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The study was done at the end of a three-year search for a suitable subject. Two factors were controlling in the writer's choice. One, the subject need be productive when analyzed descriptively with a certain degree of subjectivity, for the writer was not equipped by training or interest to employ a sophisticated quantitative methodology. Two, the work had better combine politics and communications—specifically newspaper journalism—as the writer believed his special knowledge of the print medium might allow him to make an original contribution of substance to the literature.

Over the three years the student submitted a flurry of briefs suggesting subjects to his (various) chairmen and other advisers. All proposals were knocked down, usually because their too-broad scope and amorphous concepts made them physically, geographically, or financially unmanageable. Operationalization of others of more modest sweep was shown by experienced hands to be impossible.

In 1973, Professor B. James Kweeder, then of the political science faculty of The Ohio State University, wrote to the student that he had "long been interested in what kind of people report political news. Every once in a while I come across some intriguing bit of information like the
fact that one of our most respected political analysts began his career as a sports writer. Well, what kinds of background, education, work experiences, interests do political reporters bring to their work?"

From this kernel came the study here offered. The approach was shaped through the knowledge and skill of the writer's chairman Professor C. Richard Hofstetter, whose concern and innumerable kindnesses reached well beyond the call of duty. The writer himself was "shaped" into action by the thoughtful promptings and into persevering by a few quarterdeck stimulations applied by the brilliant Professor Francis R. Aumann, now emeritus. In the beginning, in the mid-1960s, when the writer was a political science dabbler taking a course here and a course there, his enthusiasm was aroused by Professor E. Allen Helms, now emeritus, and by a course in scope and methods of the discipline taught by Professor Lawrence J. R. Herson, now a member of the writer's committee. Further inspiration was provided along the way by Professor Thomas R. Flinn, then a member of The Ohio State University political science faculty. Thanks must also go to Professor Donald Van Meter, third member of the writer's committee.

Two others earned the gratitude of the writer. They are Hazel Gaudet (Mrs. Graham Erskine), social psychologist and friend who died in 1975, and Dr. Sara Lehrman of Pittsburgh. He is greatly in debt, of course, to the forty-eight members
of the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association who gave their valuable time and allowed with more or less good grace their secret recesses to be probed.

To all others who helped and who now suffer an ingrate's forgetfulness, thanks and excuse me.
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INTRODUCTION

Clash of Interests
Stress in the National System

Conflict, "The essence of politics," has grown increasingly bitter between two major sets of actors within the political system—politicians and newspaper journalists—perhaps reaching a historic extreme in the Agnew and Watergate affairs. The antagonism is not a new one. American politicians from the birth of the republic have been strained by printers ink. The Union's first newspapers were unabashed promoters of their proprietors' interests and opinions. That role usually being their only raison d'etre. Any citizen with a few dollars could publish his thoughts as a broadside, pamphlet, or book, and those residents of the new land likely to have a few dollars also were likely to be the only individuals active in political affairs. Literacy and property-ownership qualifications restricted the voting element to about six percent of the population.

Early editors, wrote V. O. Key, Jr., "Were assimilated into the governing system through subsidies from party leaders and through the patronage of public printing." Their partisan opinions "permeated the entire content of the press..." Gleefully the partisan press overstated
the virtues of their friends and the flaws of their enemies. Opponents of George Washington rejoiced at seeing the Father of his Country flayed in print by the anti-Federalist press, just as Copperheads seventy years later glowed over the likening of Abraham Lincoln to every kind of loathsome creature that did and did not exist. Lincoln was "assassinated" by the newspapers long before the evening at Ford's Theatre, was accused of drunkenness, of taking his pay in gold because he lacked faith in the Union currency, and was even called a traitor. Woodrow Wilson wrote decades later about the "shameless and colossal" lying of the press.

A notorious but by no means uniquely self-serving role was played by early newspapers in the economic sphere as well.

Working on the railroad appears to have been a relatively profitable practice for Nevada newspapers...

Ostrander writes.

When the Central Pacific government debt was under discussion in Congress in 1876, Huntington pointed out to Hopkins that 'it would help us very much if the press of California, Nevada and Utah would come out and advocate the government taking the lands back...I think you better pay $500,000 to the press than not to have such aid.'

It was not until the Twentieth Century that some United States newspapers appeared as quasi representatives of the public at large rather than of parties, factions, or of private interests and points of view. A code was adopted in 1923 by the American Society of Newspaper Editors that
mentioned perhaps for the first time such concepts as fair play, impartiality, sincerity, truthfulness, and accuracy. The Commission on Freedom of the Press, organized in 1942, studied the problems of bias, incompleteness, untruthfulness, and other failings, and in its 1947 report stressed its belief that freedom of the press was guaranteed by law so that all shadings of thought and opinion could reach the public. A press that stifles any serious opinion, however opposed to its own, abuses the right given by law. Freedom of the press was decreed as a right of the public, not as an exclusive right for the business interests owning newspapers; the writers of the First Amendment did not intend to establish a privileged industry. A cure for the failings of the press cannot be forced by law, the committee said; only the press itself can correct the abuses. At least one member of the Commission—William E. Hocking, Harvard emeritus professor of philosophy—expressed doubt about the working of this self-righting theory and warned:

The press must know that its faults and errors have ceased to be private vagaries and have become public dangers. Its inadequacies menace the balance of public opinion. It has lost the common and ancient human liberty to be deficient in its function or to offer half-truth for the whole...There is a point beyond which failure to realize the moral right will entail encroachment by the state upon the existing legal right.

More than thirty years later, in 1973, the Society of Professional Journalists/Sigma Delta Chi adopted a Code of Ethics that attempted to define by use of examples the
terms responsibility, ethics, accuracy, objectivity, and fair play. Many editors, however, agree that absolute objectivity in reporting is impossible of achieving, although thoughtful editors attempted it and many attained a degree of fairness through careful attribution of words likely to damage those referred to, and by seeking statements for simultaneous publication from those about whom disparagement was to be published.

Libel laws imposed restrictions from the outside upon the press. But most of the teeth in state libel laws were blunted in the 1960s by opinions of the United States Supreme Court. In New York Times v Sullivan the Court ruled that a public official may not recover unless he proved that the offensive words were published even though the newspaper knew them to be untrue, or that no reasonable effort was made to discover the truth. The difficulty facing a plaintiff in proving this kind of malice is self evident. Arnold M. Rose wrote that Senator George McGovern of South Dakota received a public apology from a man who libeled him before the New York Times decision was rendered.

He probably could not have won his suit after that decision, because he would then have had to prove malice, and defeat in the court would probably have resulted in defeat for re-election...Senator Thomas Kuchel of California was falsely accused of homosexuality in a publication...He sued for libel before the recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and the defendant found his case so strong that he made a public retraction and apology. If Senator Kuchel had sued after the 1964-67 series of Supreme Court decisions, his case would probably have been hopeless...
Following *Times v Sullivan*, perhaps the best known case of defamation of a public official in print was syndicated newspaper columnist Jack Anderson's "revelations" of alleged drunken driving arrests of Senator Thomas F. Eagleton, then the vice presidential running mate of Senator McGovern. When proved wrong, Anderson admitted the error, citing the pressure of deadlines, but in an incomprehensible example of intellectual dishonesty refused to retract the erroneous statements when face to face with his victim on a television program. Although Anderson's untruths helped to force Eagleton from the Democratic party's presidential ticket, Eagleton did not bother to sue. Presumably Anderson, although admitting his published accusations were false, could have shown some sort of record of having tried to verify his information, and such an attempt under *Times v Sullivan* was a defense against which Eagleton could not have prevailed.

In *Walker v Associated Press*, and *Curtis Publishing Co. v Butts*, vulnerability was extended beyond public officials to "public figures" involved in controversial events. Almost anyone mentioned in a newspaper report can be said to be controversial in some way. Indeed, in *Rosenbloom v Metromedia, Inc.*, the Supreme Court came close to stating just such a dictum. Its opinion was that although Rosenbloom was a public figure neither before nor after the precise moment of the alleged libel, he was just such a figure at the time of the alleged libel and therefore the burden of
proving actual malice as defined by the Court fell to him. He could not so prove, and was therefore a loser. A year before the Rosenbloom case reached the Court, its opinion in Greenbelt Co-op Publishing Association v Bresler, had already pronounced that an individual's involvement in a controversy brought before the public made of him a "public figure." Perhaps ironically, at least two newspapermen have been thwarted by the public figure concept. Drew Pearson and William F. Buckley, Jr., lost libel suits to the rule. There was a relaxation of the Court's stringent rulings in 1974, but there seemed to be little here to soothe the politician and other true public figures. In Gertz v Robert Welch, Inc., the Court ruled that private individuals who are neither public officials nor public figures--although caught up in controversy of public interest--may recover for libel by showing negligence and actual provable damages instead of the "actual malice" as defined in Sullivan. In 1976 the Court denied Time magazine protection of the "actual malice" cloak and found that the publication had libeled Mary Alice Sullivan Firestone in reporting her divorce proceedings. The Court's conclusions, the Wall Street Journal reported, "suggests that in future cases the Court will continue to refine its definition of the individuals who come within the public-figure category." Politicians, office holders, and public officials, however, seem to remain fair game. Because of this, Morris L. Ernst
writes, newspapers themselves are failing the cause of freedom of the press (echoes of the 1942 Commission) and society is "encouraging total irresponsibility of reporting about government officials and other citizens who are involved in the great arenas of public discussion and controversy." 26

As Rose phrased it: "The possibilities of damage to the American political system...are enormous." 27

Public officials stung by the press grumbled, some struck back on a personal level, 28 but most took it in silence, grinning feebly so that the public could see that they were good sports. Since the Goldwater campaign of 1964, however, newspaper people sporadically had experienced a concerted counterattack. The fake grin disappeared from the faces of many national politicians and the Republican candidates attacked the press as being part of the "liberal Eastern establishment" and, thereby, somehow unamerican. That charge has become a cuss word familiarly applied to almost any newspaper, even the most illiberal, non-Eastern, unestablishment ones. In 1966, the American Bar Association adopted the Reardon Report, 29 which recommended that severe limitations be put upon the kinds of information about criminal cases given to the press by attorneys, police, and judicial employees, and that the press be excluded from certain judicial hearings, in order to "insure the preservation of the right to a fair trial." 30 The free press-fair trial battle still
rages, with newspapers being barred from proceedings, suing, winning some and losing some.

During the first Nixon Administration, Vice President Agnew undertook what appeared to be a programmed counter-attack against the "nattering nabobs of negativism," the scored liberal press. In 1971, for the first time in history, an American administration went to court in an attempt to justify prior restraint, having forbidden further publication of the Ellsberg papers.31 Blows by Agnew and others of the administration continued to fall during the second Nixon tenure--Professor John Tebbel called it "the Nixonian war against the press"32--despite the fact that fewer than 30 of the country's some 1,700 daily newspapers had supported Nixon's opponent in 1972 and could thus be presumed to be anti-Nixon.

Tormented by certain members of the press as they revealed the machinations of the Nixon reelection campaign and the details of the Agnew and Watergate scandals, Nixon in a televised national address of October 26, 1973, declared: "I have never heard or seen such outrageous, vicious, distorted reporting in the 27 years of public life."33 Many listeners were reminded then of Nixon's "farewell address" in 1962 when, after failing in his campaign for the California governorship, he flailed the newspapers and told a gathering of newspeople that "you won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more." Some listeners to the televised 1973
address assumed Nixon was referring exclusively to television news reporters. Few if any of the Watergate, reelection, and Agnew news breaks were scored by television news organizations, yet because of the ubiquity of television, that medium seemed to many to have been singled out by the President.

"A lot of peple," wrote Hazel Gaudet Erskine, "get their main news from TV rather than the papers, so what the Washington Post and NYT [New York Times] dig out painfully, the networks get credit for."34

Stress in the State System

Paul H. Weaver writes that the press-public official controversy is based in the power of the media, which in turn is based in the facts that the media select what information is to be published or broadcast, define the terms of public issues, and establish the priorities of public discussion.35

"Since few citizens ever have much immediate experience in politics," Dahl writes, "most of what they perceive about politics is filtered through the mass media...Control over the contents of the mass media is thus a political resource of great potential importance."36

Antagonism between public officials and the press is not confined to the national level. It is vigorously prosecuted on the state and local levels where newspapers may still be the influentially dominant medium, reaching society's middle group among which opinion leaders are often found.
Deutsch writes that in an analysis of power, one must look "for the crucial middle-level group—or rather upper-middle-level group—without whose cooperation or consent very little can be done in the decision system." There is a discrepancy, Deutsch writes, "between a leader's newspaper strength at the "decisive middle level," and his strength at the grass roots, because the "strategic middle level...above the mass...intervenes between it and the higher levels." Newspaper readership corresponds with political activism in that both are found concentrated among citizens of the higher social strata. In Truman's group theory, his catch-all unorganized interests obtain influence through "the quality and character of the mass media..."

In discussing the state legislator, Edward A. Shils wrote: "Whoever blocks him is his enemy." Newspaper statehouse reporters often fall into the enemy ranks. More than a few newspaper people were arrested or called before grand juries during the 1970s. Some were charged as accessories to crimes reputedly committed by their news sources, while others were jailed for contempt after refusing to identify their sources to grand juries. The number of these instances seemed to increase during the past few years.

"The influence of the local press extends both to the voter and to the public officials," wrote George S. Blair. "The fear of adverse publicity in the local press is one of the factors that keep public officials toeing the mark in
the performance of their duties." One of the most astute politicians the writer has known once told him, "The second question I ask when a new proposal that sounds like a good one is brought up is 'What will the papers say?'" (His first question, he admitted, is "What will it do for my position?" Translation: "What's in it for me?") In the view of one writer, the policies of John Lindsay when he was mayor of New York were shaped by "How will it play in the New York Times?" The author continued: "In this media age, most reporters have more power over public policy than the average member of the City Council or state legislature. Mayors and governors at least return our [journalists] phone calls."42

"In every state, the news media becomes important participants in the political system" according to Jacob and Vines.43 "Newspapers have no mandate to represent a constituency, but they often take positions on controversial matters. Together with radio and television, the press provides a communications channel through which groups of politically interested persons signal each other and communicate with the general public." The authors note that in some states only a single view may be presented by the press, as formerly in much of the south on racial matters. "When the press plays the role of censor in the political process, it isolates other participants in the political process; when the press facilitates communications and debate, it
promotes the entry of others into the political arena." Edward C. Banfield credits the newspaper with the ability to "create a sense of community, a conception of the common good, and an agenda for public-spirited action." In Iowa, the Boyington study found that support for legislative action was disproportionately in the top social strata where individuals have knowledge of legislative affairs. "For some individuals," The American Voter states, "the political content of newspapers and magazines and of radio and television is a principal means of relating to politics." Dye agrees with Weaver that the "influence of the press arises from its power to decide what is 'news,' thereby focusing public attention on the events and issues that are of interest to the press." He adds that newspapers are "more influential among middle class populations than among working class, ethnic, or Negro populations. This is a product of differences in reading habits and educational levels between [sic] these groups." Vidich and Bensman conclude that "a uniformity of experience [is] created by the press and other communications media." Former Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio is quoted as stating that if the press "gives support to the views of the governor as distinguished from supporting the views of the legislature, those views are more likely to be adopted." "Newspapermen" are "very important," "very powerful," said former Governor John Bricker in the same study.
It is the present writer's belief that newspapers probably are more than a mere connective mechanism and "structural regulator" among the public, the groups, the politicians and other demand and response elements of the environment and the process in the political system, although they would be important enough if they were only that. Newspapers make their own input into both the environment and the process, if only by maintaining community biases—"...reinforcing widely accepted norms of public morality..." is the way Truman phrases it—and if only because political actors perceive newspapers as important in the political culture.

Yet in the relatively few books about the state legislature, "that neglected institution, given little attention by political scientists," and others on state and local politics, a student often searches in vain through their indices for references to "press," "media," "newspapers," "communications," "mass media," "reporters," and even "information." Rarer still, it seems, is mention of "communicator," the person who transmits much of the public affairs information that reaches citizens of influence and who is himself--purposely or willy-nilly--a primary actor in the political process. In Dye's Politics in States and Communities, for example, there are only four sentences that mention the press, only two mentions of "newspapers" in the index, none at all of "public opinion," "media," "mass media," "communications," or "mass communications." James Q. Wilson, in his study of
Los Angeles and Manhattan reformist groups, virtually ignores the press, yet it is a prime means of disseminating information to and from people of the types Wilson found among membership of the clubs--college graduates and higher, in professional occupations. One would wager that Wilson's clubs of amateurs who assaulted with some success the political status quo surely used the newspapers. It would not be rash to state that no such success could be achieved by "amateurs" without using the newspapers as one mechanism for transmitting their demands of the system into the process.

No mention of newspapers, communications, reporters, opinion, press, public opinion is to be found in Barnes' and Noble's *State and Local Government* of the College Outline Series. Newspapers, press, public opinion are not listed in the index of *Lobbying: Interaction and Influence in American State Legislatures*. Perhaps the importance of the print medium in politics is a truism, but one would wish that analysts of the system would at least toss their readers an aside to signal their awareness of that importance. Lord Russell has written that "It is easy to make out a case for the view that opinion is omnipotent, and that all other forms of power are derived from it." Russell's "other forms" are no less than armies, law, economics, institutions, religion, and government. The words "communications," "journalism" and "newspapers" appear nowhere in the

Opinion— and the communicator— if often overlooked in the discipline's literature, are not however so ignored by the state level politician. In recent actions, some have attempted to deliver tit-for-tat to the gadflies of the press. Alabama adopted a law in 1973 that required newsmen to disclose their sources of income before they may be allowed to cover the legislature. The Florida Supreme Court in 1973 upheld 1913 legislation that required newspapers to give equal space for replies by candidates for political office who were adversely criticized by the newspapers. United States Senator John L. McClelland of Arkansas said in 1974 that Congress should consider adopting such a law. "Court decisions making it difficult for public figures to sue successfully for libel heighten the 'urgent' need for such a law," he [McClelland] said. Even if these statutes eventually are declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court— as was the 61-year-old Florida statute by the Court in 1974— they stand as evidence of the conflict. In 1973 a bill was introduced into the Ohio general assembly that would bar newsmen from statehouse press facilities unless they pass an examination on state financial matters. "Statehouse reporters can mislead the entire public," said Rep. Robert E. Netzley, Republican from Laura who submitted the bill. It was not adopted. "Right-
to-reply" bills like the Florida one were introduced in 1974 in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Vermont and perhaps other legislatures, but were killed. Despite the failures, a warning had been issued to the press. Local ordinances have been passed in several communities prohibiting placement of newspaper sales racks on city sidewalks, ostensibly as anti-clutter moves, in effect, however, anti-newspaper responses. At the May, 1976 annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the organization's "freedom of information press-bar committee" reported twice as many court-ordered closings to the press of records or proceedings during 1975 as during 1974, and an increased use of subpoenas in the attempt to obtain identification of their sources from newspaper people. It is not likely that the conflict on this front will abate soon.

The press' vigorous offensive against state political officialdom--especially the push for full disclosure of personal and financial matters by public authorities--has been thrust back upon itself. Farris Bryant, a former governor of Florida, asked in a 1973 public address: "Who Is The Press?"

"I know who the public office holders are," Bryant said. They are entitled to no secrets, and usually at the end of the campaign have none. But who is the press? A story is published about an abortion. Through whose eyes do I see the event? Is the reporter a Baptist, a Catholic, or an atheist?...Is he a man or a woman? That makes a difference. A story is written about Watergate
or Chappaquiddick. Tell me who wrote it. Is he from Boston or California? Is he a Democrat or a Republican? Is he a Catholic, a Quaker, a Mormon? Another story is written about labor-management confrontation. Is the reporter a union member or a free-lance writer? Is he well paid, or poorly paid? Is he a college graduate, or self-educated? Is he from the North or the South?

What do you have to do to become a reporter? I know what you must do to become a plumber, a taxi driver, a doctor, or a contractor. To be a reporter all you have to be is hired, that's all. What do you do to keep your job? Please the boss, that's all? The public does not have a right to say who shall be a reporter, nor what he shall report. But we do have the right to know who reports the news.61

Easton would recognize the answers to Bryant's belligerent but yet rather plaintive questions as important in an analysis of a political system, for by extension he places newspaper correspondents among the "gatekeepers," the "structural regulators of the volume of demands" that exercise "an important measure of control over the number of demands put into the system." Easton identifies his gatekeepers as interest groups, parties, opinion leaders and the mass media. "...the volume of variety of demands that initially get into the system" Easton writes, "and begin to move along toward the point of output (the authorities) will depend upon the characteristics of these gatekeepers."62 (Emphasis added.)

This study would ask with Gov. Bryant, "Who is the press?" Specifically, it would ask, "Who are the statehouse correspondents who cover a state capital?" Further, it
would probe the role self-perception of the political reporters, in effect asking also, "Who do they *think* they are?"
The method would be the personal interview, standardized by use of a questionnaire of two hundred and one questions, plus seven lists of agree-disagree statements numbering all together one hundred and ten. Data to be elicited would envelope demography; job history; work styles, including attitude toward politicians and relationships with them; life styles; role perception, the chief interest being advocacy-neutralism; professionalism and ethics; socialization; political participation. There would be no cross-correlation of factors attempted, but rather a straightforward presentation of data and the conclusions they themselves present, interwoven with subjectively drawn judgments arrived at by "trying to make sense out of the experience" through "reflection and distance," and a fairly well developed ability to detect overtones vibrating in the newspaper milieu.

The Population

"As any specialist in sampling will confirm, the absolute size of a sample is less important than its representativeness." Greenstein made this observation in a discussion of random sampling and not of the examination of an elite such as would be conducted in the present study. Greenstein's statement directs attention, however, to the
quality of representativeness, an essential ingredient if we expect to retain validity in generalizing our conclusions, when attempting to project them beyond the sample under observation. Fortunately for this study, the proximate state was Ohio, heavily industrialized yet also a leading agricultural state, one whose "pattern of life," writes Francis R. Aumann, "is so representative of the nation as a whole that it often is used to test attitudes, ideas, and programs in education, politics, and industry." Ohio is an important test marketing area for new consumer products, is "often a pivotal state in national politics," and has been at times "...the mirror of the...nation as a whole." Some have argued that Ohio may be a fair microcosm of American political, social, and economic cultures. We will not here support this argument but we do believe that we can test in the Ohio environment several research hypotheses. We begin with five basic roles that newspaper people often play (see Chapter 1) and posit that the stories covered, the presentation they are given--the slant, if you will--by each correspondent depend to a great degree on the self assigned role he has assumed, e.g., if he is a reporter, he will offer balanced accounts of the leading stories of the day; if he is a critic, he will ever be assessing the performance of government; and choosing as his subjects that material in the news that best lends itself, opens itself, to his criticism. Does this matter? Yes, because the
correspondent's copy begins the flow of information that opinion leaders obtain about their government's activities; and because the decision makers, the politicians themselves recognize the print medium as an agenda scheduler, a priority setter for these important powers among their constituents.

Ohio's some 450 weekly and daily newspapers run the spectrum of opinion orientation from liberal to arch-conservative, and journalistically range from the very good to the very poor. The print medium correspondents, those working newspaper persons and those working for wire service and groups—who report the affairs of the Ohio legislature, of the state executive and judicial branches for the several hundred newspapers that publish capital news from Columbus—are members of the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association. By joint resolution of the statehouse and senate at the beginning of each session, the Association is empowered to certify those persons to whom floor privileges are to be extended. The Association was formed in 1893 as a reform movement, led by legitimate legislative correspondents, to withdraw floor privileges from lobbyists and "free-lance writers" who produced "news letters," taking pay from lobbyists and legislators for favorable mention and "overrunning the chambers." "Ohio was run by lobbyists then, almost solely by the railroads. Out on Broad Street the railroads had the most luxurious whorehouse in the Midwest, with the finest dining room and wine cellar in town. The place was filled
up almost every night with the leaders of state. Everything was free for the taking.”

The Association occupies a twenty-by forty-foot room off a corridor a few yards from the house chamber. It is supplied to the Association rent free by the legislature. All the other states also provide such a room for use by the press. The salaries of two full-time clerks, their supplies, the Press Room furniture, and a copying machine are also supplied by the Ohio legislature. In late 1974, by a three vote margin, the Association voted down a motion to refuse thereafter to accept the free facilities. Sixteen correspondents maintain permanent desks and typing stations in ranks of three or four down one side of the room. Copies of the day’s issues of the state’s largest dailies are available on a refractory table. Two pay telephones hang on a wall. During legislative sessions, phones jangle, voices call, a teletype clatters, banter echoes, feet pound, laughter rings; it is a scene very like the city room of a newspaper.

Large photographs, a dozen of them, each with bust shots of members inset into a mat, ring the room just below the ceiling. These are Association members grouped according to legislative sessions during which they served. The oldest photograph is of the charter members in 1893. Membership images for many sessions, of course, are not represented. Among the four hundred and ten faces in the photographs—many of the same faces in more than one photo—twenty-four
are of clerks. There is only one black face, that of a clerk from 1943 to 1968. A long-time clerk said that "every now and then" a black reporter would work from the Press Room on special assignment, but neither he nor officers of the Association could recall a black who had been a permanent active Association member. Only six of the photos, several of them duplicates, are of female correspondents. There was no woman full-time newspaper correspondent working from the Press Room during the eight months covered by our study. The only feminine data input into the study came from a former statehouse correspondent now in another assignment with her newspaper. Lily white, ninety-eight percent male.

The Association roster at the beginning of the 111th General Assembly in the winter of 1975 listed only two radio representatives among active members. During the session three radio correspondents, all from local Columbus stations, joined. One of them was asked why she had joined the Association and not the radio-television organization that had quarters in the capitol basement. "It's far more stimulating around newspapermen," was the reply. "The radio-TV room is always deserted." When questioned, one of the clerks said that television reporters were once being considered for membership. "About that time," he said, "an interview was set up with a legislator in the news and the TV people came in with all their cameras and lights and wires
and so much stuff the newsmen couldn't even get in a ques-
tion. They sort of disappeared after that."

