State University

47. Michigan Technological University

48. Middle Tennessee State University

49. Missouri State University

50. Missouri Western State University

51. Northern Illinois University

52. Northern Kentucky University

53. Northern Michigan University

54. Northwest Arkansas Community College

55. Northwest Missouri State University

56. Northwestern Oklahoma State University

57. Occidental College

58. Ohio University

59. Oregon State University

60. Peninsula College

61. Piedmont College

62. Rice University

63. Saint Joseph's University

64. Saint Louis University

65. San Diego State University

66. Savannah College of Art and Design

67. Seattle University

68. Sewanee: The University of the South

69. South Dakota State University

70. Southeastern Louisiana University

71. Southern Adventist University

72. Southern Illinois University

73. Stetson University

74. Stony Brook University

75. SUNY at Albany

76. Texas State University

77. Texas Tech University

78. Texas Wesleyan University

79. Texas A&M University

80. The University of Alabama

81. The University of Texas at Arlington

82. The University of Texas at El Paso

83. University of Alabama at Birmingham

84. University of Alaska Anchorage

85. University of Arizona

86. University of Dayton

87. University of Idaho

88. University of Kentucky

89. University of Miami

90. University of Minnesota

91. University of Nebraska at Omaha

92. University of New Haven

93. University of North Alabama

94. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

95. University of North Carolina at Charlotte

96. University of North Carolina Wilmington

97. University of North Florida

98. University of North Georgia

99. University of North Texas

100.   University of South Alabama

101.   University of South Dakota

102.   University of Vermont

103.   University of Wisconsin-Madison

104.   University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

105.   Virginia Commonwealth University

106.   Virginia Wesleyan University

107.   Washington College

108.   Weber State University

109.   Western Illinois University

110.   Western Kentucky University

111.   Western Michigan University

112.   Western New England University

113.   Wichita State University

114.   Wright State University

115.   Youngstown State University

CONFLICT REPORTING

Definition: This variable designates the presence or absence of conflict-oriented reporting in the story.

Procedure: Read through each story in the sample and answer the following questions about the content therein. If the answer to the question is "yes," check the box on the spreadsheet, which will code the story "1." If the answer to the question is "no," leave the box blank (coding the story "0"). If you're not sure, code it "0" (or "no").

Q1 - Does the news story reflect disagreement between parties/individuals/groups/countries?   (conflict)

Explanation: "Disagreement" means the state of being at variance. A news story that reflects disagreement is one in which divergent points of view are expressed by the subjects of the story regarding the topic of the story.

Example: Student government argues over how to spend money; The university denies accusations of discrimination; Students protest a guest speaker on campus.

Q2 - Does one party/individual/group/country reproach another?   (human interest)

Explanation: "Reproach" refers to any expression of disapproval.

Example: University vice president condemns the city's police force; Professors complain about the administration's policy regarding permits.

Q3 - Does the story refer to two sides or to more than two sides of the problem/issue?

Explanation: Any story in which an issue is discussed from more than one point of view. This will typically involve multiple people being quoted in the story (note: multiple sources can express the same viewpoint, so read carefully to be sure the quotes reflect disagreement.)

Example: Students discuss differing opinions about abortion; Students and administrators clash over parking

Q4 - Does the story *emphasize* the achievements and/or actions of an individual/party versus the achievements and/or actions of another individual/party?

Explanation: "Achievement" is anything done successfully; "action" refers to anything done to achieve an aim. This item asks whether special prominence is given to the comparison of a success or accomplishment against the similar success or accomplishment either at another place or time. The key term for this question is *emphasize*. That is, if the actions of an individual or party vs. that of another shows up in the lead or the 2nd paragraph, then code it 1 (or "yes").

Example: Enrollment increases at one university vs. enrollment at other universities; Financial situations at the university under President X vs. under President Y.

Q5 - Does the article report the event in terms of the consequences/effects it will have on an individual or group institution?

Explanation: "Consequence" refers to the result or effect (usually negative) of an action or condition. This item refers to a story in which the long-term

effects of an action or achievement are given prominence in a news story. In this case it will refer to *specific* consequences or effects (e.g., a drop in enrollment, construction that results in flooding, etc.).

Example: The university suffers after a prominent alumnus alleges assault during their college experience; Planned new housing units are put on hold, attributed as a consequence of declining enrollment.

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING

Definition: This variable designates the presence or absence of investigative reporting.

Procedure: Read through each story in the sample and answer the following questions after thorough reading. If the answer to the question is "yes," check the appropriate box (which will (code the story "1"). If the answer is "no," leave the box blank (coding the story "0").

Q6 - Is the target (or subject) of the story a public figure and/or a person or group in a position of power (can be collective)?

Explanation: "Target" refers to the primary focus of the story, or subject of the story. This item refers to any story that makes an administration official, government official, protest leader, athlete, coach, leader of a student group, celebrity, or professor, the primary focus of their story.

Example: Professor under investigation; Athletic program accused of covering up crime; Greek system discriminates.

Q7 - Is the information revealed about that target in the public interest?

Explanation: If information is in "the public interest," the information would be of common concern among citizens and likely relate to the management

and affairs of government or administration. This item refers to a news story

which addresses the community's concern. Information that is only of interest

to a single individual or group is not likely to be of public interest.

Example: Corruption in the parking situation; University sued for lack of

handicap accessibility.

Q8 - Did the journalist seek to pursue the issue beyond allegation and denial?

Explanation: This item addresses the depth of the story, and whether the

reporter shared information beyond simply interviewing opposing sides. The

question is whether there *is* an allegation, which would answer whether

there's an allegation and denial. If there's no allegation, then code it 0 (or

"no").

Example: Records and statistics to verify statements made; observations from

uninvolved experts who share perspective on a story.

Q9 - Does the story reveal new information and/or bring together information

that is already in the public domain in a way that is revelatory?

Explanation: This item refers to what extent public records are used to address

the community concerns, beyond the interviews with sources.

Example: Appointment list for a local political office; University budget's

numbers detailing spending for the coming year; Cell phone records of a

student government official.

Q10 - Does the story alert the reader to systemic failures and/or point out where

society is failing/or falling short of purported standards?

Explanation: This item refers to any story in which the journalist refers to a larger narrative and larger system that is at issue (administrative, governmental, social) beyond the isolated local issue at hand.

Example: Former athlete with CTE kills self in apartment, and story mentions larger problem with brain injury in football; Hispanic freshman is victim of racism on campus, and story mentions larger systemic problem of racism against Hispanics); Graduate arrested for trafficking Fentanyl, and story mentions larger opioid epidemic).

APPENDIX C – IRB APPROVAL LETT

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA® | Office of the Vice President for
Research & Economic Development
Office for Research Compliance

September 28, 2018

William Heath
CCIS
Box 870172

Re: IRB#: 18-OR-358 "Conflict on Campus: Examining Multiple Levels of Influence on Investigative Journalism in Student Newspapers"

Dear William Heath:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Your application will expire on September 27, 2019. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent form to provide to your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,