On the Association roster for the 111th General Assembly
were the following newspapers and services, with the number
of active members representing each: Akron Beacon Journal,
three; Associated Press, three; Capital News Service, two;
Cincinnati Enquirer, two; Cleveland Plain Dealer, five;
Columbus Citizen Journal, three, Columbus Evening Dispatch,
five; Dayton Daily News, two; Dayton Journal Herald, one;
Electro-Media (despite name representing also eight smaller
newspapers), one; Gongwer News Service (compiling detailed
reports of all sessions, committee meetings, capitol activi-
ties for subscribers such as industries, businesses, lobby-
ists, unions, some newspapers themselves—the service staffed
by former newspaper correspondents), four; Horvitz Newspapers,
one; Scripps-Howard Broadcasting, one; Scripps-Howard Bureau
(newspapers), four; Toledo Blade, three; WNCI radio, Columbus,
one; United Press International, one; Van Wert Times Bulle-
tin, one (said by an Association officer to show up only on
opening day of each session). All active members were not
stationed in Columbus. Some former statehouse correspondents
now working on newspapers elsewhere in the state retained
their active membership so long as they wrote about politi-
cal affairs.
Interview Environment

Interviewed were twenty-nine active capital correspondents, thirteen former correspondents in other assignments in newspapering, and six retired correspondents, a total of forty-eight. These all were active OLCA members, as distinguished from associate and affiliate members. Requiring from one hour and ten minutes to three hours and a half—averaging two hours—the interviews were conducted in Columbus, Akron, Dayton, Cleveland, Toledo, and three suburban cities near Columbus. Appointments began as early as 7 a.m., and as late as 11 p.m. Sites were suburban apartments, downtown offices, newspaper cafeterias, the Press Room, desks in an empty house chamber, the curb in front of a hotel after the lobby lights and air conditioning shut off, a kitchen table overlooking Lake Erie, newspaper newsrooms, newspaper morgues, newspaper private offices, an airport waiting room, a plush big city club over a martini (for the host) luncheon, the lawn of the state capitol, hotel cafes and dining rooms and lobbies. Interruptions included crying children, querying co-workers and subordinates, mandating bosses, flowing coffee spilled down one's shirtfront, telephone calls, wailing insistence of a tornado warning as a funnel whirled by several miles away. Most interviews, however, were conducted without interruption, and only four suffered more than one intrusion.
The first interview was obtained in April, the final one in November, 1975. Those conducted with active capital correspondents took place at the best and the worst time of the year, while the legislature was in session: best because the attitudes probed were receiving daily stimuli from the session and responses lay fresh on respondents' minds; worst because the men worked upward of 15 hours on some days and spare time was a precious value not to be squandered. In addition, the corps had been "worked to death" over the preceding six months by journalism students from Ohio State University "asking the most unbelievably stupid questions you can imagine." And, further, because the newspaper people had been probed by a fellow correspondent for a graduate school project a short time before and his report was judged inaccurate, shallow, and unfair, to the rage of many who had cooperated.

This interviewer was able to obtain excellent response by introducing himself as a former newspaperman of more than twenty years experience. In order to protect against possible skewing of replies because of the interviewer's history as a newsman, he made no mention of it. Only three of those interviewed were aware of this history before they were examined. One discovered it after his interview, and was asked not to reveal it to others. So far as is known, he did not.
In introducing the questionnaire, the interviewer said:

I want to stress now and often that as an old newspaperman I have the same regard for confidentiality as you do, not to mention that scholars must also protect confidences just as rigorously. You will not be quoted by name. No statement or fact will be used in any way that will allow it to be identified as coming from you.

[Certain apparent gaps in descriptions are due to omissions caused by keeping this promise.]

I've placed a code number or letter at the top of the first page and the same code lower down. Your name is shown beside the code at the top so that when I review the results I can call you in case it is incomplete or clarification is needed. No one else will ever see your name with your code, and even I will have forgot by the time I begin tabulating the answers.

Please don't talk in detail about the questions asked with any of your colleagues who haven't yet been interviewed. There are many responses that need to be spontaneous, so they'll represent attitudes rather than thought-out opinions.

There are no right and no wrong answers. I'm asking facts about you and your thoughts. Anything you say is correct. Some answers may seem to conflict with ones you've given before. Don't worry about it. Just go ahead and give the answer that comes to mind."

The writer carried a tape recorder to the first three interviews. Each respondent, upon noting the recorder, was annoyed and asked that it not be used. Nothing of the hundred hours of questioning was recorded. The frankness of the replies surprised even the interviewer, who expected candor. Almost every correspondent gave at least one response that could put him into the bad graces of his employer, if not out on the street. Of forty-nine persons
who were asked to submit to the interview, only one refused. Now a business office executive on his newspaper, he was a former capital correspondent for the paper regarded by most of the statehouse reporters as the worst large daily in the state.

Two writers at first refused to reveal their pay. The interviewer returned to one and told him he could guess his salary and named a figure about twenty dollars a week less than average. The indignant correspondent set the interviewer right by stating his correct pay. The second person steadfastly refused to name his pay figure, saying that he had been "misquoted by the press too often." Apparently this reporter did not see the irony of his hiding behind the bush that is the refuge of every politician when caught out by the press. One correspondent said irritably, "I can give you thirty minutes at 9 tomorrow morning," a rather unusual time restriction to be imposed by a practitioner of a trade that sometimes seems to believe it has a birthright to the unlimited time of anybody from schoolgirls to shahs.

There was one paranoic. This unfortunate responded several times with shouts of, "That's none of your damn business!" and would not say what was the occupation of his best friend. At the end he characterized the interview as a "damn invasion of privacy, and there's far too much of that in this country today." He was not asked who else was invading whose privacy.
In general, the writer believes the high level of rapport, as stressed by the Survey Research Center, was maintained throughout forty-seven of the forty-eight interviews.

There is a constant flux among members of the capital press corps. Inputs reflecting this flow were supplied by a correspondent interviewed a week before he left Columbus to take over as his newspaper's Washington correspondent, by his replacement after he had been in Columbus only a month, by a reporter two months before he left for a job as capital correspondent for a larger newspaper in a neighboring state, by a reporter newly reassigned to statehouse politics from the city hall beat, and by one who soon afterward left newspapering after being denied promotion to the top statehouse job he thought he deserved. There was one death among the corps.

As could be expected, the respondents ranged through the endo-, meso-, and ectomorphic; from five feet four to six feet five in height; from a flat-top sheared ex-Marine of the Korean War to Viet Nam veterans and a non-veteran coiffed like Shirley Temple; with hairless overt physiognomies to those barely discernible amid explosions of hair; studies in grey and black and narrow lapels and skinny ties, and rainbow bursts in the sartorial colors and cut of burlesque comedians; speaking briskly, haltingly, drawlingly, sharply,
reflectively, blurtingly, aggressively, diffidently, in tones from rumbling baritone to piping tenor; projecting all-out machismo to subtle and outright femininity.

We found no correlations among attitudes and any of these properties.
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CHAPTER I
GATEKEEPERS OF THE PRINT MEDIUM

Roles of Print Communicators

In inaugurating an analysis of "the characteristics of these gatekeepers," we might first ask "What are the roles of political communicators as perceived by themselves? What is role?" "The concept of role," writes Levinson,¹

is related to, and must be distinguished from, the concept of social position...A role is, so to say, an aspect of organizational psychology; it involves function, adaption, process. It is meaningful to say that a person 'occupies' a social position; but it is inappropriate to say, as many do, that one occupies a role.

Levinson lists three senses in which role is used by various writers, thus: 1) "...norms, expectations, taboos, responsibilities...associated with a given social position..."; 2) an individual's "inner definitions of what someone in his social position is supposed to think and do about it..." and, 3) "...actions of individual members...the ways in which members of a position act..." These may be captioned as roles, expectations and actions.

Linton also warns of the necessity to differentiate status from role. "A status, as distinct from the individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties...A role represents the dynamic aspects of a status.

35
The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing the role. "Performing," it appears to the present writer, is the key word in Linton's statement.

As does Levinson, Greenstein examines role as a tri-dimensional concept, parsing it into predisposition, environment, and response, which leads this writer to offer expectations, perceptions, and behavior; or environment, the actor, and the act or acts. Another tri-dimensional approach is that of Biddle and Thomas, who offer a thoroughgoing synthesis of aspects of role as evolved since Durkheim's division of labor analysis in the 1890s. "Individuals in society occupy positions," they write,

...and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands, and rules; by the role performance of others in their respective positions, by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality."

Helpful also in arriving at a definition of role for employment in the work at hand, is a statement from Parsons and Shils: "The role is that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process." Moreno says flatly that role playing is an act, and here is that most economical of all definitions: one that occupies less space than the word defined. Role is act. It is this simplification that
leads finally to the definition of role as used herein. By definitory extension of Parsons, Shils, and Moreno, we employ role as the personification or individualization of function, not necessarily as acted out, but as descriptive of the actor's attitudinal posture. In arriving at this definition we are aware of the many caveats about "function," Easton's included. Function in this paper will simply be the perceived purposes of newspapers in covering state politics from the statehouse. The communicator performs his individualized role in actualizing the newspaper's function or functions.

What, then, are the newspaper's functions and the journalist's roles in reporting state political news?

Some scholars and other observers believe that the press in the United States is dropping its pretense of objectivity in favor of an overt adversary approach to newsmakers. Paul Weaver notes that the objective stance requires an implied understanding between reporters and officials who believe that the press would treat them with fairness. In contrast, the practitioner of the adversary method begins with a point of view and seeks to dig out information that reinforces that bias. The product of adversary reporting is read by a narrow audience that already holds the same view. A spreading of this kind of journalism, Weaver believes, will gradually cut off the press from official information freely given.
Support for Weaver's view was offered by Chet Huntley, after he retired as a national television news performer, who scorned the "new journalism--the journalism of advocacy and involvement, personalized and subjective journalism... In my opinion there is an arrogance, a haughty smugness, a conceit running through too damned much of our journalism today."\(^{10}\)

Ithiel deSola Pool, at a 1972 workshop on government and the communications media, said that many journalists see themselves as St. George with the government as the dragon.\(^{11}\) Moynihan, said Pool, believes that there is an "adversary culture" in journalism, that the press reflects "the general adversary culture of the intellectuals, a culture which assumes that to criticize power-holders is more sophisticated and enlightened than to praise them."\(^{12}\) Yet, in contrast, Pool also noted that politicians are the newspaper person's reason for being and that many of them fall into a friendly game in which the correspondent holds back some of the embarrassing things he knows about the politician in exchange for occasional exclusive tidbits.\(^{13}\) Pool calls this cronyism. He supports a pronouncement by Irving Kristol\(^{14}\) that journalism is "the underdeveloped profession," and says that the development of adversary journalism stems from this. Journalists lack the knowledge that would allow them to write analytically about complex problems, so they turn to writing about procedural matters, about "who took
what stand against whom."^{15} The present writer suggests that many reporters find actors far more interesting as subjects than their acts and the institutional environments in which they perform, and the "who" more often than not overshadows the "what" and the "how" and nearly always the "why." A Congressman found to have a sex partner on his payroll as a $14,000-a-year "typist" makes news that overflows page one; a businessman or private professional person could not make page sixty-three with similar personnel procurement proclivities. The "who" makes the news.

Pool's quotation from Moynihan is found in a Moynihan article in which he wrote that journalists who cover government affairs are "in some ways more important than their journals...A relationship grows up with the reporters covering one's particular sector...[that is]...one of simultaneous trust and distrust, friendship and enmity, dependence and independence..."^{16} (This split relationship is observed also in a study by Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman.)^{17} Moynihan, meanwhile suggests that a fundamental change has taken place in newspapers and newspaper journalists. "The stereotype of American newspapers," he writes,
is that of publishers ranging from conservative to reactionary in their political views, balanced by reporters ranging from liberal to radical in theirs. One is not certain how accurate the stereotype ever was. One's impression is that twenty years and more ago the preponderance of the 'working press'...was surprisingly close in origin and attitudes to working people generally.
Journalism now, however, has become, if not an elite profession, attractive to elites...

The "rising social status of journalism" may result from recruitment of newspaper people from middle- and upper-middle-class backgrounds and who have attended college and, "on the record of what they have been writing in college...[see to be]...more and more influenced by attitudes generally hostile to American society and American government."^18

Moynihan does not enumerate these attitudes. But Huntley reinforces him. "In my conversations with men and women of the White House and Congressional leaders and other principals in the government, "Huntley said,

sooner or later...we get down to the...ultimate question: 'Now wouldn't you agree that if I backed you up against the wall and twisted your arm sufficiently, wouldn't you agree that most of you guys are Democrats and liberals?' And I think I would have to say...yes.^19

Huntley concluded:

It would be my guess again that the majority of journalists in this country today accept...the Keynesian theory of economics. They accept without too many questions the practice and theory of big government, of centralized government. They accept without too many questions the whole philosophy of a little bit of anti-business attitude, a little bit of suspicion or hostility toward the profit system and a very healthy contempt for state and local government.^20

The "enemies" view of political newswriters vis-a-vis political institutions was discussed by Chief Justice Burger recently. Some journalists, Burger said, believe that when conflicts arise between the press and other interests that
the decision should always go in favor of the press...Those few who think that the press must have unrestrained, unreviewable power sometimes tend to view the courts as 'enemies.' Nothing could be farther from a realistic appraisal of how press freedom has evolved in our Country. Far from being 'enemies' the media and the judiciary share a need that neither can live without: the media must have journalistic independence and judges must have judicial independence...the press will keep its independence only so long as there is an independent judiciary to give meaning to the words of the Constitution.

Insisting that the government in a democracy is "the true expression of the nation's feelings," Pool declared no nation will indefinitely tolerate a freedom of criticism against the freely chosen government that leads it. The notion among some newsmen that the press can be at one with the people in combat with the common enemy, the government, is a self-destructive delusion...If the press is the government's enemy, it is the press that will end up being destroyed.

The staggering press revelations of wrongdoing in the second Nixon Administration, leading to the disgrace and removal of a President, may a few months later have caused Pool acute embarrassment and perhaps to alter somewhat the above opinion. His words in 1972, however, led him to a statement of what others also have thought to be a proper function of newspapers.

The press must identify and seek to establish...a social structure as will enable a free press to be a nation-building, concensus-forming institution that rallies the people behind shared national goals. It cannot be just a critic... Whether the alienated critics like it or not, the government in this country is what the majority have opted for, and the majority have a right to expect that such a major social institution as the media will not systematically undercut their democratic choices and values.
This seems a startling statement in view of the facts that the press is a private institution submissive to economic and limited legal strictures and not otherwise to any "right" of expectation on the part of the public. Furthermore, what of a government "opted for" by a great gulled majority of the electorate, a government that turned out to be morally bankrupt, unwilling to abide by the precepts of American democracy and which itself "undercut...[the]...democratic choices and values."? Is the public interest better served by a press that "rallies the people" behind such a government, or by a press that enters into combat with it and exposes it by relentless criticism?²⁵

Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk differs slightly with Pool on the function of criticism. Rusk said that the press must be a "balanced critic" rather than an "opponent" of the government. In words that remind one of Gov. Bryant's statement, Rusk told a group of editors that newspapers must "get rid of the myth of the fourth estate. You speak to the people, not for them. The people have nothing to say about who will be editors and columnists. When you take the role of an opponent rather than a critic, you weaken your search for truth."²⁶

The workshop at which Pool spoke at Aspen produced a workable inventory of what its planning group considered the primary functions of communications media in relation to government. Included are reporter—to provide balanced
and accurate news about government; watchdog—to dig out evidence of government incompetence, error, and wrongdoing; critic—to offer an independent point of view on the performance of government; forum—to carry the debate on public issues among individuals and organizations; ombudsman—to help citizens communicate with government. 27 Except for "forum," which is a function, these all are familiar roles of newspaper people.

Charnley has said that the newspaper person's prime role is public servant. The journalist "respects individual dignity and a man's personal and private rights as foremost except when the broader community interest overrides them." 28 Taylor and Scher are more specific: "The first function of the newspaper is to inform. Woven through this function run the threads of its other duties—to instruct, to interpret, and to mold public opinion." 29 This writer would challenge the last—to mold public opinion—as being a presumptuous goal. It may be a newspaper function to state the opinion of its publisher on matters of public concern, but it seems that the proper function ends there. Let the reader absorb the newspaper's opinion and evaluate it along with political messages received from the same or other gatekeepers; but let his opinion be molded or not. Journalism, writes Kriehbaum, "is a profession devoted to the public welfare and to public service. The chief duty of its practitioners is to provide the information and guidance toward sound
judgments which are essential to the healthy functioning of a democracy." The newspaper person, Kriegbaum adds, is a "professional" and a "public servant" also playing the role of "educator."30

Grey echoes this belief. "Whether the news media like the role or not, they are educators, burdened with responsibilities as conveyors of information and understanding of the day-to-day operation of government and society..."31 McGeorge Bundy asked a gathering of newspaper editors: "Is it not time for him [the American journalist] to deepen his perceptions and raise his sights— to fit his own quality and that of his reader?"32 Grey cites two other authorities who subscribe to the educator model.33 From C. Wright Mills we may borrow another role, that of adviser to the king, directly through the editorial page, indirectly as a feedback mechanism connecting the message originator (the political authority) to the receivers (the public) to the originator.34

As long ago as 1947 a five-point list of newspaper functions was presented by the Commission on Freedom of the Press35 in its report to the sponsors of its study. The tone of the presentation makes it plain that the list is prescriptive:

1) "A truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning. It is no longer necessary to report the fact truthfully. It is now necessary to report the truth about the fact;
Without qualification, newspapers reported day after day the charges of Senator Joseph McCarthy that he had discovered yet another group of "teen Communists" on this or that governmental agency. The public believed every word. It was getting the facts truthfully, but it was not getting the truth about the facts. After the McCarthy binge, many newspapers vowed "never again." They determined to report the "truth about the fact." Yet less than fifteen years later the newspapers (and television) created the Black Panthers, without qualification implying that here was a giant army of many thousands staffed by "field marshals" and "ministers of war" and with a straight face reported the "communiques" of these exalted functionaries. Objectivity—failing to report the truth about the fact—created McCarthy and Cleaver and Carmichael and Rap Brown. Lazarsfeld and Merton call it "status conferred." Within the past few years we have seen the instant creation by newspapers (and television) of a mighty Symbionese Liberation Army poised to bring terror to every streetcorner in the United States. It turned out that there were, what, seven members of the immense SLA. Yet there were probably hundreds of thousands of Americans who believed the SLA lurked everywhere.

To continue the Commission's list of newspaper functions:
2) A forum for the exchange of comment and criticisms...all the important viewpoints and interests in the society should be represented in its agencies of mass communications;

3) The projection of representative pictures of the constituent groups in the society...The truth about any social group, though it should not exclude its weaknesses and vices, includes also recognition of its values, its aspirations, and its common humanity;

(How sage this statement! Such a picture of American Negro life and its degradation and hopelessness, had it been presented to the American public, could have wrought a change that may have obviated much of the civil rights strife of the 1960s.)

4) The presentation and clarification of the goals and values of the society [did Pool read this?]...The Commission does not call upon the press to sentimentalize, to manipulate...We do recognize, however, that the agencies of mass communications are an educational instrument...and they must assume a responsibility like that of educators.

5) Full access to the day's intelligence...We do not assume that all citizens at all times will actually use all the material they receive. By necessity or choice large numbers of people voluntarily delegate analysis and decision to leaders whom they trust. [This leadership, the report states, is informal, unofficial, flexible and changing.] The leaders are not identified; we can inform them only by making information available to everybody.37

Cohen, in a study of reporters who cover foreign affairs, concluded that those communicators regard themselves as participants, making them an "extra-constitutional" branch of the government. They believe that they represent the public. They further perceive their role to be that of
critic of the government, advocate of policy and, as such, maker of policy. Further, in these roles they see themselves as competitors of other interest groups in the foreign policy field, even showing hostility and contempt for others.38

Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman (mentioned earlier) found two sets of belief systems— the neutral and the participatory—in media functions and the role of journalists.39 From this split comes the heated debate over "objectivity versus subjectivity," "detachment versus advocacy," "observer versus activist." The three investigators found a duality of role perceptions among reporters of public affairs, and concluded that communicators "must learn to wrestle with two opposite psychological states."

Professionals or Something Else

The concept of professionalism is inextricably woven into the fabric of the advocacy-neutralist schism. Do newspaper political correspondents perceive themselves as professionals? For every newspaper person who argues that his calling is a profession, there may be at least one who replies that it is a craft and that its practitioners, even at the highest levels of integrity, are only paraprofessionals. Moynihan and others, as we have seen, employ the words "profession" and "professionals" in discourse on print journalism, newspaper persons, and the role of
the press. It is likely, however, that they use the words loosely, because all journalists, it can be argued, do not qualify as practitioners of a profession except under the porous definition from the sports world's lexicon: they are the opposite of amateurs; they are paid for their work. An argument could be made that in sports the amateurs are closer in spirit to being true professionals than are the so-called "pros."

"Most people are paid for their work," Osler L. Peterson writes, "but professionals are paid so they can do their work."40 Here enters the concept of service; service for people; service for its own sake, rather than for the dollar. In a day of grandiose appellations in which no man's dignity may be ruffled, in which all females are indiscriminately "ladies," garbage men are "sanitation technicians," and grave diggers are "interment engineers," nearly everyone apparently likes to think of himself as being a professional. The broadest definition of profession found in the dictionary is, "An occupation or vocation requiring training in the liberal arts or sciences and advanced study in a specialized field."41 Journalists do not qualify under this stricture.

There is, of course, no agreement on a systematic classification of professionalism. McLeod and Rush work toward a classification in a 1969 paper42 that tests notions of professionalism, but they trip more than once. They list
characteristics they purport to be professional as opposed to non-professional. One is "getting ahead in your career," which the authors assign to the professional typology, while another is "having a job with prestige in the community," which they class as a non-professional desire. The assignments seem capricious. It can be assumed that many streetsweepers want to "get ahead" in their careers and that even dedicated professionals can be aware of prestige and consciously strive for its enhancement.

McLeod and Rush, nevertheless, come close to identifying some true elements of professionalism. They ask agree-not agree questions on the following: journalists should be willing to go to jail if necessary to protect the identity of their news sources; journalists should form an organization to...police the profession; members should be disciplined by the professional organization, and journalists should be certified by their professional organizations as to their qualifications, training and competence. It should be noted that each of these, which a thoughtful person might identify with professionalism, could be abhorrent to the American newspaper person with his fixation on individualism. The last, further, also might be unconstitutional. Consider this formulation:

A profession is characterized by members' consensus on their obligations and skills and on awareness of their needs to acquire new information and skills. Programs for continuing education and development are relied upon, usually,
by the members to maintain their competence and affirm their mutual interests and obligations. Extensive continuing education programs are aspects of the professional life...43

The Hutchins commission of press freedom stated that a profession performs a public service, has a common training, maintains standards, is controlled by an organization of its members, its practitioners bear the responsibility for their performance, and "the profession, as such, has a conscience."44 More than fifty years ago Abraham Flexner posited six criteria:

Professions involve essentially intellectual operations with large individual responsibility; they derive their raw material from science and learning; this material they work up to a practical and definite end; they possess an educationally communicable technique; they tend to self-organization; they are becoming increasingly altruistic in motivation.45 The National Labor Relations Board has said that newspaper reporters are not professionals, in deciding a case in San Antonio. The Act under which the board was created defines a profession as work that requires advanced knowledge obtained through specialized study. The board's majority found that newspaper work "can be competently accomplished without requiring advanced degrees in journalism or equivalent experience.46

The dictionary says that "craft" is "an occupation or trade, especially one requiring manual dexterity."47 Journalism fits the first half of this, but not the second.
Flexner distinguishes between the professional and an allied practitioner, limning the boundaries between medical doctor, a professional, and pharmacist:

I should say that pharmacy has a definiteness of purpose, possesses a communicable technique, and derives at least part of its essential material from science. On the other hand, the activity is not predominantly intellectual in character and the responsibility is not original or primary. The physician thinks, decides, and orders; the pharmacist obeys—obeys, of course, with discretion, intelligence, and skill—yet in the end obeys and does not originate. Pharmacy, therefore, is an art added to the medical profession, a special and distinctly higher form of handicraft, not a profession.48

Is journalism also a handicraft? Yes, this writer believes, more nearly so than it is a profession. Responsibility as employed by Flexner is not for the journalist original and personal; his standards of performance are his own, or those of his superiors, and his standards and techniques are not capsuled within uniformly recognized boundaries of a discipline but are as varied as are the personalities of the teachers of journalism and the newspaper editors who promulgate them. The journalist's responsibility is not to society as is the lawyer's "to the courts and ultimately to the people for adhering to the rules of court,"49 but only to himself and his employer; for him there are no "rules of court."

Kimball writes that, "A private conscience is more central to professional conduct perhaps than public credentials."50 Later he states that "professional ethics can
Professionalism is a human process, a feeling that comes over a person when he behaves in concert with his own conscience. In Kimball's opinion, there is a "decent proportion" of reporters with a "systematic approach as rigorous as a specialist's" which is "indispensable to pierce the fogs enveloping important news." These statements are at least arguable. Kimball seems to be saying that a professional is a person who claims to be one, whose standards of performance and techniques are controlled by "conscience." But, who defines conscience? What of the newsman who has no conscience to harmonize his behavior with, or who has a skewed conscience? Is he professional? The "maverick type who would rather be right than rich," Kimball writes, "has always been attracted to journalism." This may be true. But that type, which through sense of service to society could come closest to professionalism in spirit, seems to be disappearing to be replaced too often by barely literate products of journalism schools who work for organizations, often members of newspaper chains, whose consuming interest is financial profit not community service. The attitudes of the so-called business and commercial "professions" often govern this journalism "profession."

An essential attribute of professionalism is public accountability, of which the physician, the lawyer, the engineer—even the beautician and the plumber—must be
aware, for they have qualified their skills with the state and are licensed. In the final analysis, then, elevation to the status of professional is barred for the journalist by the Constitution of the United States, for he cannot without a breach of the First Amendment be made responsible to society by threat of disbarment, or dispressment.

"Art," says the dictionary, is "a specific skill in adept performance, conceived as requiring the exercise of intuitive faculties that cannot be learned solely by study." The good newspaper reporter is an eclectic, well founded in history, economics, sociology, psychology, politics, and language, employing writing skills, intuition and knowledge based on unteachable hunch and experience in order to make the public information of the day intelligible to his readers. He is an artist harried by deadlines who cannot create his opera like Wordsworth in tranquil recollection but who must create now, now, and now. Instant production on call may make him an artisan. But the best newspaper reporter, if he is not a professional, certainly is not a tradesman. The arcane method by which he pieces together bits and pieces of fact and interpretation, filtering them through his knowledge, experience, intuition, and, yes, conscience, is an original creative act. He is an artist. Newspaper reporting is an art.

What does the statehouse correspondent think of all this?
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CHAPTER II
PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICS

All of the twenty-nine active statehouse correspondents said that they believed most newspaper people covering the Ohio statehouse did so in a professional manner. The six retired correspondents agreed unanimously. But two of the thirteen former capital writers disagreed.

What, if anything, is the significance of this forty-six to two vote? What did the newspaper people believe they were agreeing to or disagreeing with?

"Professionalism," said one of the two former Columbus correspondents who answered negatively to the professionalism question,

means there is a special discipline, a special knowledge that we must have so we can know what is important and what isn't. Through experience or training we must be prepared for covering politics. A professional is at a decision making level. In a profession there is a standard of ethics that all must aspire to. The professional strives for the uplifting of his profession. That means as newspapermen we must be critics of the press.

This man, a political writer for a metropolitan Ohio newspaper did not think that most of the Ohio statehouse correspondents performed as professionals. One could almost believe that he had read Flexner, so comprehensive is his
definition of professionalism. He was not one of the two master's degree or doctorate holders among the thirteen former correspondents, but holder of a bachelorate in journalism.

How does a profession differ from just another way to make a living? "The professional must have objectivity," said the other correspondent who cast a nay vote. "He must be trained to write informatively and analytically, and to do his job with great diligence." The speaker did not think that most of the Ohio Capital reporters fitted this description. He also at the time of his interview was a political writer for a major Ohio newspaper.

The current twenty-nine statehouse reporters, what did they think about professionalism? None seems to have a grasp on the concept. Sorted out from the disorganized replies by the correspondents, the following properties emerged as some that the statehouse reporters thought most necessary in a professional:

1. Loyalty to a professional ethic
2. Responsibility to the public
3. Sense of service; dedication
4. Training, education, knowledge
5. Objectivity
6. Decision-making responsibility
7. Cerebral quality
8. Judgment

Added, but with a far less degree of frequency, were in their language, these: the work goes beyond the pay; conscientiousness; job skills; writing talent; doing a good job; honesty; others trust him; fairness; I don't know;
brains; character; consider themselves pros; thoroughness; analytical ability.

One active correspondent, more thoughtful than most, said that a profession "needs a system to discipline the errant. But no one could structure a code of ethics for newspapermen. We can't be licensed."

Language taken directly from the Society of Professional Journalists/Sigma Delta Chi "Code of Ethics" was used to formulate Statement Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 13 in Table 1 following. The Code's admonition about real and apparent interest conflicts of secondary employment was basis for Statement Nos. 14, 15, and 16. Nos. 14 and 16 are identical, yet they attracted slightly different response. Only four respondents pointed out that they were the same statement, perhaps out of politeness. But this kind of politeness did not seem to be a quality of the correspondents. They were generally quick to point out grammatical and typographical errors. It is the writer's opinion that only one or two more besides the alert four noticed the identical statements but remained silent.

Statement No. 2 was excerpted word for word from an advertisement placed in the New York Times in 1972 by Accuracy in Media, Inc., a rightish-winged group, protesting a Times reporter's alleged "obligation" to a "crusade" that, the advertisement charged, "comes before his obligation to report the news accurately and objectively."
TABLE 1
DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THESE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Newspapermen should make prompt and complete correction of their errors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advocacy that leads to misleading reporting should not be tolerated by any responsible newspaper</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Truth is our ultimate goal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A newspaperman's responsibility to the public is paramount</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Newspapermen have a professional status as representatives of the public</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Newspapermen should not campaign for a candidate or a party or public issues</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. News reports should be free of opinion and represent all sides of an issue</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Objectivity in reporting is a mark of the experienced professional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Newspapermen should accept nothing of value—such as gifts, favors, free travel, special treatment, and privileges—from sources other then their employers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Newspapermen should not carry bumper stickers advocating or opposing any political party, issue, or candidate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Newspapermen should not run for public office</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Newspapermen should not contribute money to a candidate or a party</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. There is no excuse for inaccuracies or lack of thoroughness.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Political reporters should be allowed to do publicity work for politicians and office holders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Political reporters should be allowed to do publicity work for politicians and office holders.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Political reporters should be allowed to do publicity work for any persons or organizations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining questions concern degrees of personal political activity, taken from The American Voter\(^4\) that are pertinent to professionalism and ethics. In the "old-fashioned" view of objective journalism, partisan activity is forbidden the newspaper person. Some newspapers generally regarded as among the country's best, went so far as to prohibit editorial workers' belonging to such as the Red Cross or the Lions Club, lest their organizational support show up as bias in their work.\(^5\)

"I have a feeling I'm not very consistent" said one wise correspondent while his opinions of this list were being recorded. The ambivalence in many of the corps members was apparent, but it seemed that the group in general was supportive of the institutionalized "rules" of old-fashioned newspapering. They voted here massively in favor of the Society of Professional Journalists/Sigma Delta Chi dogma; 100 percent and 97 percent against conflict of interest by accepting secondary employment as publicitors for not only political functionaries but for any persons or organizations; and from 100 percent to 86 percent in favor of the Code's standards of practice as included verbatim on the list of statements. They even lined up staunchly behind (98 percent and 93 percent) the Code's pomposities about ultimate truth and paramount responsibility, although there were six commentaries about "vagueness" and "piles of crap."
The majority, but just barely, was not caught by No. 13, which states that "There is no excuse for inaccuracies or lack of thoroughness." The supportive vote here was only 43 percent. The remaining 57 percent did not merely skim over the triteness with a grunted affirmative but thought of some very good excuse indeed for these sins—such as illness, errors in transmission, misplaced confidences, inviolable deadlines proctored by mulish editors who want copy now, now, now, any kind of copy. The attention given to this statement, and the fact that a majority was not "caught" by it, strengthens the validity of the responses insofar as they are an indication that care was taken in reading the statements, and responses may not have been made to coincide with what they thought the interviewer wanted to hear.

On degrees of personal political participation, the Ohio capital reporters voted from 93 to 67 percent against campaigning for candidates, parties, issues; against display of bumper stickers on their automobiles; against newspaper persons' running for office, and against contributing money to candidates or parties.

Finally, there is the flat turndown of advocacy journalism in No. 2, a direct statement in opposition to editorializing in the news columns. One man, and not one who agreed with other indirectly worded statements supporting the advocacy model, voted half for and half against No. 2: "Advocacy that leads to misleading reporting should not be
tolerated by any responsible newspaper." This is the formulation advanced by Accuracy in Media, Inc., mentioned above.

From Table 2 on Page 66, two responses are also supportive of a professional sentiment among the Ohio statehouse correspondents. The general one that journalism is a public service was accepted by 86 percent. Ninety percent agreed with the statement that newspapers should not pander to morbid curiosity about crime and sex. (But some of the newspapers these men work for do not reflect the sensitivities of their statehouse reporters.)

Also from Table 2, a surprising ignorance of journalism history, and recent history at that, was revealed by two statements. These had to do with agreement or disagreement with the opinions in *Times v Sullivan* and *Walker v Associated Press*. All but eight of the forty-eight reporters interviewed asked, "what is that?" or remarked, "I'm not familiar with that," when they arrived at the mention of the Times case. All but three asked or remarked the same about the Walker case. These are the landmark Supreme Court opinions that virtually freed newspapers to report anything, to make any accusations, true or not, about public officials and public figures. (Since tempered by later opinions as noted in Chapter I).

It is the writer's contention that any newspaper person with a trace of scholarly curiosity, and, more importantly, with any true sense of professionalism, would be familiar
### TABLE 2

WITH WHICH STATEMENTS DO YOU AGREE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Newspapermen should be willing to go to jail if necessary to protect confidential sources</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The good statehouse reporter has a point of view and is not just a passive observer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There should be no legal restrictions on who should or who should not be allowed to be a newspaperman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Newspapermen should have the absolute right to refuse to identify confidential sources</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Newspapermen should form an organization to police their performance, such as the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Newspapermen should be required to divulge sources and amounts of their income just as many politicians are required to do</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Newspapermen should be certified by their organization before being allowed to practice journalism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Newspapermen should be required to have special training in state government before being allowed to cover state politics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Newspapermen covering state politics should divulge their sources and amounts of income even if they are not required to do so</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 CONTINUED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Persons should be specifically educated and then certified by the state, like lawyers, physicians, engineers, teachers before they can practice journalism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The good political reporter, in the final analysis, should be as much a policy maker as is the public official.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with these 10-year-old landmark cases that radically changed the rules by which newspapers conducted themselves. And the writer would double the emphasis of his statement in the preceding sentence when applying it to newspaper persons who cover public affairs.

An unexpected revelation emerged from the application of this list of statements. Can there be newspaper reporters assigned to cover public affairs who are so ignorant of the American system and the Constitution that has constructed it? Here are at least six. They agreed with Nos. 6, 7, and 8 above, and disagreed with No. 3, positions in support of proposals that all are patently unconstitutional. If they are like many newspaper people, they will cite the sacred document and the First Amendment in claiming such nonexistent "rights" as an absolute one to keep secret any news sources (No. 4), and their publishers when denied more cookies invariably automatically blurt, "Freedom of the press!"

Perhaps what should be required of prospective statehouse correspondents--by publishers and managing editors, the only authorities who could promulgate and enforce such a requisite--is that they pass high a course in the philosophy of the American system; not a law school course in constitutional law, because law students are expected already to have grasped the philosophy, but something a bit deeper than a high school civics course. But, then, do publishers and managing editors themselves have a more realistic hold on
the system? With restrained exasperation, Chief Justice Berger has referred to

a strong view among at least some journalists that when conflicts arise between claims of the press and interests of others—for example, in areas of privacy and enforcement of criminal law—the decision should always go in favor of the press. But courts must balance conflicting claims and few rights are absolute...No element in our society can have unrestrained license...” (Emphasis added.)

Only two of the twenty-nine actives mentioned the constitutional questions raised by the more outrageous of the statements on this list. The one correspondent who voted for the unmitigatedly unconstitutional No. 10 was the unfortunate introduced earlier as exhibiting paranoid tendencies during the interview.

The reporters who agreed with No. 9—that they should voluntarily reveal their sources and amounts of income—all were under 35 years old. Curiously, the only one who refused to the end to tell the interviewer what his salary was, placed himself in favor of financial self-revelation. The interviewer was told by a Press Room clerk that in a previous year (1974), a resolution supporting financial disclosure by the correspondents was defeated before the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association by "only a couple of votes."

Favored by 83 percent of the capital writers was the moderately advocative sentiment (No. 2) that the good statehouse reporter is not just a passive observer. This, of
course, is a vague generality, but it conflicts with their sometimes expressed support for objectivity. Underscored again are the ambivalence and uncertainty that will become apparent in the attitudes of the correspondents as the analysis continued. It may be that, as the interviews progressed, the writers fell into a less wary state and responded more candidly. That was one reason for the length of the interview and the similarity of many of the questions and statements to others elsewhere in it. It is also possible, however, that the back and forth changes in attitudes indicated by the respondents as the interrogation progressed, were caused by the interview itself, by prompting the reporters, maybe for the first time to think about who they are and who they believe they are. It may be that as the interviews carried on we witnessed the actual process of people working toward some conclusions about themselves.
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CHAPTER III
WORK STYLES

Sources

Some seemingly irreconcilable responses were made to questions concerning the correspondents' most cooperative sources, the interest groups that they most often come into contact with, the interest groups perceived as the state's most powerful, the reporters' most reliable sources and most reliable interest groups, and to whom they most often talk during an ordinary week's work. The seeming discrepancies may be because there is a tight interrelationship among the questions, and as each successive question was asked the respondent had had more time to think about the subject in its entirety and to add new material. This was the purpose of asking six questions that probed the same line of information.

A multiplicity of answers was elicited, and perusing the following lists may give the reader the notion that each correspondent is out on the hunting alone, armed with his exclusive idea of what is news. The notion is not far from the truth. Each correspondent representing a newspaper must first cover the newsmaking of assemblymen who represent districts in the paper's circulation area. Secondly, he
must cover news that affects more specifically the residents of his paper's area. From then on, it seems to be every man for himself, each covering what he believes to be the top general story of the day, and responding to specific directions from the city editor or state editor to whom he reports. Beyond that there is the search for background that will make all of the above have a little more sense to both the correspondent and his readers, and the relentless quest for the exclusive, the scoop, the beat, that will raise the correspondent a notch or two above the reporting herd. Sources are where you find them.

Active Statehouse Correspondents

It is interesting to note that of the twenty-nine categories of persons mentioned as most cooperative sources, none is a press secretary in either the legislative or executive branch.

Press secretaries and lobbyists, although they are not included on the most cooperative list, are ranked high on reliability. The lobbyist may be the most stable individual around the legislative halls, outlasting the correspondents and the legislators themselves. They learn the ropes. "If anybody's got a lifetime job, comparatively speaking, it's the lobbyist."¹

The general public perhaps would be a bit shaken to find lobbyists promoted to sainthood ranking second only to the legislators themselves as the most reliable sources by the correspondents. Lobbies specifically mentioned
TABLE 3
MOST COOPERATIVE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Cooperative Sources</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislators and department heads</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Legislators</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Legislators' aides and department deputies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Legislators and department deputies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elected rather than appointed officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Middle level persons in legislature and agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anybody but the governor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People my age</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNot limited to one to a respondent.
## TABLE 4

**SOURCES TALKED WITH MOST OFTEN\(^a\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Talked With Most Often</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislators</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speaker of the House</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Governor's press secretary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Senate majority leader</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lobbyists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Governor's executive assistant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Secretary of State</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personnel Review Board executive secretary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. House finance committee chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Senate minority leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Attorney general</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. State finance director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. State treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. House majority leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Senate Democratic whip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. State director of transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lieutenant governor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Republican caucus leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Legislative aides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Deputy leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Top men</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Not limited to one to a respondent.
### TABLE 5
MOST RELIABLE SOURCES<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Reliable Sources</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislators</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lobbyists</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speaker of the House</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deputy level administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governor's staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aides, secretaries in both branches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Career bureaucratic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legislative aides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Middle level staff, both branches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. House Democratic leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. House Republican leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Assistant to House Speaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Aide to Republican House leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Public relations for the House minority (GOP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Disgruntled idealists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Anyone who's unhappy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Anyone I have a personal rapport with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Young, sincere bureaucrats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Not limited to one to a respondent.
were those of the AFL-CIO, Ohio Education Association, Ohio Manufacturers Association, and the state's retail merchants. As noted above, however, the lobbyists become the oldest hands around, and, as one Ohio correspondent said, "You can't expect balance from them, but they help to put the whole picture into perspective." Another: "They've got to be more or less straight because you can fool most of us only once."

"None" tied for first in a scaling of the most reliable pressure groups lobbying before the Ohio legislature. Some comments reflect the sentiment:

None are really reliable. All of them try to mislead by omissions.

None are totally reliable.

I'm leery of all of them.

All are relatively honest.

All of them are somewhat reliable or they couldn't perform.

You've got to take all of them with a grain of salt.

It all depends on what the situation is.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

As did the active statehouse correspondents, the former capital political writers named (42 percent) the legislators and the administrative department heads themselves as the most cooperative sources. The only other source to gain more than one mention (23 percent) was "legislators themselves,
### Table 6
Most Frequent Interest Group Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Interest Group Contact</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Labor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ohio Manufacturers Association</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School boards, superintendents, administrators</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chambers of commerce</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State employees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retail merchants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Real estate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Environmentalists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ACLU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. State bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Truckers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ohio Municipal League</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Consumers groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Highway contractors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Insurance interests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Legislators and the governor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ohio Association for Retarded Citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ohio Medical Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6 CONTINUED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Interest Group Contact</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. PTA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Township trustees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Welfare interests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not limited to one to a respondent.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Powerful Interest Groups</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ohio Education Association</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AFL-CIO (9), labor (14), UAW (2)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bankers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilities (3), Ohio Bell (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retail merchants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Highway contractors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Real estate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Savings and loans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Truckers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Beer, wine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Chambers of commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Colleges and universities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contractors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ohio Municipal League</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. State sheriffs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNot limited to one to a respondent.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Reliable Interest Groups</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ohio Education Association</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NONE</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AFL-CIO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ACLU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ohio Association of Retarded Citizens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ohio Manufacturers Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Real estate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State Department of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. State bar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. League of Women Voters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ohio Lung Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ohio Medical Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mental health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ohio Bell; T &amp; T</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Chambers of commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Retail merchants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. School boards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. State press agents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Township trustees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNot limited to one to a respondent.
but department deputies," also a high choice among the
actives. Noteworthy remarks were, "Really, the most coop-
erative of all is any ambitious man."; "Any smart guy on
the move."; "It all depends on the nature of the person
and the reporter."; and "The administrative guys are all
scared of us."

Inexplicable, the source most often talked with by the
former correspondents—five of the ten who chose a single
top source—was the governor, who was not even on the list
of the twenty-one most common sources contacted by the active
reporters. The personality of the governors seems not to
have made the difference here. The former correspondents
who favored the governor as a source ranged in age from the
oldest to the third youngest of the thirteen, and they
covered the capitol during the administrations of five dif-
ferent governors, some of them outgoing and garrulous, at
least one a secretive man who let his two top assistants
speak for him. An old newspaperman might suggest that these
governors were most often approached because they supplied
the most newsworthy copy, the best quotes. But, of the
five serving during the tenures of the former correspondents,
one had spent two terms and was now back after sitting out
four years. Yet the active correspondents did not list him
among recurring sources, as they also failed to list his
immediate successor and predecessor, usually described as
an affable, approachable man. A mystery.
Other sources named by the former correspondents as most often seen were legislators, twice; and Speaker of the House, top legislative leaders, top bureaucrats, once each.

Once again, in naming their most reliable source, the former statehouse reporters were in concurrence with the active corps. They too chose the legislators, with a 30 percent vote compared with 24 percent by the actives. This time, the No. 2 source was also the same for both groups: lobbyists. After that, there was little similarity, however. Named by one man each were the state party chairman, the state Republican headquarters, labor leaders (lobbyists also, of course).

Notable remarks: "It depends, because it changes all the time."; "It could be anyone--the second or third man, even a lobbyist of a PR guy."; "Lobbyists are the best, and the best time of all is when lobbyists are snitching on each other."

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The former correspondents came into contact most often with the following pressure groups: utilities, Ohio Education Association, union labor, and the Ohio Manufacturers Association. These contrast only slightly with the actives' list headed by labor groups, the manufacturers association, school administrators, boards, and superintendents, and the Ohio Education Association. Two mentions each were given by the former correspondents to highway contractors, real estate, savings and loans, and school board and administrators' lobbies. Receiving one mention
each were bankers, oil, the PTA, Catholic charities, the municipal league, chambers of commerce, railroads, and retail merchants. The railroad lobby is overlooked completely by the active corps. Inclusion of oil, Catholic charities, and railroads indicates the ebb and flow of public issues as society and its implements change.

The most powerful pressure groups, according to the former correspondents, were the Ohio Education Association and the utilities. These gained five each of the twenty-six mentions made of groups. Very closely in third place was the AFL-CIO, with four mentions. The active correspondents also said the OEA was the most powerful group in the state, with labor almost in a tie.

No other groups gained so much as an 8 percent mention by the former correspondents. Two were mentioned twice—business, and Ohio Manufacturers Association—and eight were mentioned once each—auto dealers, Catholic charities, coal, the governor, medical societies, railroads, real estate, and retail merchants.

Both groups of correspondents, the former and the active, placed what they perceived to be the two most powerful interest groups in the state far ahead of all others they listed. The OEA, utilities, and the AFL-CIO gained 54 percent of the mentions by the former correspondents. The OEA and labor took 60 percent of the mentions made by the active statehouse reporters.
Reluctance to confer reliability upon any pressure group was shown by the former statehouse reporters. Seven of the thirteen answered, "none," when asked the question about most reliable interest groups. Gaining only one mention each from the other six were Ohio Education Association, Ohio Manufacturers Association, bankers, liquor, municipalities, real estate, AFL-CIO, and "a secret source in the oil industry." This was the only hint of an Ohio Deep Throat dropped during the some hundred hours of interviewing.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents.

There was no agreement about most cooperative sources among the six retired political reporters. One each said his most cooperative source was the governor, legislators, top levels, all state auditors, all levels, and second and third level people. These responses fairly spread-eagled the field of replies given by the active and former correspondents.

As did the former correspondents, the retired ones picked the governor as the source most frequently talked with. Three of the six supplied this response. The others said their most frequent contacts were with, respectively, lobbyists, the state auditor, and the secretary of the House.
The retired reporters' most reliable sources were the governor (two named him), party leaders (two), the state auditor (two), and "none," the favorite of one man, who made only the one response. It is noteworthy here that no mention was made of legislators, who were named the most reliable sources by both the active and the former correspondents.

The pressure groups most often seen by the retired men resurrected some nearly forgotten bodies from American political history. There were three mentions each of utilities and the OEA (out of 21 interests named), two each of labor and the railroads, one of the state bar, county commissioners, state employees, state chambers of commerce, truckers. And there was also one mention each of the Anti-Saloon League, the Wets, the Grange, and the Ku Klux Klan, all but the last of which have been silent these last many years. As long ago as the 1930s, the utilities and school teachers (OEA) were on the seen-most-often list of statehouse correspondents, as they were on the list of the former correspondents two decades or so later. With the current statehouse corps, the OEA is third behind labor and the manufacturers.

It hardly seems possible that the Ohio Education Association could have remained the perceived most powerful interest group through all the sixty-odd years of political history represented by the forty-eight reporters interviewed.
Yet of the sixteen interest groups mentioned by the six retired correspondents as most powerful, four mentions were of the OEA. Utilities gained three mentions, labor and the railroads two each, and county commissioners, chambers of commerce, the manufacturers, and the mines, one each.

**Most reliable pressure groups?** Four of the six retired men replied, "They're all the same." The other two each mentioned the OEA, and one added state employees, utilities, and chambers of commerce. The OEA wins of a nose.

**Partisan Loyalties**

**Employers**

Thirteen of the 29 active capital reporters represented wire services, which serve newspapers of varying political colors, even those services covering for chain publications, such as Scripps-Howard and Horvitz. These correspondents indicated indifference to any awareness of the partisan stance of their newspapers.

Of the eight newspapers directly represented by staff correspondents in Columbus, only one was said by its correspondent to be a Democratic party supporter. Curiously, one reporter for another newspaper said it was Democratic, while the other reporter for the same paper said it was Republican. Of the remaining six papers, three were said by their representatives to be Republican supporters, and three were said to be independent or "split."
Both correspondents who differed over whether their newspaper was Republican or Democratic said they themselves were Democrats. The correspondent of the other paper reputedly Democratic said he was an independent who leaned toward the Republicans. The newspapers said to be Republican by their capital correspondents were also represented incongruously: one by two Republicans, an independent who leaned toward the Democrats, and a non-leaning independent; one by a Democrat and an independent; one by a Democrat and a "neither--I'm a journalist." The independent newspapers were represented by: an independent leaning toward the Republicans; an independent who was "drifting;" and the third by two Democrats and a "neither."

The thirteen correspondents representing services in Columbus identified their party preference like this: three were Democrats, three Republicans; four were independent, one was a "neither," one was a "no-comment," while one said he was a Socialist.

There apparently is little correlation between the political partisanship, if any, of the statehouse correspondents and that, if any, of their employers. (This relationship is discussed also in Chapter VI.)

Favoritism

Instructions From Home

None of the forty-eight active, former, or retired statehouse correspondents said that his newspaper or service
supplied a detailed, written set of instructions for performing the duties in Columbus. One of the active writers said, "Oh, we had a one-page thing, but it was so general it didn't tell us anything." The only other reporter who made any comment other than a "no" to this question said, "Somewhere or other I had a sheet. But it was general and no help." Learning how to do their jobs was a pragmatic process, they said, involving Press Room peer inputs; requests for specific information made by the person to whom the correspondent reported, and most of all, gaining of experience by "seeing what was cut from your copy back home and what made the paper and what didn't, and just by gradually learning the capital ropes."

Taboos

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Responses to the question "What kinds of stories do you know your paper or service wants soft pedaled?" were given without hesitation, indicating a general tendency toward candor. As could have been expected, sacred cows turned up more often among the 13 representatives of the five services that staffed the capital. They served more bosses. Six of the thirteen said there were stories that were expected to be soft pedaled. Their comments:

We soft pedal selective stuff as dictated by the clients.
I had to soft pedal a story only one time, and it involved a client.  

We have to soft pedal stuff that reflects badly on member papers.  

Stories about papers and publishers personally involved in controversies they're a party to.  

We're biased toward the GOP, so anything that reflects badly on the Republicans we've got to soft pedal.  

We soft pedal any GOP stupidities.  

The last two of the comments above were from two writers for the same service, and were the only instances of outright, continued favoritism of a specific personality, issue or entity, in this case the Republican party.  

Only three of the sixteen newspaper representatives (19 percent compared with 45 percent of the wire and group correspondents) reported cases of policy-dictated sacred cows. Their comments:  

We soft pedal just those stories relating to the paper itself, its policies, and the publisher.  

Just stories about public officials attacking other newspapers.  

Stories critical of any newspaper.  

Over the years many persons have pointed out the toughness of newspapers when on the attack and their tenderness when the thrust is the other way. They can dish it out, but they cannot take it, is a familiar complaint about the press. Would not take it, is more likely the fact. Here are at least a few newspapers proving it. One was a Republican supporter, a second was independent, the third "split"—
GOP nationally and Democratic in state races. Three former correspondents for two of these papers said that when they covered Columbus there were no sacred cows. Another who had represented one of the papers said there had been.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Eleven of the thirteen said that there were no forbidden subjects when they covered the capital. One of the remaining two, who worked with a service while in Columbus, said, "We didn't do much with anything that was critical of the governor." A Republican was Ohio governor then. The other said, "We were pretty leery of the auto dealers. They could put a lot of pressure on." One man who said he was unfettered by his paper's policy said, "We could even put the blast on candidates backed by our paper."

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Two of the six retired writers said that they had had restrictions. One said any labor news had to be played down. The other: "Why, I remember when William Jennings Bryan came to Columbus and a throng filled the entire capitol grounds and the streets around. The paper didn't report a damned word about it!"

The Fair Haired

Active Statehouse Correspondents

The reverse of the sacred cow coin is the pet, the personage, agency, or issue that an employer expects its
correspondents to give full treatment to whether or not there is anything truly newsworthy to treat.

Two men representing different group services said that they had pets. One said that he was expected to give full coverage to a certain house member "whether he does anything or not." The other reported a negative pet: "We have to go all out on any story that makes lobbyists look like rats." Both of these services were among those for which a taboo also was reported.

Two of the eight newspapers—compared with three reportedly having taboos—had pet subjects. One man said he was required to report the minutest fact about the governor. The way he put it was most inelegant. The governor was a Republican and this newspaper was staunchly Republican. It was one of the three newspapers for which a taboo was reported. The other full treatment required was described by the correspondent this way: "I have to cover a certain body whose head is a friend of my publisher. I have to cover it every time it meets, even when the story's duplicated by the AP."

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Only one of the thirteen reported that he had had a pet. "I had to cover the governor no matter what, news or not. My bureau head was a Republican and biased as hell." This man had represented a service in Columbus, one of those for which a taboo also was reported.
Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Two of the six retired men reported pets. One of them was among the two newspapers that also had taboos. "We had to give all out treatment to anyone the paper supported in campaigns," said one man. The second said: "I remember that the _____ National Bank sorely wanted to handle the turnpike bonds, so we had to give everything we had in supporting the turnpike bills."

Neutral Favoritism: News Judgmental

There were, of course, other taboos and pet subjects discussed with the correspondents, but these were of a news judgmental character and could not fairly be classed as evidence of favoritism or self serving. Examples: soft pedeling of sex and crime stories was required by one newspaper; full treatment was ordered by another paper of environmental stories; others wanted extensive coverage of mental health, transportation, abortion, fluoridation, open meeting bills, and energy matters. These changed with the issues.

Hindered? By Whom? How?

This question was asked in order to dig a bit deeper, to give the correspondents another chance to remember or to reveal taboos or favoritism. No new examples were reported, but some interesting observations were elicited:
Active Statehouse Correspondents

Almost all of the corps complained that not enough space was given to capital reports by their editors back home. "We've got a hare-brained editor," said one. "He doesn't know what real news is."

"The paper is too heavily tied to sports news," said another. "There's hardly any space left over for important copy."

"We have a policy that hinders me," said another, "to the extent that a lack of policy is a policy. They've never decided how they really want to cover the state government, so we can't determine our own performance. We don't know what standards we're trying to meet. I can't find any consistency in what's printed and what isn't."

Another: "I'm not hindered by a policy but by certain management types who downplay politics. And they're too timid. Stories that tend to have exposé material tend to be weakened by the desk."

These comments were by newspaper staff writers. The following was from a bureau man representing a group:

"They just have no commitment in covering politics. What they print and what they kill is just hit or miss."

From these remarks and others not duplicated here, the observer received a message that most of the correspondents feel discouragement over a perceived lack of understanding of the importance of politics by their editors back home,
even though their publishers were spending substantial sums in maintaining state capital offices.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Both bureau men for a group: "They tried to put pressure on me only once, but they never got away with it. Wanted me to tone down a story."

"Yes, I was greatly hindered by the general stupidity of the bureau chief, who showed favoritism to the GOP and was very reluctant to let anybody really dig into a story." Making this complaint about GOP favoritism was a man who said he voted Republican in four of the five elections we queried the correspondents about.

Conscientiousness

Productivity Self-Satisfaction

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Thirty-one percent of the writers believed that a reporter's work is never done. They answered "never" to a question asking if they believed at the end of each working period that they had covered every story they should have. Fifty-seven percent of them replied "sometimes," while only 12 percent said, "most of the time," and none at all said "always."

Former Statehouse Correspondents

In contrast, while a nearly equal percentage (33 percent) of the former capital correspondents replied "never," 17
percent believed they "always" covered everything they should have; 42 percent replied "most of the time," and only 8 percent said "sometimes." Could these be cases of the I-was-a-real-man-in-those-days syndrome? When I played fullback for Notre Dame...There I was, flat on my back at 30,000 feet, the Zero...

Retired Statehouse Correspondents
As did the actives, none of the retired political reporters replied "always." Seventeen percent said "never," 33 percent said "most of the time," and 50 percent said "sometimes." Does part of the memory return with retirement and ebbing machismo?

Types of Stories Neglected
Even those former super-correspondents who said they believed they always covered every story they should have every day, were able to discuss the kinds they most often were forced to neglect. One former and two active statehouse reporters said that there were no stories they had to pass by. Compounding the conflicts, the three persons who replied "none" when asked what they had to neglect were not among those who had said they covered everything every day.

Active Statehouse Correspondents
Most often mentioned as regretfully neglected were investigative stories and/or depth articles, and next were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actives</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"There's no time to get to these," was a common complaint of the reporters who thought that their time was used up in covering the breaking news of the day. Next most regretfully neglected was not a story type but a specific governmental branch—the administrative, the agencies, the bureaucracy. "There's just no time. We either cover the agencies by handout or let the AP do it." Next were features, especially personality profiles, and here again, of course, lack of time was the culprit named. Specifically mentioned as overlooked by almost all correspondents were the state supreme court and the civil rights commission. About the latter, a correspondent said, "We just can't cover it. It takes all day and you end up with just one story. No matter how important that one story may be, you've got to turn out more than one a day." The lack of follow-up stories was prominently mourned, and "keeping up with the 'new' news" was blamed here also. Noteworthy comments:

We hardly ever get a chance to go around to people and find out the why of the stories we write.

The stories we neglect are the hard ones. We bang out the easy ones and let the hard ones wait. Then we never seem to get around to the hard ones.

We miss a lot by not covering the routine meetings and reading the routine bills. There's no time.
Former Statehouse Correspondents

The same list in almost the same order was turned in by the former statehouse reporters: investigative-think-depth-perspectives-backgrounders; the agencies; features and personalities. One man said, "The truth is, that we were so pushed for time that we didn't even cover all of the important legislation. And that was the basic assignment."

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

The retired correspondents cited backgrounders and features as most often neglected. One said, "We almost never had time to cover the stories that affected only a small segment of the readers. And there were a lot of important stories missed that way."

Free-Lancing: Outside Jobs

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Eleven of the twenty-nine active correspondents said that they did free-lancing—that is, wrote stories or articles for publications other than their service or newspaper employers. Cited were acting as "stringers" for national and/or larger city newspapers and magazines, writing encyclopedia articles on commission, supplying pieces to trade journals and a Washington newsletter. Four of the reporters were the Ohio stringers respectively for *Time* magazine, *Sports Illustrated*, the *National Enquirer*, and the *New York*
Times. Although the common complaint among the corps was lack of time to do all the reporting the members thought should be done from Columbus, none of the free-lancers thought a conflict of interest arose from their part-time, extra work.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Only three of the thirteen former reporters said that they had free-lanced while in their Columbus assignments. One worked for a yearbook and did other commission pieces, another was a stringer for the Washington Post, another wrote fiction and political articles for magazines, a fourth did unpaid writing for a church. None of these persons believed their outside endeavors constituted a conflict of interest. "It could have been a conflict," one explained, "but it wasn't." Oh.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

All of the retired political writers said they had free-lanced. "In those days you had to," said one, "because you couldn't raise a family on $15 or $20 a week. We weren't paid like they are now. We all wrote for everybody we could sell to, but we were careful to get our own work done, to protect our own paper first with the stories we sent out and not let this work interfere."

For those who have carried an image of the newspaper person as a cynic, weary with the nefarious and venial doings
TABLE 10
DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THESE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State legislators represent a pretty good intellectual cross-section of the public at large</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State politicians are on the average the intellectual equals of the newspapermen who cover them</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most state politicians can be trusted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is no such thing as an honest politician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11
DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THESE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultivating friendships with newspaper people is a good way for a state politician to advance.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State legislators are the rivals of newspaper correspondents in a kind of game of give and take.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Newspapermen and politicians are natural enemies.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In exchange for not publishing all the &quot;dirt&quot; they know about politicians, newspapermen get an occasional news beat from the politicians they protect in this way.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
he has witnessed, the response to No. 4 above will come as a surprise. The Ohio statehouse correspondents, with only one exception, proclaimed the existence of honest politicians. Of state politicians as a whole, however, only 53 percent of the correspondents believed they can be trusted. A like percentage agreed—a weak agreement, of course—that state politicians are the mental equals of the statehouse press corps. That state politicians do represent a good intellectual cross-section of the state's electorate, though, the capital reporters agree by 79 percent.

Some of the work styles mentioned by scholars—Pool, Weaver and Moynihan—in the Introduction of this study were tested by Table 11 above. The Ohio correspondents agreed with two: 71 percent thought that state politicians can advance by cultivating their friendship; and 62 percent agreed that they are engaged in a kind of give and take game with the politicians. Seventy-two percent, however, rejected the notion that they can obtain scoops by withholding unsavory facts they know about politicians.

The third statement in Table 11 is one of many inserted throughout the interview in the attempt to test for the adversary-neutralist psychological state. Only 42 percent of the Ohio statehouse reporters looked upon politicians as their natural enemies. This is a 58 percent vote in favor of the neutralist state.
Elsewhere in the study, but pertinent to the material discussed here, are three other attitudinal indicators. The correspondents repudiated by 89 percent to 11 percent a statement that "In general, I feel contempt for state government," showing disagreement with the Huntley pronouncement. And 86 percent of them rejected the statement that, "What happens in a state legislature is of little importance to the average person as compared with what happens in Congress." They believe in the importance of their jobs. Finally, by the 89 percent to 11 percent vote, they turned thumbs down on a suggestion (Pool's and Moynihan's) that the Ohio government is their "common enemy" and that of the people.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATIONAL AND JOB HISTORY

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Pay

Twenty-seven of the twenty-nine Ohio statehouse correspondents earned from $225 to $390 a week, with the median being $340. One of the corps was in a position to set his own salary, so his wage was not included in an examination of pay. The one reporter who refused to name his pay was placed in the highest bracket, as his organization generally paid its bureau members better than any other in the state. Twelve of the twenty-eight who answered the question said that they had incomes other than from their jobs. These ranged from a tiny $60 a year on stock dividends, up to $9,500 a year, also in dividends, from inherited securities, making one correspondent almost independent of his job. Other sources of outside income yielded $200 a year from "a small inheritance," $200 a year for stringing for a large newspapers in the East, $700 in dividends, $700 from freelancing, $2,000 from inherited rental property, $2,000 in dividends, $1,700 from inherited investments, $3,000 from stringing, $3,000 from free-lancing, and $3,400 from inherited rental property.
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TABLE 12
CORRESPONDENT'S SALARIES PER WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Brackets</th>
<th>Number in Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$225-$290</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$315-$340</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$345-$364</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $369</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational level, union membership, length of time in assignment, age, and total experience are often determinants in size of salary. What relationship do these variables have to the pay of Ohio statehouse correspondents?

Education

Twenty-five of the twenty-nine Ohio correspondents (86%) had obtained college degrees. The remaining four had completed from one to seven semesters of college work. Six of the twenty-five graduates had master's degrees. Twelve (48%) of the graduates had majored in journalism; three (12%) had majored in English; four (16%) in political science. Of the fifteen non-journalism majors, three had master's degrees in journalism, and four others listed journalism as their minor subjects. Other major studies were economics, two; education communication, speech and zoology, one each; and, supplying a curious fact, only four chose history as their major subject, although eighteen of the twenty-nine correspondents listed history as a favorite subject in high school. (Yes, all four history majors were among this eighteen.)

No significance of educational level vis-a-vis salary was evident. One of the four non-college graduates was found in each of the four salary brackets. Three reporters holding master's degrees were among the lowest paid group; two were in the next lowest bracket, and one was among the six best paid correspondents.
Unionism

The Associated Press, United Press International correspondents and those working for three individual newspapers that covered the Ohio state capital worked under contract with the American Newspaper Guild. Only seven of the twenty-nine reporters (24%) belonged to the Guild. Four of these were from the wire services, three from newspapers. Five representatives of wire services did not belong to the union, including two of the six journalists in the top pay group. One union member was in the lowest pay bracket, three were in the next highest, two in the third highest, and one in the top pay group. Of the five journalists who said they were strong union supporters on a philosophical plane, only one actually was a member of a union. Two other union correspondents classed themselves with the ten who regarded themselves as weak union supporters, and the remaining two union members said they were so-so unionists.

Union membership seems not to be a significant determinant of salary level.

Tenure

Some correlation between pay and length of time in the statehouse assignment was noted. The five in the lowest pay group averaged sixteen months in Columbus; the nine in the next highest bracket, twenty months; the eight in the third group, five years, and the six best paid reporters, also
five years. Examination reveals, however, too many exceptions for time in assignment to be a major contributor to salary level. Two members of the lowest pay group, for example, were exceeded in assignment time by only two of the nine correspondents in the next highest groups, and by only four of the six best paid reporters.

Age

There is some correlation also of age and salary. All five correspondents earning $290 and less were under 30 years of age, the median being 27. The median age of the nine whose earnings were from $315 to $340 was 34. The average age of the eight earning $345 to $364 was 33.6 years. The average for the six in the highest pay bracket was 44 years, with only one reporter being less than 40 years old. There are four displaced persons, however. One reporter in the highest pay group was 13 years younger than the average, and three more than 40 years old were in the middle groups where the average was 34 and 33.6 years. Median age of the twenty-nine correspondents was 29 years.

Experience

A more fruitful avenue seems to open up when we translate age into total journalistic experience; that is, the number of years the correspondent has been employed in newspaper journalism. Those in the lowest pay bracket averaged three years experience as journalists; those in the next highest group averaged 9.5 years; those in the third group, 9.8 years,
and the best paid reporters averaged 18 years as newspaper persons. Only two communicators were "out of place" in this correlation: one with far fewer than the average 18 years' experience was in the highest pay bracket; one with far more than the average 9.5 years' experience was in the next to the lowest group. Exceptional talent and the lack of it could explain these anomalies.

It may for purposes of comparison be of interest to cite here a study of United States capitol correspondents conducted recently by Robert O. Blanchard of American University (corresponding data for the Ohio statehouse corps are in brackets):

The median age of all correspondents was a little over 39 [29]. More than a third [45%] was between 30 and 40 years of age. A little less than a third [24%] was 40 to 50. The under 30 age group was 17 percent [28%] and the 60 and over group was 5 percent [0]; less than 20 percent [0] were women. Nine out of ten [96%] were college graduates and about a quarter [24%] held Master's degrees. One third of the college graduates [48%] were undergraduate journalism majors, 21 percent [16%] had majored in political science ... The median annual income of the correspondents was $20,000 [$17,800].

Titles

Job titles varied: statehouse reporter, newsman, Columbus correspondent, legislative reporter, Columbus bureau chief, capital bureau chief, head of service, state offices reporter, political writer assigned to the governor's office. They spent from 10 percent to 100 percent (average 69 percent)
of their time over a year's period covering politics; that is, anything having to do with the official government of Ohio—its legislative, judicial, and administrative branches and the people involved in their functioning—and with the unofficial but substantive institutions such as parties and lobbies. During legislative sessions and at times of intensified controversy, most of them spent all of their time covering politics.

Job Satisfaction

Only seven of the twenty-nine regarded a statehouse assignment as a fulfilling career, but only three of the seven said they wanted to remain in the assignment. The others expressed preferences for other jobs. Desire for a "change of scenery" and to escape a job that "despite the glamor and importance, becomes pretty much the same old thing over and over" were the prevailing sentiments, variously phrased by the twenty-two others. Seven of these men said that they wanted an assignment to Washington as their next job; two wanted to move up to chief of their Columbus bureaus, and one each wanted to become Columbus correspondent for another paper, editor of his newspaper, a columnist for the Associated Press, a copy reader, an investigative reporter, state editor, a wire service special correspondent with roving assignment, his paper's political writer, a newspaper owner, and press agent for a state agency. One
man responded: "I don't know." One, who has just assumed
the post, wanted to remain in Columbus for a few years. In
all, nineteen of the twenty-nine wanted to move upward in
newspaper journalism. Only one intended to depart the field.

But twenty-one of them (82%) had at one time or another
given thought to leaving the newspaper field. Seven, thus,
had never entertained the thought. There is no relation
apparently between the glance toward greener fields and pay
level. Five of those who had not thought of leaving were
in the second to lowest pay group, and two were in the next
highest. One was among the best paid. They ranged in age
from less than 30 to more than 40. All of them believed
they were making more money than half of their colleagues
in the Press Room, although three of them were wrong in their
self-estimate. All but the lowest three of the twenty-eight
on the pay scale believed that they were making more than
at least half of their colleagues. Their estimates ran from
making more than 90 percent down to more than 50 percent.
Only two who had thought of leaving newspaper journalism
were wrong in the self-estimate of their pay ranking, meaning
that of the 28 correspondents whose pay was used in the study,
twenty-two had an accurate idea of their rank on the salary
scale.

To what other employment had the twenty-one been
tempted? Eight said to the public relations and lobbying
fields, four to teaching, two to free-lance writing, and one
each to business, restaurant operation, aide to politician, "just looking," and "where there's money." Two didn't know. Only one of the entire corps of twenty-nine had left journalism. He served as an aide to an office holder, but returned to his old employer and to the capitol Press Room. Higher pay was given as the reason by each of the twenty-one men who had thought of leaving newspaper work. Yet all remained in journalism—one left but returned—indicating that perhaps more than a vestige of the old tradition of newspapering as a calling, a service, still existed in the 1970s.

Twenty-three of the twenty-nine (79 percent) had had their statehouse assignment less than five years. This compares with Blanchard's findings that 60 percent of Congressional reporters had been covering the Hill from one to five years, but it may indicate a slower turnover rate than there evidently is at the New York statehouse.

Our Albany bureau is a vale of tears to pass through en route to someplace else," says a former Albany staffer for the New York Times, and this attitude seems fairly typical, although the desired destination may vary: Washington, new newspaper's political staff, the front office, or a job inside state government.  

A view from Illinois was expressed by a former state lieutenant governor: "Too often good reporters view the state capital as an unhappy stopping place on the way to Washington or some other assignment." Unhappy? Not the Ohio statehouse correspondents. Most of them believe they
are on the way up in newspapering, they would not want the Columbus assignment as a permanent one, but they know it is a necessary stepping stone on that way up. All of them remember the stepping stones that led them to Columbus—police reporter, covering subdivisions such as school boards, city hall reporter, county reporter, courthouse correspondent—and gave them the fundamental experience they needed in order to rise in the covering of public affairs.

Most Desired Jobs

What do you think the most desirable job with your employer is? Eight men said covering the state legislature; four said Washington correspondence; three said editorship; two said ownership, and one each chose assignments as editorial writer, investigative reporter, public affairs editor, bureau chief, managing editor, political writer, reporter, and war correspondent—"But there's no war going on right now." One respondent did not know.

In response to the fanciful question about what is the most desirable job in all of American journalism, six replied Washington correspondent covering the White House or Congress, and one each said Columbus newsmen, Columbus legislative reporter, investigative reporter, syndicated columnist, owner, foreign correspondent, editor of any large paper, syndicated Washington investigative reporter, small town weekly editor, James Reston's (Reston is the retired

Goals

Finally, after having been examined obliquely on the dimension of ambition, the statehouse correspondents were asked flatly what their ultimate job goals were. Responses: Washington correspondent, eight; undecided, four; present job at Columbus statehouse, three; public affairs reporter for employer newspaper, three; foreign correspondent, two; and, one each, columnist, editor, publisher, managing editor, owner, small daily editor, and fiction writer. There were two don't-know replies, from a reporter less
than 30 years old and from one more than 40. Goal choices often are tempered by a felt sense of attainability. Eight of the twenty-three who had stated goals---35 percent---looked to Washington, which is the top reporting rung for men who have generally begun the climb by covering police and other local government entities at the other end of the ladder.

Comparing Former Correspondents

Of the thirteen former capital correspondents, one had become a professor of journalism, while twelve remained in newspaper journalism. Seven of them were with the same newspaper for which they had covered the state capital. The twelve now had the titles of editor, managing editor, city editor, telegraph editor, feature editor, public affairs editor, political writer (three), editorial writer (two), while one was a general assignments reporter. Eleven of the twelve had advanced in job classification and prestige, all had advanced in pay, and the median was now $413 a week, some 22 percent higher than the median of the active correspondents. (To show the range of salaries would be to reveal the pay of at least one of the journalists, and that would violate his confidence. Average pay, however, was $490.) This compares with the active correspondents' $340 a week. One of the twelve said his income outside his salary made him "almost independent," while one earned about $2,000 a year in extra income, another about $400, eight had no outside income, and one would not answer. Three of the
former Columbus writers had covered Washington after leaving the Ohio capital assignment.

Median age of the twelve was 49, with a range of 31 to 62. Active statehouse reporters had a median of 29 and a range from 57 to 26. Eleven of the twelve former writers (92 percent) were college graduates (as compared with 86 percent of the actives). Three (25 percent) had obtained advanced degrees (21 percent of the actives), and one of these had earned a doctorate. Possession of advanced degrees did not correlate positively with salary level. Nine of the eleven college graduates (82 percent) had majored in journalism (compare 48 percent); of the other two, one had minored in journalism. This is a significant difference, 82 percent compared with 48 percent, and could indicate some lines of research of interest to journalism educators as well as to political scientists. Does majoring in journalism generally relate positively with advancement in newspaper job status for journalists who primarily cover public affairs?

Seven of the twelve former statehouse reporters still in newspapering were members of the American Newspaper Guild, a significant 58 percent as compared with 24 percent of the actives, but none of them said he was a strong supporter of unionism. Six assigned themselves to the so-so column, while one stated an anti-union bias.
The former correspondents served a median term of five years at the statehouse, with their service ranging from two to fourteen years. They spent from 11 percent to 100 percent of their annual time covering politics, averaging 82 percent.

Five of the twelve, including those in the two top job positions represented, said an assignment to cover Washington was the best job in American journalism. Three said their present jobs were best. One said editorial columnist, another ownership. One was undecided between the assignments of Charles Kuralt, a television reporter with a roving feature assignment, and that of Inez Robb, former wire service woman's editor. The twelfth responded to "What job do you want next?" by replying, "Christ, I don't know." What is the most desirable job with your employer? "I don't know. Christ!" What is the best job in American journalism? "I don't know." What is your ultimate goal? "Christ, I'm trapped."

Only two of the thirteen (15 percent) regarded state capital political writing as a fulfilling career in itself. This compares with 24 percent of the active correspondents.

Nine of the thirteen (89 percent, compared with 82 percent of the actives) said they had thought of leaving newspaper journalism. The alternate fields that had attracted them were, with one exception, the same ones to which the active reporters had cast an eye—three said
"aide to an office holder," two said public relations, one teaching, one church work, one said "I want money," and one didn't know. Two of the four who said they had not thought of abandoning newspaper work held the top positions among the former correspondents and were the best paid of the thirteen. Only one of the thirteen had left newspapering--to work in a campaign job--but, as had his counterpart among the current corps, had returned to newspapering.

Comparing Retired Correspondents

In contrast, four of the six retired former statehouse reporters said that they believe the assignment could have been a fulfilling career. These retired journalists ranged in age from 90 to 67, having a median of 72 years. They had spent from 15 percent to 100 percent of their time covering politics while in the statehouse assignment, averaging 67 percent (82 percent former, 69 percent active). Five years to twenty-three years was the range of tenure at the capital, with a median of seventeen years, significantly longer than the five-year median of the former correspondents and the 2.5 of the still active corps.

Their pay from 1915 to 1968 ranged from $25 a week to $300, appreciably higher than general newspaper pay in Ohio during that time, according to the men themselves. Their average at the time of leaving the statehouse was $171 a week. Four said that they had no outside income during
their service. The other two free-lanced or acted as stringers for New York, Washington, or Chicago papers, earning up to $30 a week in extra income.

Three of the six retired newsmen had attended college, and two had obtained degrees. Although six is not a healthy sample, this fact seems to refute Moynihan's contention that old time newspapermen came to the job with working class attitudes. All three of the graduates had majored in journalism. None had a minor. None had an advanced degree. Two of the six has been members of the American Newspaper Guild (58 percent for former, 28 percent for actives), but only one said he was a strong supporter of unionism. A non-union man rated himself anti-union, one Guild member strongly pro-union, the other three non-union members were so-so on unionism.

Half of the retired journalists said that they had not wanted another job while assigned to capital politics, one didn't know, the other two had looked to Washington. The most desirable job with their employers? Two listed statehouse reporter, one columnist. The best job in American journalism? No concurrence here: "freelancing the news," "stimulating writer in Columbus," "owning a small paper," "editor of a big city daily," "national political columnist in Washington," and "general assignments reporter with a free rein."
Five of the six retired correspondents said they had thought of leaving newspaper work. Two of them had left, one to work for an office holder, the other for a chamber of commerce. But both returned to newspapering, a mistress none could abandon for good. Two of the remaining three who had thought of leaving were attracted to public relations, the third to broadcasting.
CHAPTER IV

FOOTNOTES


2 Blanchard, op. cit.

3 Whitehead, and Ziff, op. cit.

CHAPTER V

LIFE STYLES, LIFE HISTORY

Unmarried Cohabitation

Interest other than the prurient led us to inquire if the correspondents were living with or had ever lived with boy- or girl-friends. Overt mixed habitation was a news-making element in the life modes of younger persons in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, but we found that only one of the twenty-nine active correspondents and one of the thirteen former statehouse reporters were living with girlfriends. (The one woman in our population, a former capital correspondent, was not among the cohabitators.) Seven of the remaining twenty-eight active correspondents, however, or 25 percent said that they had at one time or another lived with a girlfriend. Two of the remaining twelve, or 17 percent, of the former correspondents said that in the past they had lived with a woman in unwed state. Thus, eleven of the forty-two (26 percent) had been or were living in unwedded bliss. None of the retired reporters was or had.

One of the two currently so established was in the early 50s in age, the other the mid-30s. The two former correspondents who had previously lived with girlfreinds
ranged from the mid-50s to the lower-30s. The seven active capital writers who had at one time lived with girlfriends ranged in age from the mid-20s to the mid-30s, with a median of 29—which happens to be the median age of all the twenty-nine active reporters. All eleven of the practitioners had attended college, one had a master's degree, three had not received degrees.

Of the eight actives who were or had been cohabitators, all but one had joined a church during his youth, but only one of the seven church joiners said he now attended church a lot. Three said they attended church a little, four said almost never. Both the mothers and the fathers of three of the four who now attend almost never, attended church a lot. The mother of the fourth attended a little, the father almost never. The mother of the correspondent now attending church a lot also attended a lot, the father almost never. The three correspondents attending church a little said their mothers attended a lot, their fathers a little. Nothing startling in this rather normal pattern.

Two of the three former capital writers who were or had lived with girlfriends said they never attended church now. Two of them had joined a church as youths—both mothers attended a lot, the father of one only a little. The third, who said he was an atheist, was one of the two of our forty-eight population that had not joined a church. His mother had attended a lot, he said, his father never.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joined Church</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>Church Attendance Now</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived or Had</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived With</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Lived</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Girl­friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twice as many who had not lived with a girlfriend said they now attend church a lot, but the almost-never churchgoers (probably a more valid response) are about equal among cohabitators and non-cohabitators. Churchgoing and sexual-marital orthodoxy are hardly sufficient variables with which to test conventional morality, so the raw figures seem more useful. The most noteworthy is that slightly more than half the active and former statehouse correspondents admit they almost never go to church.

Churchgoing

There is a significant difference in the life styles of the full populations of former and active capital reporters as regards churchgoing. Six—or 46 percent—of the thirteen former correspondents said that they attend church a lot, while only seven—24 percent—of the actives said that they do. Is the fact significant that four of the six former correspondents who attended a lot were professed Roman Catholics? Perhaps. But two of the seven former reporters who said that they never attend are also Roman Catholics. The others were three who never joined a church and one United Brethren member. Four of the total of six Catholics among the former reporters attended a lot. No Catholic said he attended a little.

Of the seven active correspondents who attended church a lot, two were Roman Catholics, one was Russian Orthodox Catholic, and one each was a Methodist, a Lutheran, and a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Former</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Orthodox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Brethren</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Church of Christ member. Of the seventeen actives who never attended church, none was Catholic.

Perhaps it is age that is a salient factor in church attendance. The former statehouse writers have a median age of forty-nine, the actives twenty-nine. But then the retired men are even older—median seventy-two—and four of the five who responded said that they never go to church. Never. The other said he went a lot. Both of his parents had been faithful churchgoers. All of them were Protestants. The non-churchgoers' mothers had gone to church a lot, the fathers a little, except for one who went never. He was a socialist, a follower of Eugene V. Debs, so staunch that he went to jail off and on for his activities.

For our statehouse correspondents, active, former and retired, churchgoing rose with the march into middle age and then ebbed beyond 70.

Numerical leaders are Lutheran, Roman Catholic, and none, tied with nine representatives each. The Catholics are of German and/or Irish ethnic background, the Lutherans of primarily German descent. The "nones" show mostly Scotch-Irish and/or Scots-English backgrounds.

The diversity of the religious backgrounds is indicated by the fact that ten different denominations or religions are represented among the twenty-four active correspondents who signified such. The ratio was nearly equal among the former capital writers, with ten denominations or religions
among twenty-four persons. Nothing in our data indicates any significance to the fact that there were two correspondents of Hebrew background among the actives, and none among the former and retired statehouse writers.

Friends

Among Other Journalists

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Only four of the actives said that they did not have a friend or friends among journalists. A restrictive definition of friend was employed: a person to whom one gives his confidences—talks of his dreams, aspirations, innermost thoughts—and who returns the confidences in similar fashion. Sixteen of the active reporters said that they had one such friend; five said that they had two; two said three; one said four, and one said he had "many."

Twenty of the twenty-five who reported journalistic friendships said that the friends were colleagues working for the same paper or service. Occupationally clannish, but that is a norm. Only five said that they had a friend who worked for another journalistic employer. Only one of the thirty-seven friends listed (excluding the one man's "many") was a journalist outside the print medium. This friend worked in broadcast news.

If sociability were calibrated only on the basis of home-and-home visitation, the statehouse reporters would rank low. Their contact with journalistic friends was
limited almost entirely to working hours, lunch time, and after hours fellowship enjoyed away from their homes. Some had never visited the homes of the persons they called friends; some did visit "once or twice" a year; others reported an annual visit for a holiday party; and the same frequency was evident in the friends' visits to their own homes. In some cases the wives of the reputed friends did not know each other; in some few more they were only acquaintances. The wives of only seven correspondents were classed as close friends of the wives of the men regarded as the correspondents' close friends. These cases represented ten of the thirty-seven close friends enumerated by the active corps.

The reporters were not entertainment oriented. Their wives had their own friends whom they saw during the day, the men their friends with whom they worked, ate lunch, and sometimes "lifted a few" after hours. One reporter's comment:

"We just don't have the time, and I don't think any of the fellows around the Press Room go for the party scene. We're smothered with people and meetings and conversations all day, and long days, and I think most of us want nothing but unlimited peace and quiet after work. Besides, there's enough partying we have to go around town to when you're trying to pry a story loose from the legislators.

There apparently was no pattern in the socialization, work- and life-styles of the four correspondents who said that they had no friends in journalism. The very restrictive
definition of friend may account for their negative responses. Each of the four reported that he had friends outside journalism who met the definition, so they evidently were not anti-social loners.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Four of the thirteen former capital reporters said that they did not have a close friend who was engaged in journalism. Of the nine who said that they did have such a friend, only two reported more than one. In six cases of the nine, the friend was a colleague working for the same newspaper or service, leaving only half that number whose friend worked elsewhere in journalism. All the friends were print journalists.

The former capital writers were a bit more home-visit conscious than their active colleagues in Columbus. They visited their friends' homes and were hosts at home for their friends from once a year, through four or five times annually, once a month, to weekly. The reason for this difference in styles may be that the former correspondents each was back at home base in his new job, while most of the actives, even those who were buying homes in Columbus, were figuratively away from home while working their capital terms.

Seven of the former members of the capital corps were married, but only three of them said that their wives also were friends of the wives of their friends.
Retired Statehouse Correspondents

All six of the retired men said that they had had close friends in journalism. These friendships followed the pattern of the active and former correspondents' in that five of the six men said that their friends were colleagues on the same paper or service. And, although all of the men were married, or had been, only one said that his wife and the wife of his friend also were close friends. Their home visiting was limited as were those of the active correspondents. Only two said that they exchanged visits, one at yearly parties, the other several times a year.

Friends in Politics

Active Statehouse Correspondents

If there were many Ohio politicians who fancied themselves as winners of friends among the statehouse press corps, there must have been broad disappointment in Columbus. No politician was regarded as a close friend by more than one correspondent. And only seven of the twenty-nine reported that they had friends who were "in politics" in any role as elected or appointed official, party worker, lobbyist, or civil servant, from the top echelon down through the office boy. Every age group was represented by the seven.

The political friends named were a lobbyist, a senate clerk, the secretary of state, the state treasurer, a deputy city official, two press secretaries, the lieutenant
governor, a state representative, and two aides to the lieutenant governor.

Perhaps significant is the fact that of the four reporters who said that they had no close friends in journalism, three claimed close friends in politics. On the basis of home-and-home visits and mutual friendships among wives, none of these friendships assayed out as true. Their wives were not friends of the politicians' wives, usually did not even know them or the politicians, and they did not visit each other's homes.

Several correspondents made remarks similar to, "It's impossible for a good reporter to have friends among the people we're supposed to keep an eye on." Many of the newsmen who said they had no political friends answered with an edge of scorn in their voices. One who did claim friends in politics explained that "that's the only way to get a real inside source." A friendship based on utility, however, was not the kind of friendship that the study's question was devised to seek out.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Of the twelve former members of the Press Room club still active in newspapering, three said that they had had friends in politics while in Columbus. This is almost the same percentage as among the active corps--25 percent and 24 percent. Unlike the active corps, however, all of these
three also reported having friends in journalism. On the basis of wives' involvement and home visitations, the friendship of only one of the three seemed to be a genuine one. There was no aberrant fact to mark this reporter as otherwise different from the other former and, indeed, active statehouse writers. The three claiming political friends spanned the age groups of the former correspondents: one each was among the youngest, one in the middle set, the third among the oldest. Named by the three as friends were a high state official's spouse, a city council member, a national party official, a United States senator, and a state legislator.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

It was with obvious pride that all six of the retired statehouse reporters replied that they had friends among politicians while they covered the state capital. Without waiting for the next question all of them voluntarily rattled off the names of their important friends: two governors, a state senate clerk, and a party chairman; a governor, a party leader, and a secretary of state; two governors; a senate president pro tem, a house speaker, and a party chairman; and a governor, and a United States senator.

Home visits were not swapped, however; wives were not included in the friendships, and, as one said, "We weren't on a social basis with them." Yet they held fast to the
claim of friendship when reminded of the restrictive definition employed. They seemed proud of "friendships" with the great.

Friends Among Non-Journalists, Non-Politicians

Active Statehouse Correspondents

A 180-degree turnabout was noted here. Whereas only seven of the twenty-nine said that they had friends in politics, all but seven of the twenty-nine said they had friends who were neither in journalism nor politics. These friends ranged through fellow church members, bankers, restaurateur, nurses, ministers, salesmen, social worker, landlord, photographer, Air Force non-com, "my brother," architect, to the corner bartender and barber.

Most of these friends were neighbors, so proximity made home visitations a regular event, in many cases a daily thing. Sixteen of the twenty-three writers who were married said that their wives and these friends' wives were also close friends. The female spouse usually is the family social secretary, and the double-friendships also would thus contribute to the frequency of intercommunication.

Yet, every one of the seven men who reported that they had no friends outside journalism or politics was married. It seems that there should be some significant correlations among so exclusive a group as this, yet there are no apparent ones. The men ranged the age groups; five of the seven also
had no political friends, but all of the seven had friends in journalism. They were not friendless. Perhaps the next question to be asked of these men is, "How do you and your wife get along?"

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The former capital writers were less sociable around the neighborhood than were the actives. Five of the thirteen—62 percent—said that they had no friends outside journalism, except one who claimed a political friend. Of the eight who had outside friends, only three said that they were neighbors, and the wives of only three of the eight were friends with the friends' wives.

Identified as friends were an attorney, who was a news source, a brewery owner, a writer, two salesmen, a physician, a plumber, and three public relations men. It has been said that public relations men and newspapermen are natural enemies, and these are the only instances of this kind of odd-couple relationship among all the forty-eight respondents. Press agents would strive for close relationships with newsmen in these higher ranks.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

A three-three division was recorded here among the six retired correspondents, all of whom had friends in journalism and all of whom said they had friends in politics. The "outside" friend of one of the three men was rarely seen,
the wives of none were friends, there was home visitation by two of the three. The friends were a university president, businessmen, educators, a gas company executive whose primary duty was not that of lobbyist.

Marital Status

Remarkable in an occupation that has long projected a public image of instability is the fact that of the forty-one present, past, and retired capital reporters who had been married, only two had been divorced. Forty-seven of the forty-eight responded to this question—"Have you ever been divorced?—forty-five negatively, two affirmatively, and one with, "None of your damned business!"

The two divorced men both were former statehouse reporters now in higher echelon positions with large newspapers. Their only other demographic similarity was age. Both were between 47 and 51. One had remarried, the other had not.

Working Spouses

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Perhaps consistent with the recent increased flow of women into the employment ranks is the fact that the wives of twelve of the twenty-three married (52 percent) statehouse reporters had income producing jobs, while the wives of only two (20 percent) of the ten married former correspondents had worked in Columbus. Pay for the twelve
ranged from $1,000 annually to $12,000, with a median of $6,500. The jobs they worked at were copy editor for a medical journal, medical secretary, free-lance writer, beautician, hospital clerk, teacher, baby sitter in her home, legal secretary, and executive for a non-profit organization.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The wives of the two former capital reporters who worked earned $6,500 (during the early 1970s) and $1,040 (several decades earlier). One was a legal secretary, the other a newspaper copy writer and then secretary to the paper's advertising manager.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

The wife of one of the six retired correspondents had worked as an accountant. He did not recall her income.

Organizational Memberships

Social, Civic, Fraternal

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Except for the retired writers, Ohio statehouse correspondents were not joiners. Only two of the twenty-nine actives belonged to a "social" organization, both to an athletic club. None belonged to a civic club such as the Rotary or Kiwanis, and none belonged to a fraternal group such as the Masons or Elks. Although thirteen of the twenty-nine had served in the military, not one was a member
of a veterans organization. One of the twenty-nine had belonged to the Elks, American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, but had dropped from each.

Two writers belonged to the American Civil Liberties Union, one to an environmentalist group, and one mentioned his membership in the Ohio State Alumni. That is all.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Of the thirteen former capital reporters, only one belonged to a "social" group, and he was a member of two—an athletic club and a singing organization. Seven of the thirteen had served in the military, but none had joined a veterans organization.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

If the former correspondents were even less organizationally gregarious than the actives, the retired correspondents were veritable hail fellows. Four of the five (the interview with the sixth was not completed) told of memberships, one in the Elks, another in the Masons, a third in the Rotary and Kiwanis at various times and the Elks, and the fourth in a lunch club. These differences evidently mark a change in the statehouse corps itself, and not within the individual members. They did not join more organizations as they returned to bigger jobs in the home office and then to still more after retirement. The question
asked was of memberships maintained while a statehouse correspondent.

Professional Organizations

Active Statehouse Correspondents

By definition, all of the twenty-nine belonged to the Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association. That necessary membership was their entree into the legislative chambers, and the OLCA roster was the population for this study. But only three of the twenty-nine said that they belonged to the local Press Club of Ohio, a "social"-professional sodality. A perhaps surprising fourteen of the twenty-nine (48 percent) belonged to Sigma Delta Chi/The Society of Professional Journalists, an occupational-social group with overtones of fraternalism. This percentage seems unusually high, as only 30 percent of working newsmen nationwide belong to the organization. ¹

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Six of the thirteen former correspondents (46 percent as compared with 48 percent) belonged to Sigma Delta Chi, which must be at its strongest in Ohio. The same number, six of thirteen, belonged to the Press Club. This is a 46 percent representation, while the actives showed only 10 percent. Maybe the bar and/or kitchen at the club isn't/aren't what it/they used to be. None of the former corps said he belonged to a fraternal club. All, of course, did
belong to Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association and still did. Seven of the thirteen had served in the military but none had joined a veterans organization.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Of the five retired reporters, four belonged to Sigma Delta Chi. The one who did not was a member of the Press Club. All were carried on the OLCA roster as honorary members.

Parenthood

All three groups, active, former, and retired, had done their bit toward the propagation of the race. Sixteen of the twenty-three married active correspondents were fathers, their offspring numbering from one to three, for a total of twenty-eight. Family average was a modest (and modern) 1.7. Of the eleven former statehouse writers who were married or had been, ten produced children and the eleventh was a stepfather. The ten had twenty-five children, their progeny numbering from one to six per family, averaging 2.5. Three of the five retired newsmen were fathers of from one to three children, totaling six, averaging 2.

Life Histories; Demography

Birthplaces; College

The Ohio statehouse correspondents are mid-Americans through and through. All but four of the twenty-nine were
raised either in Ohio or in bordering states of Kentucky, West Virginia, Indiana, and Michigan. Fourteen of them were rural or small town products, while twelve grew up in large cities, and three in small cities. Of the twenty-seven college graduates, sixteen attended large public universities in Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Michigan; three went to Ivy League or "Little Ivy League" institutions; four to small, obscure colleges or institutes; two to smaller private Ohio establishments; one to a large private New York university, and one to a Washington, D. C., area private university.

Of the four who were raised outside Ohio and adjacent states, three attended Midwest universities. Only one of the four "outsiders" attended a "prestige" university of the kind—one can only guess—that Moynihan probably was speaking of in his government-is-the-enemy reference. Three others who attended such universities were Midwesterners. Either their Midwest natal and adolescent environment was too influential, or the indoctrination at the "prestige" schools did not take. In political coloration and support for the new advocacy journalism they were indistinguishable from the average of their fellows at the Ohio capitol. Two of them—as did twelve others in the corps—perceived themselves as political liberals, but the designation is, of course, a relative quality. What is liberal in Ohio may well be moderate or conservative in New York City. It would be interesting to subject reporters who cover New York City
and its area governments to the same agree-disagree questions that the Ohio capital corps answered and compare the advocacy-neutralist intensities.

Active Statehouse Correspondents

In college, the active correspondents were middling to better students, with sixteen of them averaging C, ten averaging B, and one scoring a four-year academic grade average of 3.7. Eight of them won some sort of academic honor, including campus writing prizes, making the dean's list, graduating with honors, and one cum laude. Four of them held scholarships—one for 75 percent, one 50 percent, one $600 a year, the other $250 annually.

Nineteen of the twenty-nine worked for the campus newspaper and eight of them became its editor, while the other served as editor of the yearbook. Only three worked for the yearbook, only five for any other campus publication.

Twenty-five of them engaged in campus activities, such as clubs, band, fraternity affairs, intramural sports, but only four took part in politics. One of the future political writers was elected president of his student body. Despite these activities, twenty-three held outside jobs averaging twenty-two hours of work a week. Eight of them were engaged in some area of journalism, with a local newspaper or radio station. Not one of the twenty-nine took part in varsity athletics.
Former Statehouse Correspondents

The thirteen former Columbus correspondents (eleven graduated) as a group averaged higher grades than did the actives. Ten earned B grades, three earned Cs. Five took some kind of honor, with two making the dean's list off and on, two winning writing prizes— one for $1,500— and one being elected outstanding freshman. One man had a full tuition scholarship for four years.

Ten of the thirteen worked for the college newspaper, but only one made editor. One worked for the yearbook, and three for a campus humor magazine, with one achieving the editorship.

Seven were active in campus affairs, but only two participated in politics. One was elected to the student senate, the second was campaign manager for a campus party.

Twelve of the thirteen had outside jobs and, curiously, they averaged a 22-hour work week, the same as did the active correspondents.

One took part in varsity athletics, winning a letter in swimming.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

The three retired statehouse reporters who attended college earned C, C+, and B grades. None took scholastic honors, one had a 50 percent scholarship. All of them worked for the campus newspaper, but none became editor.
One worked for the yearbook, the other two for the humor magazine. None took part in other campus activities, but all held outside jobs, averaging twenty hours a week. None went out for varsity sports.

Economic Status

If journalists now are entering the ranks from upper and upper-middle class homes as Moynihan believes, they are not becoming Ohio statehouse correspondents. Despite the almost unanimous incidence of college graduation among them, twelve (41 percent) of them are sons of fathers of tradesmen-clerk-laborer status; four are sons of businessmen or merchants; four are sons of newspapermen; one of a federal agricultural technician; seven of businessmen or merchants, and only five of professionals (17 percent).

Although a higher percentage (61 percent) of the fathers of former statehouse correspondents were of the lower income group, all their sons attended college, twelve of the thirteen graduated, two received master's degrees, and two others earned doctorates. Nine of them attended large Ohio public universities, three went to neighboring state universities, one to a southwest college.

Of the five retired correspondents who replied, four (80 percent) were sons of fathers of the lower income group, one the son of a newspaperman who, a century ago, probably was making clerk's wages. These increases in lower income
backgrounds—from 41, to 61, to 80 percent as we move backward in time—would tend to bear out Moynihan, that newspapermen formerly brought to their jobs the attitudes of the working man. But the Ohio statehouse corps, now, then, and long ago, were college products despite the depressed family incomes, presumably therefore having been imbued with some attitudes of the privileged classes. Three of the five of the retired correspondents attended college, two graduating (one more than sixty years ago), the other completing three years.

Ethnic Background

Only one of the twenty-nine active correspondents was a first generation American, both of his parents having emigrated to the United States. Only three of the paternal grandparents of the fifty-eight total, and three of the same number of maternal grandparents, were born abroad. The corps was mid-America and solid American. All of the thirteen former correspondents were at least third generation Americans. None had more than one grandparent of foreign birth, and only four grandparents of the fifty-two were immigrants. Even the retired statehouse reporters, whose average age was more than seventy-two, were long-time Americans. Of the twenty-four grandparents of this group, one grandfather and one grandmother were born abroad.
Ethnically they also were true American, being a multiplicity of hyphens, thirteen of them preceded or followed by "German." Only two of the actives had any family origin in Eastern Europe: one of Russian parents, the other of hyphenated Hungarian descent. The rest were English, Scots, Irish, Scotch-Irish, Welsh, Dutch, Swedish, and French, almost all with German infusions. One Press Room worker had a special distinction: he was one-eight Cherokee, the only one of the forty-eight with a touch of original old stock in him.

The former correspondents were of English-Scots, German, English, Dutch, hyphenated German, and Lebanese descent. The latter was the only first generation American of the former Columbus reporters.

The retired capital correspondents were ethnically German, English, and Scotch-Irish.

This Anglo, Celtic, Teutonic makeup of the entire group of forty-eight seems more appropriate for a statehouse corps a few states southward, rather than in a state with a high concentration of Eastern Europeans in its northern part. German, English, and Scotch-Irish do seem to predominate in central and southern Ohio.

Adolescence; Schooling

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Only one of the active reporters attended a prep school. He was raised in New England. All the others of the
twenty-nine, except three, went to public schools through high school. Two of the three attended Roman Catholic schools, the third Lutheran school. History and English were by far the most popular courses among the future political newspaper writers. Journalism and civics (government, politics) were far down the line, just barely ahead of music, and journalism was even outranked by mathematics.

All but three were very active in sports, clubs, band, and/or other school activities after classes. The three, one a farm boy, "worked all the time," the one at farm chores, the other two in grocery stores. Twenty-six of their schools had newspapers, but only twelve worked on theirs, with fourteen abstaining. Three were editor. Twelve earned scholastic honors, and seven made the National Honor Society. Nine lettered in at least one sport. Only four had no outside jobs, either after school or during summers. One was a newspaper carrierboy.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Four of the thirteen attended Catholic parochial schools, the rest the public schools. Again history and English headed the list of most popular subjects, but this time government was in third place. Eight of the thirteen were active on campus in clubs and sports, and eight also worked on their school newspapers, two of them becoming editor. Six of the thirteen earned scholastic honors, and
one was class valedictorian. Four lettered in at least one sport. Ten of them had jobs, one as a newspaper carrierboy. He and the boy above were the only two of these newspaper reporters who had paper routes as boys. A point should be made of this fact, but we do not know just what.

As a group, the former statehouse writers were better students in high school and college than were the actives. There may be a correlation here between this fact and their advancement beyond the statehouse assignment as well as their increased interest in government in school.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

All attended public schools. History and English, spanning the decades, were their two favorite subjects. Latin was third. Only one was active on campus, but three others lettered in football. Three of the five worked on their school newspaper. One was voted the outstanding senior. Three had the usual odd jobs, the nature of which does not seem to have changed from their time down through that of the active correspondents, who average nearly half-a-century younger.

Occupational Decision

It seems appropriate to ask at this time, "When did you decide to become a newspaperman?" and "Why?" instead of placing the questions with the correspondents' job histories.
Active Statehouse Correspondent

Six decided in high school, after encouragement by a teacher; newspapering ran in the family of six others; five said they decided after military service; three said in college; one explained, "I always wanted to be one." The largest number, eight, when their replies were sifted and classified, turned out to have entered newspapering by accident, straight-out or round-about.

Accidental:

I got fired by a farmer for wrecking his tractor and didn't know what to do. My sister was working for a weekly paper and she said, 'Take my job.' She was going to work in radio. I took it. Later in the Army they assigned me to Stars and Stripes. I liked it and just kept at it.

I got a summer job with a wire service out West during college. I didn't know what else to do when I graduated, so I kept at it.

After graduating in political science, I was offered an assistanceship at the journalism school. I took it and got an MA and here I am.

I couldn't find a job teaching. After a while, I remembered that the last thing I'd been successful at was as editor of the high school paper, so I thought I'd give the newspapers a try.

I graduated in a science and wanted to be a dentist, but my grades weren't good enough. So I went around to see what graduate programs I could get into and journalism was the first.

I didn't know what else to do with an English major.

I went around to ask a newspaperman some advice and he offered me a job.
Always wanted to be:

Don't remember anything else. As a boy I'd had a little printing outfit with blocks and used to put out a paper with them. It was exciting.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Six, nearly half of the thirteen former Columbus reporters, had always wanted to be "newspaper people. This is a major difference in their road to print journalism from that of the active correspondents'. Two decided after experience on their high school papers; two after encouragement from others; two via "an aversion to math," and one by accident of opportunity.

Always wanted to be:

I had a fascination with words, and I wanted an audience.

From way back. It was my idea all along. I don't remember any other.

From the time I was a little kid. O'Henry was my idol. I sold a story to a magazine when I was twelve.

Accident:

I was working as a printers apprentice and got an offer to move to the newsroom.

Via aversion to math:

I had an interest in English and history and I hated math and science.

In high school I read a life of Ernie Pyle and he said there was no math in newspapering and I thought that's for me.
Retired Statehouse Correspondents

One "always wanted to be;" one was encouraged by a high school teacher; one "grew into it," and two got there by accident of opportunity.

Grew into it:

As a kid I used to hang around the railroad depot and pick up items about who's going where for the social column on the paper. At 17 I went to work in the shop and just grew into it.

Accident of opportunity:

I decided the day I graduated from high school and was offered a job.

I was just two days on a job at the bank when the president called me in and said, 'Son, we ran out of money.' The only other job in town was on the newspaper.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Active Statehouse Correspondents

Partisanship

Of the twenty-nine active capital reporters, nine said that they were Democrats, five said Republicans, ten claimed independence, three said "neither," one said he was a socialist, and one refused to answer. When asked to which party they felt closer, the ten independents divided into four Democrats, three Republicans, and three unmovable independents. The partisan lineup thus was:

- Democrats .................................. 13
- Republicans ............................... 8
- Independents .............................. 3
- Socialist .................................... 1
- Neithers ..................................... 3
- No answer ................................... 1

The three neithers could not be shaken. "I'm neither," declared one. "I'm a journalist!" They expressed no kindship leanings toward either major party, and their voting record in the past two state and national elections was mixed, but with more abstentions than the declared party members and reputed independents.

Only one of the twenty-one Democrats and Republicans said that he was a strong supporter of the party. He was
a Democrat. Only one, also a Democrat, said he was a weak party man. All the remaining nineteen placed themselves in the so-so column.

Voting

Thirteen of the twenty-one professed and "leaning to" partisans did not vote their parties straight across in the elections noted. Their comments indicated that they were candidate-oriented, rather than issue- or party-oriented, supporting their claims to be so-so in their partisanship.

Some remarks:

Cloud (a Republican gubernatorial candidate) was lousy. I had to vote for the Democrat.

Gilligan (Democratic gubernatorial candidate) stank. I voted for the man.

I just didn't like Nixon after his first term.

McGovern was a thousand miles left of everybody in the country.

I was against Humphrey on Viet Nam. (Issue)

The man Humphrey was very attractive.

Twelve voted against their ostensive party choice in the state senate race, and sixteen against the party man for the state house seat. Comments:

The better man.

Parties aren't important in state races.

I voted against O'Neil.
Other Political Activity

Besides voting, the correspondents were inactive in politics. Five of them said that they had belonged to political clubs, but only in college or high school. One of them had given money to a candidate or party, and one other had attended meetings other than as a reporter. In addition, one said he once had written political advertisements, but without pay, for a friend seeking nomination in a state senate race.

Political Socialization

Political socialization in the home evidently is as influential among statehouse journalists as with the general populace, a discovery not expected to be made at the outset of this study. It had been expected that with their insertion into the political process as political writers, their attitudes would reflect less closely those learned at daddy's knee. In the twenty-one cases in which party preference was claimed or indicated, there were only six defections from parental alignment; that is, when both parents were of the same party. Two correspondents with Democratic parents now professed to be Republicans. All four parents had voted in every election, three were inactive otherwise, the other had occasionally done campaign work in "getting out the vote." One of the converters said he was a conservative, the other said he was a liberal. One pair of parents had talked
politics before their son a lot while he was growing up; the other pair had talked only a little. In each case, the fathers had been strong Democrats, while the mothers were so-so in their support. Is the mother's influence greater, affirmatively and negatively? It may be suggested by the above and also by the following:

Among the twenty-one party men, there were only three cases in which the father and mother supported different parties. In each case the father was a Republican, the mother a Democrat. In each case the son was now a Democrat, professing support for his mother's party. Other data are mixed. Two of the sons said they were liberals, one said moderate. One mother was a strong Democrat, another so-so, the third weak. One pair of parents talked politics a lot, the other two only a little.

The other four of the six defections from unmixed households were sons of Republicans who switched parties, four to the Democrats; the fourth was the proclaimed socialist. As with the Democratic defections to the Republican party, all parents here had voted in every election. Two pairs had talked politics a lot, the other two a little. The father of one had given money to candidates. The others were inactive except for voting.

The socialist said he was a liberal, of course, as did two of the turned Democrats. The fourth said he was a conservative. Mother's impact was divided. Two had been strong Republicans, two so-so.
The three neithers among the statehouse corps all had two Republican parents.

In general, political awareness was well fostered in the homes of the future statehouse reporters. In nineteen of the twenty-nine families, mothers and fathers voted in every election. Only one mother and two fathers never voted. Twenty-two fathers and twenty-four mothers always voted. Politics was talked almost never in only one of the twenty-nine homes. In twelve others, it was talked a lot, in fourteen a little. One or the other or both parents in eight homes were politically active beyond voting. They gave money, passed out literature, helped in campaigns otherwise. One father was a city councilman.

Liberalism-Conservatism

The Ohio statehouse correspondents philosophically were as down the middle as their state is represented to be. Fourteen of the twenty-nine said that they were liberals, thirteen said that they were conservatives, and one said he was a moderate. One did not say.

As may have been expected, nine of the liberals identified themselves as Democrats, while only three said they were Republicans. The remaining two liberals were the socialist and one of the three neithers. As may not have been expected, however, more Democrats than Republicans--five to four--said that they were conservatives. The other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neithers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{a (N = 28)} \]
conservatives were the three independents and one of the two neithers. (The third neither did not answer.) The moderate was a Democrat.

Nearly half of the conservatives, six of them, said that they once were liberals but had gradually changed to conservative. This interesting fact had to be left unturned. It is the writer's feeling, gathered by osmosis during the interviews, that the change may have had something to do with a general disappointment—in some cases disgust—with the record of a Democratic, liberal state administration that had been elected in an upset and had just ended its term without welding together a durable liberal coalition, and leaving behind a stench of petty scandal.

Blanchard reported that the Congressional correspondents he examined said that they were 43 percent liberal, 14 percent Democrats, 4 percent Republican, 35 percent independent, 2 percent conservative, 1 percent none of these, and 1 percent don't know. It is too bad that these are scrambled oranges and apples, with partisanship and political and social attitudinal patterns minced into a fruit salad and therefore inutile. Note the 35 percent claiming independence. This is almost exactly the percentage of active Ohio statehouse correspondents (34 percent) who said they were independent. But by asking them toward which party, if any, they leaned, and by asking how they voted in the preceding four state and national elections, we were able to reduce their
number from ten to three. And by separating party membership or affinity from liberal-conservative propensity, we found usable (and interesting) alignments.

Correlating Writers and Employers

Partisan custom and philosophical propensity of the statehouse reporters rarely conformed on both dimensions with the partisanship and political bent of their employer newspapers. The Republican-supporting paper voted by the correspondents as tied for the designation state's most conservative, was represented by one good "fit," a Republican, conservative reporter. One of its other three statehouse writers was a Republican, all right, but he said he was a liberal despite his paper's reputation and practice. The two remaining writers were professed conservatives, but one claimed to be a "neither" and the other a Democrat. Despite the crosspatching, however, three of the four were conservatives.

The other newspaper tied with the preceding one as the most conservative in the eyes of the corps, was represented by an apparent perfect fit: an independent conservative. This newspaper was also seen by the corps as neither Republican nor Democrat but supporting both at varied times.

The most thorough going case of mismating occurred with respect to the newspaper perceived as the third most conservative. It also was a Republican supporter. But its two
capital correspondents not only were Democrats, but both professed to be liberals.

The most liberal paper, which was said to support the Democratic party, had sent to Columbus a liberal, but he said he was a Republican. Three correspondents covered the capital for the publication that was voted the second most liberal and which supported both Republicans and Democrats in no apparent pattern. Two of its men were liberals, one a conservative, all in the classic conjunction: the conservative was a Republican, the two liberals were Democrats. These relationships seemed to fit: a politically mixed paper had a mixed crew.

The third most liberal paper was a Republican party supporter. Both of its men in Columbus, wouldn't you know were Democrats, one a moderate, the other a liberal. Two liberals represented the fourth most liberal newspaper, which also itself was Republican oriented. One writer was a Democrat, the other a Democratically leaning independent.

Finally, the eighth newspaper with staff coverage in the state capital rated low on both the liberal and conservative scales and was said to support candidates of both parties. Its statehouse reporter was, fittingly enough, a conservative "neither."

In the opinion of the capital writers, two of the eight newspapers that had staff men in Columbus were truly liberal and two were truly conservative, meaning that they consistently
supported the prevailing "line" on rising issues as well as the perennials. The two conservative newspapers were Republican; the two liberals were split, one a Democratic supporter, the other a mixed. Recapitulation shows that of the eight, four were Republican, three were mixed, and one was Democratic.

Wire and Group Service Correspondents

Of the thirteen correspondents representing the wire services and newspaper groups, six said that they were Democrats, four said they were Republicans, and one was the socialist. One said he was a "neither" and one did not answer the queries in this section of the interview.

Although there were more Democrats than Republicans, there were more conservatives than liberals, by a six to five margin. The socialist, of course, was a liberal, as were three of the Democrats and one of the Republicans. But three other Democrats and three other Republicans identified themselves as conservatives.

The service and group reporters were as inactive politically as were the newspaper representatives. Three had belonged to political clubs, but not since leaving school or college. One had given money, one had attended meetings not as a reporter, one had left journalism to work for an important politician. He returned to his former employer.
The Associated Press and United Press International supply copy for newspapers of all stripes. Gongwer, in its specialized function, had little occasion for exhibiting bias in assignment of priorities in its agenda-type daily "Ohio Report." The Scripps-Howard capital bureau represents member newspapers--there were three in Ohio's largest cities--and sells to certain other non-competing publications. The Scripps-Howard papers are not unanimous in their partisanship. Capital News Service, only a few months old at the time this study began, was attempting to sell its service to smaller dailies of all political beliefs, and could hardly have afforded any appearance of bias. The Horvitz Newspaper, Inc., one-man Columbus bureau operated in a loose regimen combining the reporter's initiative with response to special requests from the four chain members.

There is no consistent employer partisanship-philosophy with which to compare or contrast their correspondents'.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

Partisanship

Eight of the thirteen former capital writers said that they were independent when first asked their party choice. Four of them, however, said that they were closer to the Republican party, two said they were closer to the Democrats, and two remained in the middle. Apportioning this group of independents among the avowed four Democrats and one Republican,
gave the thirteen former statehouse correspondents a makeup of six Democrats, five Republicans, and two independents. There were no "neithers" as there were among the active corps. None said he was a strong party man. There were eight so-sos and one weak. (The two independents were not scaled, of course.)

Three of the five Republicans did not vote down the line for Republicans in the elections asked about. Two of the six Democrats also split their votes, leaving two Republicans and four Democrats as "loyalists." Canceling themselves out, one of the independents voted straight Democratic, the other straight Republican, showing on which side of the aisle they truly belonged. The former correspondents then actually were seven Democrats, six Republicans. Some comments of those who split their votes:

I voted for Gilligan, then I wasn't pleased with him and voted against him the next time.

My vote was against McGovern and not for Nixon.

The war in Viet Nam made me vote against Humphrey.

The Democrat was an ass.

I voted for the better man and not his party, my party.

There just was no choice. I know both these people.

Only five of the thirteen could come up with the party identification of the men they had voted for for the state assembly. There were four "don't knows," three "can't
remembers," one "I think," and one respondent asked plain­
tively of the interviewer: "Say, who is my state senator
anyway?"

Political Socialization

Parental example was strongly political. Both parents
of eight of the thirteen former capital writers voted in
every election, both parents of two voted sometimes, and in
two other cases one parent voted sometimes, the other always.
One man did not know the frequency of his divorced father's
voting.

There were only two defections from solidly partisan
households. A Democrat said both his parents were Republi-
cans. A Republican said both of his were Democrats. There
were remarkable similarities in the cases. Each said both
of his parents talked politics a lot during his youth, voted
in every election, and worked in campaigns. The mother of
one served as mayor and county supervisor. Both parents of
one of the two independents were Republicans who always
voted, talked politics a lot, and gave money for campaigns.
The strong partisan vibrations in these four homes seemed
to have been counterproductive.

In the aggregate, the parents of six of the thirteen
former Columbus reporters talked politics a lot, four talked
it a little, and only three almost never. Five parents
were active beyond voting. Already cited was the mother
who was elected to two different offices. Another mother and father were campaign workers. Another father worked for candidates, and a fifth was a member of the county Democratic central committee.

Liberalism-Conservatism

While the active capital corps was almost equally divided among conservatives and liberals, the former correspondents were two-to-one conservatives--eight were conservatives, four were liberals, one was a moderate. By party identification, three of the six Democrats were liberals, as was one independent; and three of the Democrats--half of them--said they were conservatives, as did four Republicans and the one independent. The eighth Republican was the lone moderate. No Republican was a liberal.

Two of the four liberals indicated that they were growing more conservative, and one conservative said he had recently undergone the spectrum shift. These men were former statehouse reporters who had moved up into better paying, more responsible jobs on the editorial and news managerial levels. They seemed settled, their ambitions not reaching beyond the opportunities available with their present employers. The only dimension by which they did not fit the usual pattern of growing conservatism coincidental with upward economic movement was age. Three of the four liberals were among the four oldest of the thirteen.
Correlating Writers and Employers

One of the thirteen former correspondents in the study is no longer employed in journalism. The dozen who are still newspaper people are employed by five different Ohio newspapers, eight of them by the same papers for which they had covered the state capital. Three had been Columbus bureau correspondents for a group service, one for another newspaper no longer represented by a staff reporter in the capital.

It may have been expected that these people, having moved up into higher echelon, policy forming positions on the home paper and presumably in contention for further advancement there, would more closely match their employers in party identification and political philosophy than do the active capital writers. But such is not the case. Only two of the twelve were complete fits. These were conservative Republicans working for a Republican newspaper tied for the state's most conservative by vote of the correspondents. Preventing unanimity, though, a third former statehouse reporter working for that newspaper was an opposite: a liberal Democrat.

Six of the former reporters fit their present newspapers in one dimension of partisanship-philosophy. The remaining three--two conservative Democrats and one moderate Republican--worked for a newspaper that supported candidates of both parties and ranks among the lowest on both the liberal and conservative scales. It is difficult to establish a
fit here, as it can be said that everyone would fit, or no
one would fit.

In the cases of three large Ohio daily newspapers, management apparently does not force conformity on employees even in the upper levels of the editorial department where bias could be exercised through editorial writing, selection of reports to be published, page one placement, and size of display. A liberal Democrat occupies such a position on a paper voted in a tie for the state's most conservative; a conservative independent for the second most liberal newspaper, and a conservative Democrat for a newspaper of no consistent partisanship that ranked low on conservatism and liberalism. Many veteran newspaper persons would consider these facts to be a credit to Ohio journalism.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Most striking information offered by the five retired statehouse writers who completed the interview was the fact that the parents of four of them never talked politics in their presence while they were boys. It was an age in which many children were expected to be seen and not heard. We all know that. But now here is indication that they were barred also from listening. For it seems improbable that politics was not subject of conversation at some time or other in at least two of the four politically silent homes. The father in one of these was once a candidate for recorder,
the second served as a city councilman and once ran for mayor. Another of the silent fathers was a strong party supporter.

The son of the officeholder did not even know what party his mother supported. The unsuccessful candidate for recorder could have lost by one vote—his son said his mother never voted. There must have been some talk around the house about that.

Only in the home of the Eugene Debs supporter who was jailed for his beliefs were political affairs talked of a lot. The mother in this home was a strong Democrat, and the son became a Democrat who was so-so in his support of the party but termed himself a liberal.

In the only home with parental party consistency—both parents were Republicans, the father strongly so, the mother so-so—the son became a strong Republican. There were two split households in that day of women's unliberation: in one the father was a weak Republican, the mother a weak Democrat—weakness kept the pair together—and the son became a so-so Republican. In the other, the father was a strong Democrat, the mother a weak Republican, and this son also became a Republican and a strong one. All three of the men who became Republicans said that they also were conservatives. The second liberal of the five said that he was a Democratic-leaning independent. His father, the office-holder, had been a strong Republican, his mother of
unknown partisanship. His parents, however, were the only ones of the five sets who voted in every election. Even the wife of the Debs supporter voted only sometimes.

Unlike the former and active statehouse correspondents, the retired writers voted consistently in the two previous presidential and gubernatorial elections. The only anomaly was that one man who said that he was a Democratic-leaning independent, cast his ballot all four times for the Republican candidate. He used to be a Democrat maybe and had not yet noticed a change. The other Democrat cast four Democratic votes, and the three Republicans entered four Republican votes each.

Only one of the five, however, voted down the line for state senator and representative. This was the Democratic-leaning independent who always voted Republican. The others cross voted. One said, "I voted for the man," Another: "He was a friend." The third said: "I didn't always know the locals' parties and I voted for the man." Does this make unanimous among the active, former and retired correspondents a partisan inconsistency of the informed voter?

All five retired reporters said that they never belonged to a political club or had attended meetings and rallies except in the line of duty. Three said that they had never given money or bought tickets, and two said they had. Three of the five said that they had engaged in other political activity: one worked for a politician during a campaign,
another lobbied for colored margarine, the third had taken
leaves of absence to work for candidates. In seeming con­
tradiction, two of the men who had done this other political
work said that they had never belonged to political clubs,
given money, or attended meetings other than as reporters.
These men recognized no contradictions and did not change
their replies when offered the opportunity to do so.

The retired men, as had the former, and as were the
active statehouse correspondents, had worked for newspapers
that did or did not match their own political coloration,
and neither they nor their employers had seemed to mind in
the least.

The evidence throughout the study is that there is no
pattern of congruity between the political convictions of
Ohio statehouse correspondents and those espoused by the
newspapers that hire them and publish their copy.
FOOTNOTES

1 Blanchard, op. cit., p. 50.
CHAPTER VII

TRAITS, ROLES, FUNCTIONS, PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES

Desired Traits in Political Communicators

Twenty-five questions, in addition to one hundred and thirty-one on agree-disagree lists, were asked in an attempt to exhaust the correspondents' opinions on the most valuable attributes for a state political writer to possess, the proper roles of state political correspondents, the functions of newspapers in covering state politics. Finally, a fifteen-statement and a twenty-one statement agree-disagree lists were submitted that attempted to assess the correspondents' degree of support for the advocate-adversary-participant attitude as opposed to the observer-reporter-neutralist state. Some of the questions seem to be duplicates of others, but there were subtle differences that elicited additional information by amplifying the responses. These concerned role filling, the most admired news people, and the most respected statehouse writer, if any, who set the priorities for the day.

It was soon obvious that the statehouse reporters were not intellectuals. Few had thought about or tried to articulate what were their roles, their purposes, their core value in the newspaper world, the political system, and the larger social system of their state. Indeed, only five
seemed to have any idea of a definition of role. In all but those five cases, the respondents answered role questions with a list of traits. The interrogator then reluctantly gave as examples some of the roles that might be played by a football coach (august personage in central Ohio) such as teacher, disciplinarian, father figure, task master, dispenser of rewards. Even then, all but the five failed to give parallel answers. The one journalist who responded in language that might have marked him as a sociology graduate student turned out not to be a college graduate at all, one of the two of our twenty-nine active correspondents at the capitol.

QUESTION: What do you think are the most important attributes or traits for a top political journalist to have?

In assembling and sorting the many attributes described by the writers in a wide range of language, we determined that knowledge-experience is the fundamental necessity most often mentioned (25 times). It came in these varied guises:

1. Knowledge-experience . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 25
   a. knowledge of legislation, so you can see where it is leading
   b. experience with the political system
   c. know-how to sniff out the story the average reporter would miss
   d. learning how to get and keep good sources
   e. perceptiveness you get from experience; the ability to put your finger on the guts of the story
   f. knowledge of history that gives perspective; a feeling for and a sense of history
g. knowledge of national affairs so that you can fit state affairs into the bigger picture
h. judgment you get from experience
i. knowing who and where are the powers behind the thrones
j. being around long enough to know how to cut through the bullshit

Second was:

2. Aggressiveness-industriousness .................. 22
   a. persistence in seeking out the story
   b. energy and physical stamina to stand the pressure
   c. curiosity and inquisitiveness enough to follow through
   d. thoroughness that checks all facts and digs deeper

Third was the old-fashioned virtue of fairness, with its components subtended thus:

3. Fairness ........................................ 18
   a. honesty
   b. objectivity
   c. integrity—"Your credibility depends on it"
   d. accuracy
   e. compassion
   f. trustworthiness—"The only way you can inspire confidence."
   g. detachment—"Not getting personally worked up about your stories."
   h. dedication to ideals

Far behind in the enumeration of desired properties in the good political reporter were:

4. Intelligence .................................... 6
5. Skepticism ..................................... 4
6. Interest in politics ............................ 4
   "Do you know there are some correspondents who really abhor politics and politicians?"
7. Writing ability .................................. 4
   "You don’t have to be a real star, but you need to be good enough for readability."
8. **Affability** .......................... 3
9. **Enjoyment** of the job .............. 3
   "The real good ones find an excitement
   in doing their job."
10. **Lack of cynicism** .................... 2
11.-18. Alertness, brashness, conniving, sneaking,
   cynicism, sense of humor, ingenuity,
   puctuality, speed ........................ each 1

Designated here in a separate paragraph of their own—
because of surprise, in an era of participatory, subjective,
anything-goes journalism, that they gained only one brief
reference—are the following attributes:

19. **instinct for conflict**
20. **adversary attitude**

Later, in responding with agree or disagree comments to
the lists of suggested roles, functions, attributes, atti-
tudes, and opinions that were shown to the correspondents,
more support for adversary journalism may have been indicated.
But when asked to name desired traits without the stimuli of
the lists, the correspondents barely allowed these two
qualities to creep in.

**QUESTION:** Who covering the Ohio statehouse comes
closest to having these traits? (The trait named by each
reporter being asked this question.) Responses were scaled
three points for a first choice, two for a second, and
one for a third. The result:

1. Hugh McDiarmid, Dayton Journal Herald  .... 36
2. Ron Clark, Akron Beacon Journal ........... 12
3. Lee Leonard, United Press International .... 9
4. Dave Lore, Columbus Dispatch .............. 6
6. Brian Usher, Akron Beacon Journal ........... 6
7. William V. Merriman, Scripps-Howard Bureau . 3
8. Robert H. Snyder, Cleveland Plain Dealer . 3
9. Warren Wheat, Cincinnati Enquirer . . . . . . 3

QUESTION: Who among the Ohio Statehouse correspondents do you admire the most? (Same weighting as above.)

1. Hugh McDiarmid, Dayton Journal Herald . . . . 39
2. Ron Clark, Akron Beacon Journal . . . . . . 36
3. Lee Leonard, United Press International . . . 29
4. J. Bradford Tillman, Dayton Daily News . . . 10
5. Robert E. Miller, Associated Press . . . . . . 8
6. Brian Usher, Akron Beacon Journal . . . . . . 8
7. William V. Merriman, Scripps-Howard Bureau . 8
8. Warren Wheat, Cincinnati Enquirer . . . . . . 6
9. Tom Lindeman, Toledo Blade . . . . . . . . . . . 4
10. Andy Cota, Gongwer News Service . . . . . . 3
11. Perry Smith, Associated Press . . . . . . . . . . 3
12. Robert J. Caldwell, Cleveland Plain Dealer . 2
13. Tom Diemer, Associated Press . . . . . . . . . . 2
14. Dave Lore, Columbus Dispatch . . . . . . . . . . 2
15. Robert H. Snyder, Cleveland Plain Dealer . . 1

QUESTION: Who among the Ohio statehouse correspondents is so respected that his or their judgment of what is important tends to influence the other statehouse reporters?

1. Nobody--"We're no pack here . . . . . . . . . . . 11.00
2. Hugh McDiarmid, Dayton Journal Herald . . . . 9.33
3. Myself . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3.00
4. Lee Leonard, United Press International . . . 2.50
5. Ron Clark, Akron Beacon Journal . . . . . . . 1.50
6. Robert H. Snyder, Cleveland Plain Dealer . . 1.00
7. Robert E. Miller, Associated Press . . . . . . . . 33
8. Warren Wheat, Cincinnati Enquirer . . . . . . . 33

QUESTION: What are his or their outstanding qualities?

(The comments here, so close to the heart of the matter that we are searching for, are quoted fully):

Cool, able to explain the importance of the issue, what its affect is on people, even difficult things like the budget. Clarifying, that's the job. The other fellow is a very clever writer, and he has the freedom to do what he wants.
He's good at cutting through the baloney, aggressive with his sources, and has a lot of latitude from his editors that lets him be interesting, outrageous, and controversial.

Myself. Because of my column. I'm older and have more freedom and a broader range.

He's able to go through all of this stuff without being bored, turned off. All of this stuff is still important to him.

They're well trained and perceptive, and they're not cynical to the point of impairing their daily effort.

His group of papers have the clout to give him the power to define the issues and get the pack running. The other man, because his writing style makes him the leader. The third guy because he represents the major newspaper in the state.

Clout. They have clout of major newspapers behind them. The legislators want to be quoted in those papers.

He's self confident, aggressive, knowledgeable, has a strong political background, is well read and has wide sources.

He's very aggressive, knowledgeable, experienced, and has a unique writing style that's readable, irreverent, and sometimes irrelevant.

He's a reporter's reporter. He even looks like one, with his khaki pants, seersucker coat, and floppy shoes. He's very personable and has broad experience. The other man's articulate, thorough, and his credibility is A-plus.

The first one knows the officials and the workings of the legislature and government better than anybody else. The second man is a legend--colorful, with a wide range. The third man keeps a low profile, is very quiet, but he has experience.

The first man's enthusiastic, committed to the proper role of explaining the guts of the truth and cleaning away all the non-essentials.
He's honest and straightforward. The other fellow's a respected professional and also a witty, engaging fellow, a veteran who knows the legislature. He's in the Press Room all day. He's honest and straightforward also.

He's a man of tremendous charm, brilliant, and he comes on which such authority. He's a hard worker who has a retinue of sources and a reputation among the politicians as the best.

He's ambitious and very conscientious at getting all the news and in his treatment of it.

He keeps his cool. He gets the facts before he makes a decision.

Myself. I was very green at first, but I learned a lot. I attribute success to one thing. I do not look disparagingly at politicians as a class. I have a respect for the system and the people in it. I think this is the professional ideal.

Then this fanciful QUESTION: What three newspeople—not necessarily newspaper people—in all American journalism do you admire the most?

1. David Broder, Washington Post columnist .... 13
2. Seymour Hersh, New York Times reporter .... 9
3. Mike Royko, Chicago general columnist .... 8
4. Jack Anderson, syndicated Washington columnist .................................................. 8
5. James Reston, New York Times columnist .... 7
6. Dan Rather, CBS News .............................. 6
7. Walter Cronkite, CBS News ..................... 5
10. Harry Reasoner, ABC News ....................... 4
11. Mike Wallace, CBS News .......................... 4

It is noteworthy that four of the five top choices are or were primarily concerned with politics and in Washington. Royko is a writer on general subjects. The other newspapermen among the top eleven also are writers chiefly on national
politics. Five of the seven newspapermen on the list have won Pulitzer Prizes. Equally as noteworthy—to an observer who remembers the days when no self respecting newspaper person would acknowledge a radio or television personality as being a journalist—is the fact that the Ohio statehouse newspaper correspondents chose four television performers among the eleven journalists that they most admire in all America.

Gaining three mentions each were:

William F. Buckley, Jr., national syndicated columnist
Paul Gallico, novelist and former sports writer
Will Grimsley, Associated Press special writer
David Halberstam, former newsman, onetime chronicler of the Kennedy administration
John S. Knight, publisher
Peter Lisagor, Chicago Newspaper Washington chief
Walter Lippmann
H. L. Mencken
James Naughton, New York Times Washington reporter, former Cleveland newspaper representative at the Columbus statehouse
Jack Nelson, Los Angeles Times
Saul Pett, Associated Press special writer
Ben Reeves, Louisville Courier Journal
Richard Rovere, Washington Columnist
Carl Stern, NBC News
Hunter Thompson, chiefly a magazine writer

Eleven of these fifteen men are or were newspapermen. Thompson is the only representative of the "new journalism" to gain an admiring glance from any Ohio statehouse correspondent. The work of nine of the fifteen men was not primarily centered on national politics.

Drawing two votes each were:

George Condon, Cleveland Plain Dealer columnist
John Chancellor, NBC News
Stewart Alsop, Washington columnist
Clifton Fadiman, magazine writer and critic
Henry Hornsby, Lexington, Ky., Leader
Sidney Harris, political columnist
Norman Isaacs, Louisville Courier-Journal retired editor
Mary McGrory, White House correspondent
William Shirer, radio newsman and author
Haskell Short, late chief of the Columbus Scripps-Howard Bureau
Helen Thomas, United Press International White House correspondent
Dick Young, New York Daily News sports writer

This is a mixed group, including the first mention of women newspaper people, and of persons known only locally, except, of course, within newspaper circles.

Taking one vote each on the list of most admired in all American journalism were:

Martin Agronsky, public television broadcaster
John Appel, New York Times
Peter Arnett, Associated Press special writer
Bob Considine, late Hearst special writer
Max Frankel, New York Times sub-editor
Carl Leubsdorf, Associated Press Senate correspondent
S. L. A. Marshall, Detroit newspaper military affairs writer
Clark Mollenhoff, Des Moines newspaper Washington correspondent
Drew Middleton, New York Times foreign correspondent
Rick Zimmerman, New York Times Washington reporter, formerly an Ohio statehouse correspondent
James Perry, National Observer columnist
Nick von Hoffman, Washington Post general columnist
Jim Myers, Cincinnati Enquirer city editor

Another mixed bag, only two specimens in which were chiefly Washington reporters.

QUESTION: What qualities seem paramount in these admired people? Some responses:
Each is able to make the story understandable to the average reader, no matter how difficult. Their copy is alive and hard hitting.

The clarity with which they present ideas, the insights they give, the ability they have to take a difficult subject and make it understandable.

The ability to get all the nuances of a story, all angles.

The ability to cover anything and to put it into perspective.

Depth. Putting into perspective, yet a pleasure to read.

Basic honesty, down to earth. Put complex issues into words anybody can understand.

Independence of mind and spirit, diligent workers. Their stuff has qualities of newsworthiness, not just the BS of the rest of us. They write well.

Ability to get the story, analytically, exciting. They're strong willed, hard nosed newsmen.

Important copy made interesting. They're all writers, good ones.

Able to turn out informative, well reasoned copy on subjects other writers become emotional and illogical about.

All truly dedicated to the job. Hard working.

They'll stick with it when everybody's lined up against them.

They have a feeling for perspective; they can clarify the issues, and they are not doctrinaire.

Ability to lay things out neatly, and to find out secrets others can't.

They are men of ideas, they think a lot, and they write well.

They're good writers, digging reporters.
They're dogged, careful, and have a consummate knowledge of their areas.

Professionalism. They have a passion for the truth and the ability to get at it.

Intellect, compassion, ability, resourcefulness, persistence.

Writing with such clarity that it can be understood.

Unquestionable integrity. And like old Brinkley, they just don't take the news too seriously as if it's everything in the world.

Excellent writers. Smart, with a healthy skepticism. Always get the answers.

Solid reporting ability; calm.

From these assessments can be precipitated out a clarifying ability, which fits within the knowledge-experience qualification that the correspondents placed No. 1 among traits needed by the good statehouse reporter. Writing ability comes through strongly as among the outstanding qualities of these men admired on the national stage. It was almost overlooked as a necessity for the reporter acting on the state capital level. Perhaps the men and women who reach the very top in political reporting—and newspaper journalism in general—are those with the basic traits as foundation for superior ability in the use of the language.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The former Ohio statehouse correspondents, just as did the active ones, chose David Broder, the Washington Post political columnist, as the person they most admired in
perhaps showing the influence of their own enhanced status, however, the former reporters placed chain publisher John S. Knight in the second most admired position. Mentioned behind Broder and Knight were Meyer Berger, New York Times reporter; Walter Lippmann; John Chancellor; Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier Journal and Times; Lew Seltzer, retired editor of the Cleveland Press; Seymour Hersh, the New York Times investigative reporter, and McDiarmid, the Dayton Journal Herald correspondent at Columbus during this study.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Chosen as most admired by the retired Ohio writers was Jack Bell, former Associated Press Washington correspondent, with Roy Howard of Scripps-Howard and Lippmann as runners-up.

Roles

QUESTION: What, in your opinion, is the proper role of the newspaper person who covers state politics?

The replies showed the correspondents' confusion over the meaning of role. They could describe their activities during a day's work, but they could not recast them into abstractions that would parallel, and could be classified with, the parts performed by other individuals in society. "I never thought of it," said one. "I'm not playing a role, I'm doing my job, and that's reporting what happened in
state government, what has happened, and what's expected to happen." This report will attempt to translate responses like this one into roles without altering the respondents' meaning. We would say, for example, that the correspondent quoted here acted out the roles of observer, recorder of events, and seer.

Forty-five percent of the replies resulted in casting the respondents in the obvious roles of recorder of events and observer. "We are observers, and the activists are wrong," was one comment. Others: "He should be a chronicler of the day's events. He should be a discoverer." (Those are roles.) "I'm a reporter, but not always without subjectivity." Ah, a participant.

Fifteen percent were assigned the role of watchdog, of policeman, which is so old a concept in journalism that many an experienced, old-school hand probably has long forgot that it is in a way an activist role. It is activist, yet it can be performed with fairness and detachment. "My job's to keep the pols honest." "I uncover the scoundrel." "We should let the people know who the crooks are."

Close behind, with seven percent of the responses, was the role of interpreter, the clarifier of issues. "We give the news balance." "To put complex situations into perspective." "To explain things so people can understand." "We have to tie all the facts together to make sense."
Claiming only a small portion of the self-assigned roles were: adversary—"He's got to be a cross-examiner of the public servant."; skeptic—"Don't ever trust the bastards."; educator—"We give the electorate information so they can make judgments."; seer—"He has to be a future gazer," and "To say what may be and what the politicians may do."; accountant—"He should see if the politicians deliver on their promises."; persuader—"Cranking in the personalities into the scene and influencing the reader's judgment on persons, issues, and groups."; agent—"We're the eyes of the public."; culler of untruths—"To check for falsehoods."; investigator; vacuum cleaner—"To pick up all the everyday stuff." (This is hardly self respecting. Garbage man?)

Former State house Correspondents

The former correspondents, maybe influenced by their new positions at the "home office" away from the reporting front and closer to the heart of the newspaper--the editorial page--overwhelmingly believed that the role of interpreter was the proper one for the statehouse writer. Even when mentions of the roles of observer and recorder were combined, they amount to less than three-quarters of the mentions of interpreter. Notable also is the demotion of watchdog to an also-ran down in the pack, from his position as contender in the opinion of the active correspondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Percieved Roles</th>
<th>Times Mentioned (Pct.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recorder of events</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Watchdog</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interpreter of issues</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adversary</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Skeptic</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seer</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Persuader</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Culler of untruth</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**Self-Perceived Roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Times Mentioned (Pct.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpreter</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recorder of events</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agent</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observer</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Doubter—&quot;Distrust everything&quot;</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educator</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ferret—&quot;Relentless seeker of secrets&quot;</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inquisitor</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Investigator</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Watchdog</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retired Statehouse Correspondents

The retired newsmen offered only very sketchy responses to the role question. Only one of them spoke in role-related terms. One said frankly, "I don't understand," and he could not be made to. From this inadequate response, it could with risk be concluded that covering the statehouse was a simpler, easier assignment thirty to sixty years ago. Reporter—"only a reporter"—was the preponderant reply: recorder of events, 45 percent; interpreter, 22 percent; analyst, 11 percent; backgrounder, 11 percent, and watchdog, 11 percent.

QUESTION: Which of the following do you think are particularly important as roles of newspapermen and or functions of newspapers?

Eleven chose "to discover and publish the truth" as the statement they most strongly agreed with. No other statement received more than six such votes. Eleven most strongly disagreed with "to act as censor in the political process." Five of the twelve other strongly-disagree-with votes were placed against "to determine which sides of public issues are right and publish stories to support those viewpoints." These two statements were employed as tests for the support of advocacy journalism, one formulating a negative role, the other a positive one within the framework of advocacy.

Five different men cast the six advocacy ballots, three for the censor role, three for that of promoter of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct. Believe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To discover and publish the truth</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To interpret governmental processes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To inform</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To provide balanced and accurate news about government</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To act as watchdog, to dig out evidence of governmental incompetence, error, and wrongdoing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To be a critic of matters of public interest and importance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To facilitate debate on public issues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To act as a forum where all the pros and cons of the public debate may have an airing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To serve the general welfare</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To act as ombudsman in helping citizens communicate with state government</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To act as educator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To instruct</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To mold public opinion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Responding</td>
<td>Pct. Believe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To rally the people behind shared state goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To act as censor in the political process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To determine which side of public issues are right and publish stories that support those viewpoints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOrder of suggested roles/functions rearranged for scaling.*
one's viewpoints. One man thus chose both as proper roles, and we would expect him to be a firebrand activist. He does not fit the profile sketched by Moynihan and seconded by Pool as scion of middle or upper wealth, graduate of a university that taught him that the government is the enemy. He was only exhibiting the tenuousness, the uncertainty, the ambivalence already noted in Ohio statehouse correspondents and which shall be seen even more markedly. Only one correspondent strongly disagreed with both advocacy statements. Perversely, he did fit Moynihan's model.

The list derived from the Table 18 catalogue of statements closely follows the correspondents' own expressed scaling of their proper roles, which was led by recorder of events, observer, watchdog, and interpreter. Striking the first two of these as so obvious as to be truisms, leaves watchdog and interpreter virtually tied as most important. The second list, derived from the sixteen statements submitted for selection as important roles/functions, is led by discoverer and publisher of the truth, interpreter, informer, provider of balanced and accurate news about government, and watchdog. If we strike the three unspecific, aphoristic role-statements from this second list, it is reduced to interpreter and watchdog, making the top of the two inventories identical. It is refreshing to come upon, at last, consistency.
QUESTION: What, in your opinion, are the most important functions the newspaper should fulfill in covering state politics?

Here, again, confusion. The active correspondents used this question mostly to let off steam, to explode their gripes about the home office. Nearly half of the responses were not about functions at all but were prescriptions for unshackling the statehouse correspondent, providing him an enlarged forum, and granting him near autonomy.

"They can keep their god damned mitts off my copy!" was one instant reply.

Some others: "They shouldn't go off on an editorial tear without checking with the statehouse reporter. The editorial writer's perceptions are often wrong." "They should rely more on the judgment of the man on the spot, the statehouse correspondent on the scene." "They've got to upgrade the importance of political news." Six men issued pleas for their papers to give "adequate space," "ample display," "a better play" to copy from the statehouse. Extracted from the rather forceful speeches this question provoked were several familiar themes that are functions. Among these are, in order of number of citations by the correspondents: to inform, to report, to act as watchdog, to expose, to advise the public, to interpret. Scattered mention was made of these: to be a moral
and political leader, to amuse the public, to persuade the public on political issues, to advocate policies in editorials, and, by one reporter only, to act as adversary. "The newspaper should be a full fledged combatant in politics. It should stand and look over the politicians' shoulders all the time."

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The former correspondents did not seize on this question as a call to the soapbox. Their responses, not couched in function terms, translate to these, in the order of number of mentions made: to interpret, to inform, to act as agent, to criticize, to state opinions on issues, to educate, to expose wrongdoing. Two new formulations were offered: "The paper should promote change. It should bring all its influence to bear on getting bills passed or defeated."; "The paper should act as the public's lobby. It's the only one they have." This latter is, of course, the agent or deputy role, but it is put into interesting terms. The first is maybe a catch-all of activist, watchdog, agent, persuader, educator, and more.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents

Five of the retired correspondents had ideas, but no new ones. Translated, they are, to report, to inform, to interpret, to act as watchdog, to expose the "fakes and personal interest profit seekers," and to "look for
skullduggery," another way of saying watchdog. One man said, "I have no ideas on that."

QUESTION: What Ohio newspaper do you think best performs these functions? (See Table 19.)

QUESTION: What Ohio newspaper do you think misses the widest in performing these functions? (See Table 20.)

The invalidity of these two polls—except for the choice of the Akron Beacon Journal as the paper best performing the proper functions—is seen at a glance. The Plain Dealer and the Dispatch, voted No. 2 and No. 4 among the papers best performing, are then consigned to the No. 1 and No. 3 slots as those performing worst. The Akron newspaper, voted the best performer, was the only paper that received no points as the worst performer. The two questions—which Ohio papers best perform the proper functions, and which Ohio papers least perform those functions, were asked back to back, so there was little opportunity for intervening messages or stimuli to reach the respondents, except from and within their own minds. What those messages could have been, the writer will make only this guess, with fingers crossed: In answering the first question, the correspondents gave a straightforward response free of overtones—rating the Plain Dealer and the Dispatch high. When asked the next question, however, the thoughts that the Plain Dealer has a three-man Columbus bureau, the largest of any out-of-Columbus paper, and the Dispatch sits across the street from
TABLE 19
NEWSPAPER PERFORMS BEST\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akron Beacon Journal</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dayton Journal Herald</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Columbus Dispatch</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Toledo Blade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dayton Daily News</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columbus Citizen-Journal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cincinnati Enquirer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}First, second and third choices were asked for; replies were scaled three points, two, one.
### TABLE 20

**NEWSPAPER LEAST PERFORMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Columbus Citizen-Journal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Columbus Dispatch</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cincinnati Enquirer</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Horvitz papers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Toledo Blade</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dayton Journal Herald</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First, second and third choices were asked for; replies were scaled three points, two, one.*
the statehouse with a whole floor full of reporters, may have intervened. The Plain Dealer and the Dispatch each then could have been contravening itself and have been rated down as a poor performer because, considering the circumstances, it was not better than it is.

Former Statehouse Correspondents

The former capital reporters ranked the best performing papers during their tenure in Columbus this way: Toledo Blade, 19; Cleveland Plain Dealer, 16; Akron Beacon Journal, 9; Columbus Dispatch, 4; Dayton Daily News, 1; Dayton Journal Herald, 1; Cincinnati Enquirer, 1.

They rated the weakest performers thus: Columbus Citizen-Journal and Columbus Dispatch, 13 each; Dayton Daily News, 6; Dayton Journal Herald, 4; Cincinnati Enquirer, 3; Toledo Blade, 1.

Retired Statehouse Correspondents.

In their days at the capitol, the retired reporters said the best performers were the Cleveland Plain Dealer, 8; Columbus Citizen-Journal (then the Ohio State Journal) and Cincinnati Enquirer, 6 each; Dayton Journal Herald and Dayton Daily News, 1 each.

There was almost a dead halt when the next question came up. Which papers least performed the functions? "By golly, I just can't say," said one man. "I can't answer that," said another. Three just refused, and only one man
offered a list: the two Dayton papers tied for first (worst), the Toledo Blade and Columbus Dispatch tied for third and fourth (next worst). Some fires had been banked.

Psychological States

QUESTION: Which of the following statements do you think are true?

In examining this poll, the response to the first two statements in the list in Table 21 indicates that the capital correspondents must enjoy a high order of self-esteem stemming from occupational pride (No. 1) and political efficacy bestowed by their assignment (No. 2). Their secure ego state, however, does not lead them overboard, for they reject the suggestion that journalism is society's best instrument for change (No. 6), and agree three-to-one that newspapers do not speak for the people (No. 3).

They borrow a bit of nobility, but just barely, when 57 percent agree that journalism is devoted primarily to the public welfare (No. 4). Realism grapples with idealism when they almost can't make up their minds whether or not the first newspaper objective is to make money (No. 5), but candor is a winner, 52 percent.

The Ohio statehouse press corps obviously has not had the kind of socialization that Pool and Moynihan deplore, for it rejects the notion (No. 12) that criticism of
TABLE 21

A NEWSPAPERMAN'S OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct. Believe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The role of the newspaperman in society is fully as important as the roles of any professionals such as lawyers, physicians, and educators</td>
<td>26 3 90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being a newspaperman covering state politics allows me to have more control over public affairs than does the average citizen</td>
<td>25 4 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Newspapers speak to the people and not for them</td>
<td>19 10 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Journalism is a profession devoted primarily to the public welfare</td>
<td>17 12 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The first objective of a newspaper, to be frank, is to make a financial profit</td>
<td>15 14 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Newspapers are society's best instruments for forcing a change in the American system</td>
<td>11 18 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is more enterprising for newspapermen to criticize politicians than to praise them</td>
<td>8 21 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Newspapermen should discover who are the bad guys in government and then expose them, even if they break the old-time &quot;rules&quot; of &quot;objectivity&quot; and &quot;fairness&quot; in order to do so</td>
<td>6 23 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My chief role is that of watchdog and my chief function is to help throw the rascals out</td>
<td>5 23 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Number Responding</td>
<td>Pct. Believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Newspapers should report only events that have occurred and should not speculate in the news columns about what may occur</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. In order to inform the public fully, a reporter should infuse his opinions about the subject at hand into his reports</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. The press has done its job if it serves only as a critic of government</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. It is impossible to achieve objectivity; therefore, we should not waste time trying to do so</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. The Nixon-Watergate-Agnew affairs prove that our governmental system has failed and should be changed</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses listed in descending order of percentage of true answers, not as they appeared on the list.*
government is by itself journalism's prime function. The critic role is spurned also (No. 7) when nearly three-quarters of the correspondents do not rate criticism of politicians over praise as the more enterprising behavior. The watchdog role, which was in a virtual tie for the lead in the first two scalings, is rejected (No. 9) when it is proposed as the chief role and compounded with the objective of "throwing the rascals out." Ambivalence, perhaps; perhaps a reluctance to proclaim superlatives in any form, a mood often noticed among experienced newspaper people.

Mildly supportive of advocacy journalism was the corps' thumbs down on No. 10. It must be admitted that this was a poorly worded statement. The author should have modified "news columns" with such as "straight" or "non-bylined." Some respondents noted that their selection here in favor of speculation in their daily leading story from Columbus which almost invariably was bylined.

A thrashing was administered by the capital writers to the pair of blatant advocacy journalism statements, Nos. 9 and 11. The relatively large size of the 21 percent support for the breaking of the objectivity and fairness rules (No. 8) in order to expose "bad guys," may be ascribed to the fact that the Watergate scandals were still large in the press while these interviews were being conducted. Acclaim for the newspapers most responsible for breaking the news was almost unanimous. Some of the newspaper
reporting that helped lead to the Nixon and Agnew downfalls, however, notably many of the Washington Post's, breached the old rules by publishing unattributed accusations and even accounts from grand jury sessions, maintenance of the secrecy of which is a fundamental precept of American democracy, not to mention decent newspapering. It is suggested that fewer Ohio statehouse reporters would support this advocacy statement were a poll taken a year later in calmer days.

That there was doubt in the minds of the six men who supported No. 8—not to mention possible schizoid symptoms—is quite evident in the fact that none of them voted for No. 13, which advocated discarding the objectivity tenet because it is impossible to achieve objectivity. One cannot without extreme dissonance be in favor of both No. 8 and No. 13. On the face of it, they are irreconcilable.

Finally, the statehouse correspondents unanimously repudiated the radicalism of No. 14. Some of them remarked that, on the contrary, the scandal's denouncement proved the system's strength, proved it a success.

(The strongly agree and strongly disagree assessments of the statements here were scattered in twos and threes over 10 of the statements, making them of little significance.)

Knee Jerk Liberals or Conservatives

A set of provocative, some inflammatory, statements designed to elicit attitudes rather than studied opinions,
indicated the corps generally had a liberal rather than a conservative cast (Table 22). But not by a great margin. The statements were a mixture about matters then in the public mind, such as marijuana, abortion, sex, student riots, police authority, welfare, black rights. It was hoped that this presentation would test for doctrinaire liberalism and conservatism, on the political, moral, economic planes. The black rights responses could have been compromised by backlash over the busing turmoil in Boston. James S. Coleman, University of Chicago sociologist complained that his theories were being cited in some courts as authority for judicial forced busing, although he had warned in 1972 that his conclusions were being misapplied. A similar skewing was possible in respect to the welfare statements, which instead of being about a sort of Rooseveltian welfare-ism suddenly drew new connotations following revelations of welfare system frauds.

Ten of the statements, the writer believed, would more likely have been responded to affirmatively by liberals. Of these, the statehouse correspondents affirmed seven, responded negatively to two, and split 50-50 on one. Their liberal choices averaged 71 percent favorable.

The writer believes that the automatic liberal response to eleven other statements in this set would be negative. On these, the correspondents signified negatively to eight, and positively to three. These responses lean to liberalism
### TABLE 22

**DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THESE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The federal government is getting too powerful</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The government should help underprivileged groups with special programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It's probably to everyone's best interests if black people live in white neighborhoods</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The law should allow anyone who wants to to get an abortion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On the whole, more good than bad resulted from the students riots of the 1960s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social security benefits should be increased</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The welfare system as now set up encourages deadbeats</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Welfare payment should be increased</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gilligan was a better governor than Rhodes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The government ought to help pay everyone's medical bills</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. America should spend whatever is necessary to have a strong military force</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Marijuana should be legalized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Television has become too powerful a molder of public opinion and should be toned down</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22 CONTINUED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Pct. Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Busing should be used as a means of racially desegregating public</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Court rulings give the criminal too much protection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. More free sexual practices make for a healthier society</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A woman's place is in the home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Most people on welfare could take care of themselves if they really</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The police ought to have more authority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Blacks who want to work can get ahead just as easily as anyone else</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The United States should get out of the United Nations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Weaknesses in our system of government, such as the election of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified men, indicate that the system has finally failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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by 83 percent.

(One statement in the set was not evaluated.

It is No. 9 in the above table.)
On the ten statements the writer believes the liberal
would respond to positively, here is the way the corre­
spondents reacted:
Government should help the underprivileged . . .
It's beneficial for blacks to live in white
a r e a s ......................................... 79%
Anyone should be able to get an abortion
. . . .
Student riots brought more good than bad
. . . .
Social security benefits should be increased . .
Welfare payments should be increased ...........
Government should help pay medical bills
. . . .

89%

75%
71%
70%
63%
56%

The liberal response to the eleven expressions that the
writer believes would draw negative reaction by the liberal
follows the negative percentage indicated:
Weaknesses indicate government system has failed 100%
United States should leave the United Nations
. 100%
Blacks can get ahead as easily as anybody else . 93%
The police ought to have more authority
. . . .
93%
People on welfare could take
of
. . 82%
A woman's place is in the h o m e .....................78%
Courts give criminals too much protection
. . . 66%
Television is too powerful, should be toned down
54%
The five propositions on which the correspondents indi­
cated conservatism, are these, with the percentage of con­
servative vote shown:
Federal government is getting too powerful . . .
89%
Freer sex practices [do not] make society
h e a l t h i e r .........................................70%
Welfare system [does] encourage dead beats . . . 68%
Busing should [not] be used for desegregation
. 65%
[Should] spend for strong military force . . . .
58%
The percentage showing a preference for the overall 15
liberal statements was 78.

Favorable response to the


five statements considered expressions of conservatism was 70 percent.

An unexpected conservative reaction was approval (89 percent) given to "The federal government is getting too powerful." This is a direct refutation of the Huntley model that includes acceptance of big government.

Appropriate to the liberal-conservative state here examined is the correspondents' denial of the statement that, "Richard Nixon was hounded out of office by the lying news media." (See Table 23, Page 213.) Only a rigor mortised conservative could maintain that rationalization, yet there were conspicuous individuals in central Ohio who cherished it during 1974 and 1975. Not one of them, however, was a statehouse correspondent. They voted 100 percent against it.

The overall liberal tone established by the political writers on this set of twenty-two expressions would not place them among the "liberal to radical" coterie that is Moynihan's model. The Ohio correspondents' state is mixed—which follows the ambivalent paradigm already consistently drawn—and would place them at about the middle mark on a liberal continuum.

Pinpointing Advocacy-Neutralism

QUESTION: With which of these statements do you agree?

(See Table 23.)
TABLE 23  
ADVOCACY-NEUTRALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A newspaper should not communicate unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without giving the accused a chance to reply.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special articles and reports devoted to advocacy or the writer's own conclusions and interpretations should be labeled as such.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Newspapers should not pander to morbid curiosity about details of vice and crime.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth violates the spirit of American journalism.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Newspapers should not run a story adverse to anyone without allowing the person to reply in the same story or explaining in the same story why a reply is not included.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For society as a whole, the opinion in Times v Sullivan is a good one.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. And the same is true of the opinion in Walker v Associated Press.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It's all right for newspapers to reveal damaging information about public officials so long as the reporter knows his facts are true but he technically could not prove them in court.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Testimony being presented to grand juries may be published if it is in the public interest to do it.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 23 CONTINUED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Any person who is connected in a newsworthy way with a story, however damaging, should expect to have his part made public in the newspapers without recourse to damages</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Persons who are unfavorably reported on in newspapers should have the right to reply with equal space and equal placement of their story</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public figures—persons in the public eye so to speak—should expect unfavorable reports to appear about them, even if they are not accurate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Newspapers should not publish stories adverse to anyone that are attributed to unnamed sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. An arrogant and overbearing tone has crept into newspaper reporting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The libel laws protecting public officials are too strict</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Journalism is not a public service endeavor such as medicine or education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Advocacy journalism is good journalism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is better for society that a few are hurt in order to bring one crooked official to justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Advocacy journalism, even if it occasionally misleads, should be practiced by every responsible newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 23 CONTINUED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. It is all right to print uncorroborated material about a public official when the reporter hasn't had time to verify for accuracy</td>
<td>0 29 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Richard Nixon was hounded out of office by the lying news media</td>
<td>0 29 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ohio statehouse correspondents exhibit their familiar ambivalence in examining the above list of statements relating to activist-neutralist newspaperman roles, and advocacy-objective journalism. They firmly support neutralism on ten statements, with percentages ranging from 54 to 100, having a median between 89 and 93 percent. Articles devoted to advocacy, they believe, should be so labeled, and they believe also that:

Persons accused in news stories should be allowed to reply; knowingly erroneous editorials violate the spirit of American journalism; persons adversely affected by news stories should be allowed opportunity to explain in the same stories; persons harmed by news stories should have recourse to seek damages; even public figures should not have to expect inaccurate material to appear about them in newspapers; exposing one crooked official is not justification for hurting innocents; uncorroborated material about public figures should be verified before publication.

On the reverse of this coin, however, the corps lined up with the advocates by approving such actions as publishing legally unprovable material if the reporter "knows" it to be true; publishing grand jury proceedings "if it is in the public interest;" and publishing unattributed stories. Their support for these, however, was 61, 70 and 71 percent, significantly lower than support for the neutralist sentiments.
(Parenthetically, they rejected crime and sex sensationalism by 90 percent.)

So the ambivalence remained until the end of the interview. One obvious reason for it could be faulty wording of questions and statements that made for ambiguities and other lack or clarity. That such is true will remain for critics to discover. The writer believes it is indicative only of a true state of dissonance during a time of rapid changes in moral values in society as a whole; when unstructured activism on the part of everyone from grape peddlers to priests had become an accepted avenue by which to ram one's demands on the system; when worlds have been shaken and great feats performed by newspapers that did not adhere strictly to the old rules, thus bringing those rules more than ever into the examining room, and, finally, by a demonstrated lack of intellectualism that may have prevented the statehouse correspondents' examining themselves and producing reconcilable conclusions about their predilections, perceptions, attitudes, and opinions about themselves and their life's work.

On the most interesting and timely of the concepts looked at during the study--advocacy-objectivity--a final unequivocal conclusion was reached, when, after hours of oblique approaches to the subject, the final questionnaire asked point blank: do you agree.
that advocacy journalism, even if it occasionally misleads, should be practiced by every responsible newspaper?

and the Ohio statehouse correspondents answered no, 93 percent to seven; and

do you agree that advocacy journalism is good journalism?

and the Ohio statehouse correspondents answered no, 100 percent of them.
CHAPTER VII

FOOTNOTES

1These words were used by the late Henry Luce, co-founder of Time magazine, in explaining what the policy of the magazine was; reported to the author by Kenneth F. Gormin, who obtained the quote from Luce during an interview with him in New Orleans in 1950. Gormin, advertising executive, is a former New Orleans newspaper reporter.

2Coleman complained in 1975 that his work was being misused "...for legal arguments that I feel (and felt) were incorrect..." In The Public Interest (Summer, 1972, Coleman wrote, "I stated that I felt the results of the 'Coleman Report' were being and had been inappropriately used by the courts as a justification for affirmative integration...The results are relevant to the actions of school boards and legislatures...but not to the courts." The National Observer (August 23, 1975), p. 12.

3Blanchard, op. cit.
CONCLUSION

The primary research instrument would seem to be...the observing human intelligence, trying to make sense out of the experience. The researcher learns...by fleeting empathy which is followed by reflection and distance. He can use a good ear for the overtones in a social situation. Theodore Reik in Listening With the Third Ear describes how one may listen for some kinds of overtones...the journalist and the insightful political scientist get good interviews...because they know how to listen for such overtones.1

The overtones of a hundred hours of interviews with the Ohio statehouse correspondents tell one that these are people of quality. Their interest in their work, concern for its proper performance, and belief in the worthiness of their calling and of the political system that they are an integral part of, impart substance to the impact. So, also, does the sincerity of the approach they take to their tasks. There was no single representative of the old newspaper stereotype of the wise cracking, bow tied jumping jack with his press pass in his porkpie hat band and a pint on his hip. And, although their personalities ran the gamut, there was a notable absence of what was known in the vernacular of other
days as a jerk, the type currently familiar as a smartass. The clown would find no audience among these industrious practitioners. As in almost any group of newspaper people, there was much levity of a fair literary quality while at rest, but only sober craftsmanship when there was work to do. Of all forty-eight persons who were interviewed for the study, there were only two palpable deviates of other kinds—the one who responded often with "None of your damn business!", and the one who called on Christ with every response and who displayed a weariness unto breaking.

As pointed out in the running generalizations that thread through the text, the group included a short supply of intellectuals, intelligent and rational persons of a philosophical bent who wonder about the whys and the significance of matters beyond their daily activities. Few could formulate expressions about their roles. This is not to say they were not intelligent. They were. We did not measure intelligence except against a subjective experiential model, but as a group, the Ohio statehouse correspondents have no superiors among newspaper people met up with in that experience. They speak well, use a varied vocabulary, talk in completed sentences. One wonders who inserts the imbecile non sequiturs, the battered grammer, dangling fragments, and other graces of the new broken-English journalese that soils the newspapers of the 1970s. Certainly not these people.
People of quality. If the writer may be permitted another comment in an area of his expertise, there was none among them, except the two cited above, that he would not have been happy to hire were he still an editor and publisher.

Professionalism

Journalism, the author believes, is an art, not a profession, chiefly because it lacks original responsibility, a necessity for advanced education, and accountability that ultimately reaches to the public. Yet the study revealed a large measure of professional sentiment in the Ohio statehouse correspondents, mainly an attitude of public service, a feeling for the rights of the public, and a belief that newspaper people should meet certain standards of performance. They seemed to favor objectivity and detachment over outright advocacy, yet they exhibited an ambivalence by supporting some attitudes and practices thought to indicate advocacy. This ambivalence, these dual psychological states, would remain a phenomenon evident throughout the study.

SUMMARY

First we will summarize the findings, reminding the reader that our data is straight-run results.

Partisanship: Political Bias

As determined by self identification, kinship feeling, and/or voting records, the active correspondents were made
up of thirteen Democrats, eight Republicans, three independents, one socialist, three "neithers," and one refuser to answer. Voting records indicated that they were candidate oriented, issue oriented to a far lesser degree, and only slightly party oriented. Parential influence had been strong, and there were few partisan defections from the home alignment. The parents of most voted in every election, politics was talked in the home. The correspondents, beyond voting, were politically inactive.

Fourteen of the twenty-nine active reporters were liberals, thirteen were conservatives, one was a moderate (one refused), fairly representative of the cross-sectional state of Ohio. There was a splendid foul-up of liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats that also seemed to reflect the unusual political stance of Ohioans. It has been the writer's opinion that one can tell an Ohioan's liberal or conservative bias by listening to him talk a while, but one cannot tell from this what his party preference is. Former statehouse correspondents still working in newspapering, declared themselves two-to-one conservatives. They averaged 49 years in age, as compared with 29 for the active reporters; their median pay was $70 a week more than that of the actives. They were settled down "at home base." There was little congruence of partisanship-philosophy between a correspondent's employer and himself.
There was little pattern in the variety of statehouse news sources sought out by the correspondents. It seemed to be every man for himself, each with his own ponds for fishing out the daily news. Legislators and the house speaker were the functionaries most frequently named as sources. The most cooperative sources, however, were said to be the legislators and the heads of departments in the administration. Most reliable sources were the legislators, again, the lobbyists, in almost a dead heat.

The interest groups with which they most often came into contact were, in order, labor, manufacturers, and school boards and administrators lobbies. Thought to be the most powerful groups in the state were the Ohio Education Association, and the AFL-CIO, far outstripping the third and fourth place bankers and utilities.

The most reliable interest group was identified as the Ohio Education Association, followed closely by the AFL-CIO, with the remainder of the vote fragmented to give only one or two to sixteen other entities.

The former statehouse correspondents most often talked to the governor, a source not even mentioned by the active reporters. Most cooperative sources named by the former capital writers were legislators, as with the actives, but
department deputies not department heads as with the actives. Their most reliable source had been legislators and lobbyists, the same as for the actives.

The utilities, Ohio Education Association, labor, and manufacturers were the interests most often talked with. The OEA and the utilities were voted the most powerful in the state during their Columbus tenures. No lobby was voted the most reliable by the former reporters, with seven newspaper people responding "none," and the remaining six naming six different interest groups.

As did the former reporters, the retired men said that they most often talked with the governor. Each named a different source as his most cooperative, and two of the six said the governor was the most reliable.

Among interest groups, the retired correspondents most often saw the OEA and the utilities, which also were named as the most powerful groups.

The experience of the forty-eight correspondents covered a period of sixty years, from 1915 to 1975. During all that time, the OEA remained at the top of the list among the state's most powerful groups as seen by the statehouse correspondents.

Favoritism

Taboos and pets were said to be minimal. Only a few reporters said that they were expected by their superiors
either to soft-pedal or to give favored treatment to persons, issues, or institutions. The newspaper group representatives received more such orders than did the staff representatives of individual papers. There were favorite and anathematic subjects, but these were chiefly of a news judgmental nature. Self service favoritism may have been more blatant in the old days of the retired correspondents. The author believes, because he could speak the newspaper jargon of the respondents, and because of his experience, that he could discern the overtones, and he believes that the responses to these questions are valid.

Hinderances

Most of the correspondents harbored resentment that the copy they work so hard to produce was not given better space and display by their editors. This complaint among newspaper people is as constant as the gripes about the chow in the Navy, but it seemed to be a bit louder than usual among the statehouse correspondents.

Conscientiousness

The active and retired correspondents believed that they never were able to cover everything that they should have at the end of a work period. The former statehouse reporters, however, believed that they always covered everything. Neglected stories and types mentioned were
investigative-depth articles, coverage of the bureaus, features and follow-up pieces on stories already published.

Secondary Jobs

Thirty-eight percent of the correspondents engaged in paid writing for publications other than their employers. None said that this work created a conflict of interest. If there was a conflict, it probably would have been in finding time for the outside work.

Attitudes Toward Politicians

The correspondents were not cynics. They believed that there was "such a thing" as an honest politician, and 53 percent of them agreed that state politicians were the mental equals of themselves, and that politicians can be trusted.

Political Participation

Except for voting, the correspondents were virtually inactive in politics, and they believed that that was as it should be for them. The retired writers had taken a greater part in politics during their capital terms.

A decided trend toward conservatism was discovered. Half of the active correspondents said that they were liberals; one fewer than half said they were conservatives. And almost half of the conservatives said that they were growing more conservative, or that they had been liberals but had recently shifted. While the actives were half liberal,
the former capital correspondents were two-to-one conservative. The design of this study made no provision to deviate down pathways of opportunity, no matter how inviting, and it is the author's regret that this most alluring one had to be passed by. The shift could be the usual one of growing conservatism accompanying rising economic status and advancing age; or it could be that something in the experience of covering state politics had entered as a causal factor. The writer believes that one possible element may have been disappointment over a recent supposed-to-be liberal state regime that did not perform up to expectations. This would seem to be, however, if not frivolous, at least superficial cause for the shift. The former Columbus reporters mentioned the growing conservatism also. Is this shift to be noted among the press corps at other state capitals, or among other "non-political" individuals working close to the heart of the system?

Occupational and Job History

After gaining public affairs experience by covering local governmental entities for about three years, the correspondent received his assignment to the state capital. The median age of the Ohio corps was twenty-nine, the median pay $340 a week ($17,680 annually). They thought they were better paid than their employers' other experienced reporters. Seventy-nine percent had held the assignment less than five
years. Eighty-six percent had been graduated from college, the remainder had attended. Six had master's degrees. Forty-eight percent had graduated in journalism, 16 percent with political science as the major.

Twenty-four percent belonged to the American Newspaper Guild, but only one member said that he was a strong supporter of unionism. (No mention is made of a house union at one of the newspapers.) There was some correlation of salary level with age and tenure at the capital, but the closest correlation was with salary and total number of years of newspaper experience.

Only three of twenty-nine said that they wanted to remain as statehouse correspondents, an assignment they thought eventually would become stultifying. The most desirable jobs in newspapering, they believed, were those closely connected with political affairs and centered in Washington D. C. Although most of them had at one time or another thought of leaving newspapering, only one had done so, to return after a few years to his old employer.

The former statehouse reporters who remained in newspapering--twelve of the thirteen did so--were earning a median of $413 a week ($27,476 annually). Their median age was 49; 92 percent were college graduates, 25 percent had advanced degrees (one a doctorate), and a perhaps significant 82 percent had majored in journalism. A large 58 percent belonged to the union, but none said he was a strong
supporter of unionism. Nearly half believed a Washington assignment was the best in newspapering, but most seemed to be satisfied with a goal of moving still farther upward within their present organizations. One had left newspapering for a time. They had spent an average of five years at the statehouse.

Half of the retired correspondents—who averaged 72 years in age—had attended college and two had obtained degrees. All studied journalism. Their college experience would tend to make them nonconformist with the Moynihan-Pool model of yesteryear's newspaperman taking with him to the job an unadulterated working-man's set of attitudes, although four of the six had been sons of working class fathers. Two of the six had been Guild members, none was a strong unionism advocate. Four of the six thought that the statehouse assignment could be a fulfilling career job. Two had left newspapering but had returned. Only one thought a job covering Washington would be the best in journalism.

Life Styles

Only one of the actives and one of the former capital writers was living with a girlfriend, although six others had done so. The eight men all had joined a church during youth, but only one was now a regular attendant. Thirty-nine of the forty-eight total population had joined a church. None of the retired men, 46 percent of the former reporters,
and 24 percent of the actives said that they attended church a lot. Church membership was spread over twelve denominations and religions.

The active correspondents maintained close friendships with other newspaper people, almost invariably with colleagues working for the same employer. They claimed no friendships—the feeling was that it was a near insult to ask—with people engaged primarily in politics. The former newspaper correspondents showed no greater interest in having politician friends, but the retired men proudly claimed friendships with the great. On the basis of the restrictive definition of friend that was employed, they did not enjoy such. Their claiming so, however, may indicate that the older reporters engaged in a cronyism (see Pool) not evident among the former and active correspondents. Newspaper friendships were not shared with wives. Often the wives did not know the friend and/or the friend's wife. But friendships with persons outside journalism and politics—generally with neighbors—were more fully developed. The spouses also were friends, there were more frequent home visits back and forth.

A signal fact is the marital stability of the sample. Forty-one of forty-eight had been married, but there had been only two divorces among them (three, if we read "None of your damn business!" as an affirmative reply).

The wives of twenty-three percent of the active reporters worked outside the home; fifteen percent of the
formers' had done so; one of the six retireds' had also. This seems consistent with the recently reported increase in the flow of wives into the employed ranks.

Organizational membership was almost nil. Only three of the active and former correspondents belonged to a "social" club. None belonged to a civic club, although several had in the past. None belonged to a fraternal organization, although some had. Twenty of the forty-eight were military veterans, but none belonged to a veterans organization. Obviously, they were not joiners. But the retired men had been, with four of five respondents members of "social," civic and/or fraternal groups.

Life History

The Ohio statehouse correspondents were mid-Americans, only four having been reared outside Ohio and four of the states bordering it. Three of the four "outsiders," however, attended college in Ohio and adjacent states. Fourteen of the active reporters were raised in a rural or small town environment. Forty-one percent were sons of fathers who were in a tradesman-clerk-laborer status; only 17 percent were sons of professionals.

The corps was at least third generation American, with two exceptions whose parents were immigrant. Only three of the forty-eight had any descent from Eastern Europe. Ethnically the group was overwhelmingly Anglo, Celtic, and
Teutonic. All but seven attended public schools, the exceptions being six who went to Catholic or Lutheran schools, and one who attended a private prep school in the East. Favorite subjects were history and English. They were generally active in school affairs, took part in athletics, had odd jobs after school, on weekends and during summers. Only two were newspaper carrier boys, a noteworthy fact.

In college they were active in extracurricular affairs but only five took part in campus politics and only one of the forty-eight lettered in a varsity sport. They were C+ to B students. Thirty-two of them worked on their college newspaper, with nine serving as editor. Forty held outside jobs averaging 21 hours a week. Only one of the twenty-nine active correspondents had "always wanted to be" newspapermen, while six of the thirteen former statehouse writers and one of the retired were in this category. Eleven, the largest to take any one avenue to the vocation, entered newspapering by direct or indirect accident.

The percentage of working and clerk class fathers increased from 41 percent among the active correspondents, to 61 percent among the former, to 80 percent among the retired, partially filling Moynihan's model. But these people attended college—even three of the retired men did—and presumably they did not take to their jobs unadulterated working class attitudes, but attitudes at least overlaid with those of the upper middle and higher income classes.
There has not been, then, among the Ohio statehouse correspon
dents, the change in origin of newspaper people of which Moynihan writes. But they now were, however, solidly middle
to upper middle in residential status. They lived in
suburban homes or apartments. Ten of the twenty-nine rented,
eighteen owned or were buying homes, while "None of your
damn business!" maintained his integrity. Median rent paid
by the unmarried active correspondents was $200, and,
strangely, the median for the married was $170 a month.
The median value of homes was $36,500, ranging in value from
$20,000 to $60,000.

Traits

What do you think are the most important traits for a
top political reporter to have? In analyzing, translating
into parallel expression, and classifying the correspondents'
replies to this question, the following emerged as the
most important:

1) Knowledge-experience
2) Aggressiveness-industriousness
3) Fairness
4) Intelligence

To probe further, the interviewer asked successively:
"Who among the Ohio statehouse correspondents do you admire
the most?" and "Who among...[them]...is so respected that
his judgment of what is important influences the others?"
The correspondents then were asked to cite the outstanding
qualities of the writers they had chosen. The qualities most frequently mentioned, with none having a decisive edge, were:

1) Knowledgeability-training
2) Aggressiveness
3) Clarifying ability
4) Freedom to choose subjects
5) "Clout"
6) Enthusiasm
7) Writing style

Knowledge, experience, training, which have been integrated into one attribute, was at the top of both lists. "Adversary attitude" received only one mention, and the venerable virtue of fairness was ranked third among their most important traits.

"Freedom" in this second list meant being so fortunate as to have superiors who allowed the correspondent to write what he wanted to about almost any subject he chose. "Clout" meant working with a newspaper large enough—or having a column widely enough disseminated—so that one's work could make an impact upon the state's citizens and politicians.

One man responded with a statement deserving of a second notice. He chose himself as the one most influential leader of the pack, and the reason, he said, was because, "I have a respect for the system and the people in it. I think that is the professional ideal." Indeed, it very well may be.
The writers were asked to name the three persons in all American journalism—not only newspaper journalism—that they most admired and to muse on their outstanding traits. From the mixture offered in reply, the following were chosen:

1) Clarifying ability
2) Writing ability

Knowledgeability is presumed to be a characteristic of the top level journalists named, while clarifying ability, or expository talent, which was high on the list of traits of the most influential Ohio statehouse writer, becomes No. 1 trait of the national leaders. Writing ability, rather far down the list in listing for statehouse reporters, apparently sets apart these nationally distinguished journalists from their cousins at the statehouse.

SOME SPECULATIONS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF ROLES

The social sciences have not yet found a way to prove that attitudes cause behavior. Yet the assumption is so strong and the connection so often is taken for granted, that the attitude-behavior linkage almost speaks for itself. We here make the assumption that behavior is determined to some degree by attitudes, and, in our specific case, that the roles played by the statehouse correspondent determine to some degree what he chooses to cover (other than the day's run of news and the items that need localization for his circulation area), and, more importantly, how he chooses to cover it. The observer role player, for example (also called
the reporter) will simply state the facts as they appear on
the record, will list the who, what, where, when, but will
present a balanced "why" by summarizing both sides, if "why"
or another element is in contention. The activist, the
advocate, on the other hand, will tend to choose items for
coverage about which he has viewpoints, and his reportage
will be infused with that point of view. The extreme advocate
will not attempt balance, will not report the views, the
persons, the issues, the events or any other factor that
offers opposition to his view.

Our speculation is that the newly assigned correspondent
arrives at the statehouse already established within a role,
whether or not he can articulate what it is. As he has no
written set of instructions with which to coordinate his
activities, he will set to work learning how to cover the
capital by watching and questioning his peers already in
the Press Room. It is likely that there will be a tendency
to copy the man who is most admired, to follow his lead and
to assume his roles. This will cause frustrations at
first because the most admired correspondent will be an
old-timer who has butted heads with his superiors and ex-
tracted from them a freedom to range a broad field. The new
reporter will have that battle to wage on his own. Person-
ality of course will play a part in the choosing of a role
model. There will be newcomers with personalities antipodal
to that of the most admired. Some of them will seek kindred
personalities with which to identify, from which to learn, and, it is reasonable to speculate, whose roles to imitate.

What happens with the correspondent's copy once it reaches the hands of the editor whose responsibility it is, will depend, of course, on the weight the correspondent has been able to amass, and the roles played by the editor. Some long-time statehouse reporters have created such a firm following among citizens and politicians that their copy is published virtually unchanged—or they are consulted about proposed changes before an editor sets pencil to the copy. This situation is an extreme. There probably were not more than two such "stars" at the Ohio capital. Editing of the copy of the remainder of the corps will be done by an editor—maybe more than one editor—whose own attitudes will govern how he shapes the material for publication. A transaction is conducted through which the correspondent learns, by what is deleted and what is appended to his copy, the expectations of the home office. We would speculate that this transactional flow also is a causal component that enters into originating, altering, and shaping the correspondent's attitudes and thus the roles that he plays in the system.

These people are gatekeepers, the new as well as the experienced correspondents, and the stories they decide to cover and the manner in which they do so—strongly influenced by their attitudinal stance, the roles they play—set the
agenda, establish the priority of issues by informing the public, and, perhaps even more importantly, by letting the politicians know what information they may have to react to. In this way, the statehouse correspondent is a co-originator as important probably in the political system as the politicians themselves. What the politician originates can die there on the floor if the press ignores it. What the politician regards as trivial can assume major consequence if, because of an angle seized upon by role playing correspondents', the public receives information that certifies it as important.

Roles

The inability of the correspondents to conceptualize their activities as roles was a basic justification for a conclusion, despite their intelligence and skill in a more or less cerebral calling, that they were not intellectually oriented. A gallimaufry of verbiage was received in response to the role and function questions. In classifying the responses, these were found to far outstrip others in importance:

1) Recorder of events
2) Observer
3) Watchdog
4) Interpreter of issues

Recorder and observer are neutralist roles. Watchdog can be said to possess activist or adversary tinges, yet it is ancient and honorable role than can be played within the
bounds of fairness. Interpreter also has activist vibrations, but it too is an old role, the heart of the kind of story known as a backgrounder, a depth story, and it can be played with fairness and without mounting the advocate's charger.

The former correspondents inserted a new role into their top four--agent, or representative of the people--along with interpreter, recorder, and observer. This also is an overall neutralist set.

The correspondents, in replying agree or disagree to a list of suggested roles, overwhelmingly rejected the advocate approaches of determining the "right" side of issues and publishing stories in support; of acting as censor; and of rallying the people behind shared state goals, the former vote rejecting Pool's absurd suggested role. These formulations gained the support of from 10 to 17 percent of the active corps. The corps agreed with, however, by 100 percent, the neutralist functions to discover and publish the truth, and to interpret governmental processes; by 97 percent, to inform, and to provide balanced and accurate news about government; and by 97 percent the gently activist role to act as watchdog, to dig out evidence of governmental incompetence, error, and wrongdoing.

Psychological States

The correspondents' station on the liberal-conservative continuum apparently had little correlation with "who they
are. Studied side by side, liberals and conservatives looked almost identical, or at least like brothers. This seems to be the Ohio condition generally. Liberals and conservatives alike ran the age scale, the former from twenty-seven to forty-seven, the latter from twenty-six to fifty-seven. Both groups had a median age of thirty-two years. Two liberals attended college in the Ivy League or "Little Ivy League," while one conservative did so. In all, three conservatives attended private colleges, two of them in Ohio, while a total of five liberals attended private colleges, two of them in Ohio, two of them institutions having religious affiliations. (All twenty-nine of the active correspondents attended college, although four did not graduate.)

Six liberals and six conservatives were sons of fathers of tradesman-clerk-laborer status in lower income ranks. Only one liberal was raised "in the East," all others being products of Ohio and bordering states. Two conservatives were raised in metropolitan areas of the East.

Of the five sons of professional men among the twenty-nine, only one professed to being a liberal, the other four espousing the conservative tilt. These are perhaps the only liberal-conservative data imputing a possible pattern, but data with only one sample will not move us to a conclusion. The one sample is the scion of upper income who attended an Ivy League college and turned out to be a liberal. This correspondent, even if his variables could be generalized
from, fills in only a small portion of the Moynihan-Pool profile: he does not regard the government as an enemy, he does not "believe" in big government, he does not think it more enterprising to criticize than to praise.

The Ohio statehouse correspondents have a firm self-esteem and sense of efficacy derived from their jobs. They do not elevate that job into one of prime public service, however. They do not believe that criticism is more enterprising than praise, repudiating the Moynihan-Pool paradigm, and they do not believe in breaking the old-fashioned newspaper rules of fairness and objectivity even to expose the "bad guys" in government. Nor do they support the infusion of a reporter's own views into news reports. On the other hand, a majority would publish damaging material even if the reporter could not prove its truth, would publish grand jury testimony and unattributed stories, all of which are directly in opposition not only to the self imposed rules of fair journalism, but in the case of grand jury testimony, to the spirit of the law itself.

Support for the "fairness" formulations throughout the interviews ran ahead of support for the advocacy attitudes, yet ambivalence is indicative of a duality of psychological states apparent from beginning to end. The author believes that journalism rides a dilemma, the two horns of which are advocacy and neutralism, and newspapermen will not soon be able to disengage. The irreconcilability of the two states
may be a contributory factor in the non-intellectualism of the Ohio statehouse correspondents. Self searching and self criticism are elemental in the intellectual cast of mind, but self searching would force the correspondents face to face with the dissonance causing duality. One way to ease the discomfort of dissonance is to ignore the conflicting elements. The duality was not only a group state but existed individually in each respondent. No person was all neutral or all advocate. No correlations were evident between responses and demographic or experiential variables, just as none was evident between liberal or conservative biases and the variables.

As we near the conclusion of the conclusion, the author is aware that the study has raised more questions than it answered. Maybe that is the nature of the dissertation beast. It is hoped that a starting point has been marked for deeper probes into the animus of the men and women whose work furnishes much of what the American citizen knows of the system that reconciles the demands on, compromises the conflicts in, allocates the values for, and imposes order upon the society in which he lives.

The author also reminds himself that the end he has reached is not the discovery of who are the statehouse correspondents and who do they think they are, but a giant step short of that: who the statehouse correspondents say they are, and who the writer thinks that they say they
think they are. The test for who they truly are would require, among other techniques, content analysis of the raw copy as it comes from each reporter's typewriter, and even then it would be matched and measured against a control only arbitrarily conceived as a standard.

The study throughout nibbled at the core question of newspaper advocacy. At its end, the correspondents finally were asked outright: should responsible newspapers practice advocacy journalism, even if it occasionally misleads?, and is advocacy journalism good journalism? The response was no, by 93 percent, and no, by 100 percent. Our population, the statehouse correspondents, massively repudiated advocacy journalism. Yet a small voice had the last words:

   but an unresolved duality remains, nevertheless.
CONCLUSION

FOOTNOTES

1Dexter, op. cit., p. 152.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH STRUCTURE
QUESTIONS ASKED OF THE CORRESPONDENTS

Identity Code _____

Name of Respondent. Home address.

Name of Employer.

Code _____

Date

OCCUPATIONAL

01) What is your job title or description?
02) What percentage of your time do you spend covering state politics?
03) Is your office a union shop? If yes, which one?
04) Do you belong to the union?
05) If no: If you have ever belonged to a union, which one was it?
06) Would you consider yourself a strong ____ so-so ____ or weak ____ union supporter?
07) How long have you had your present assignment?
08) How long have you been with this newspaper or service?
09) Let's trace your job history: What non-newspaper jobs have you had since you were 18?
010) What other newspaper jobs have you had? Name of paper, where, duties, pay.

011) What was your first job assignment with your present employer?

012) List in order the other assignments you have had with your present employer and the pay for each.

013) What job on your paper or elsewhere do you want next?

014) What do you consider the most desirable job on your newspaper or service?

015) What do you think is the best job in American newspaper journalism? Give title, specific newspaper or service.

016) What job are you working toward ultimately, or do you believe your present job will make a fulfilling career?

017) Does the possibility of libeling someone occur to you when you write something unfavorable about the person?

018) Have you thought of leaving the newspaper or news service field? If yes, into what other field(s)? Why?

019) Do you have a close friend or friends who is/are a journalist? If yes, who is/are he/they?

020) What is/are his/their positions?

021) How often do you see each in the course of a week's work?
022) When was the last time you visited his/their home?
023) When was the last time he/they visited your home?
024) Are your wife/husband and his/theirs close friends also?
025) How often do you see your friend/friends on purely social occasions?
026) Do you have/or have you had a close friend/friends who is/are politicians? If yes, who is/are he/they and what are their positions?
027) How often do you see each other in the course of a week's work?
028) When was the last time you visited his/their home?
029) When was the last time he/they visited your home?
030) Are your wife/husband and his/theirs close friends also?
031) How often do you see your friend/friends on purely social occasions?
032) How many people other than journalists and politicians would you say are close friends? Who; what do they do?
033) How often do you see each other during a week?
034) When was the last time you visited his/their home?
035) When was the last time he/they visited your home?
036) Are your wife/husband and his/theirs close friends also?
037) How often do you see each other on purely social occasions?

038) Broadly speaking, the politicians or political office holders of what job descriptions or titles seem to be the most cooperative with newspapermen? (If answer is "public relations people," ask who seem to be the next most cooperative.)

039) With what interest, or pressure, groups do you most often come into contact?

040) Which interest groups, would you say, are the most powerful in Ohio?

041) Who are your most reliable sources of information?

042) What interest groups are the most reliable sources?

043) What politician or office holder or political employee or worker do you talk with most often in covering your beat?

044) What next most often?

045) Third most often?

046) What kind of stories do you know your paper or service wants soft pedaled?

047) What kind given the full treatment?

048) At the end of a shift, do you believe you have covered every story you should have? Always Most of the time Sometimes

049) Because of lack of time or other reasons, what kind of story in what areas of the news must you most often neglect?
What political party does your paper most often support?

Are there written instructions that tell you how your paper or service wants you to perform your job? If there are not, how do you know what rules to go by? What to emphasize? What to ignore or give a once over?

What freelance work do you do?

What freelance work have you done in the past?

Do you think this could have conflicted with your job?

What is your newspaper's or service's pay scale for your job? (Please remember that nobody but I will ever see this sheet in any way that it can be identified as yours. Your name, the name of your employer have been separated from your answers, and only I will ever be able to connect the name code with the answer code. I promise you complete confidentiality.)

What is your salary? (If hesitates or refuses, hand card and say, "Well, please tell me the letter on the card that shows your pay range.")

What percentage of the newsmen on your paper or service, do you think, make less than you do? How many make more?
058) How many of your colleagues covering the state legislature, do you think make less than you do? How many make more?

059) What newspaper that covers the statehouse, do you think, pays its correspondents best? Which one pays worst?

060) Which wire service do you think pays its correspondents the best? Which the least?

061) What outside income do you have? Sources Amounts (If hesitates or refuses to answer, hand him Card II and say, "Well, please tell me what letter on this card corresponds to income range.")

ROLES (of newspapermen), FUNCTIONS (of newspapers)

R1) What, in your opinion, is the proper role of the newspaperman who covers state politics? (If prompting needed over definition of role, ask what are the proper objectives of newspaperman.)

R2) Which Ohio statehouse correspondents do you believe come closest to performing this role? Next?

R3) What, in your opinion, are the most important functions the newspaper should fulfill in covering state politics?

R4) What Ohio newspaper do you think best performs these functions? Next?
R5) What Ohio newspaper do you think misses the widest in performing these functions? Next? Next?

R6) Are you hindered or inhibited in performing what you believe is your proper functions by any editor, executive, or policy of your newspaper or service? If yes, explain who, what and how?

R7) What do you think are the most important attributes or traits for a top political journalist to have?

R8) Who covering the Ohio statehouse comes closest to having these traits? Next? Next?

R9) Who among the Ohio statehouse correspondents do you admire the most? Next? Next?

R10) What three newsmen—not necessarily newspapermen—in all American journalism do you admire the most?

R11) What qualities seem paramount in these newsmen?

R12) Which among Ohio statehouse correspondents is so respected that his or their judgment of what is important tends to influence the other statehouse reporters?

R13) What are his/their outstanding qualities?

R14) Which of the following do you think are particularly important as roles of newspapermen and/or functions of newspapers? Hand the respondent List III. Just read off the letters identifying
the statements that you think are important.
(See Table 18 on page 192).

R15) Hand respondent list IV. Which of the following do you think are true? Just read me the letters identifying the statements in order and say "agree" or "disagree." (See Table 21 on page 202).

DEMOGRAPHY

D1) Age  D2) Sex  D3) Race  D4) Do you rent your home or are you buying it?  D5) Approximate value?
D6) How long have you lived there?  D7) How many places have you lived in the past seven years?
D8) What were your reasons for moving?
D7) Are you married?  D10) Have you been divorced?
D11) Or widowed?  D12) Do you live with a girl/boyfriend?  D12a) Have you ever?  D13) If you have children, what are their ages?
D14) If your wife/husband/boyfriend/girlfriend works, what is her/his occupation?
D15) Approximate income?
D16) Where were you born?  D17) Date  D18) Where did you "grow up?"  D19) Was this an urban, rural or semi-urban setting?  D20) What was its population?
D21) How many years of elementary school did you complete?  D22) How many years of high school did
you complete?  D23) Did you go to public schools?
D24) If no: Name, address of private school.

D25) What were your favorite subjects?  D26) What were your hobbies?  D27) Recreational activities?
D28) Extracurricular school-related activities?

D29) Did you work on the school newspaper?  D30) the year book?  D31) Any other school publication?
D32) Did you win scholastic honors?  D33) Athletic honors?  D34) What jobs did you hold, if any?

D35) Did you go to college?  D36) If yes, name of college, location.  D37) How many years did you complete?
D38) What degree or degrees?
D39) What was your major?  D40) Your minor?
D41) Do you remember your grade-point average?

D42) Did you regularly work for the college newspaper?
D43) The year book?  D44) Other publication?
D45) What positions did you hold on the publications?

D46) Did you have a scholarship?  D47) Full or what percentage?
D48) For how many years?  D49) What, if any, outside jobs did you have?

D50) How many hours a week did you average at work?
D51) What extracurricular school-related activities?

D52) Any scholastic, athletic or other honors?
D53) When did you decide to become a newspaperman?

D54) Why?  

D55) To what other vocations were you attracted?

D56) What jobs in what other fields have you held since leaving school?

D57) How long did you remain at each?

D58) What clubs do you belong to?

D59) Fraternal organizations?

D60) Professional organizations, societies?

D61) Social organizations?

SOCIALIZATION

S1) What was your father's chief occupation?

S2) Any others?

S3) What would you say was your parents' economic status? Upper income? Middle? Lower?

S4) What was your father's ethnic background?

S5) Your mother's?  

S6) What country was your father born in?  

S7) His parents?  

S8) What country was your mother born in?  

S9) Her parents?

S10) What was your father's religious background?

S11) Mother's  

S12) How often did your mother go to church? Almost never? A little? A lot?

S13) How often did your father go to church? Almost never? A little? A lot?

S17) What was your father's political preference, Democratic or Republican?  Other?  S18) Your mother's?  S19) Would you say your father was a strong Democrat/Republican/Other, so-so, or weak?  S20) Your mother?  Strong, so-so, or weak?

S21) Did your father vote in every election?  Sometimes, almost never?  S22) Did your mother vote in every election?  Sometimes, almost never?  S23) Did your parents talk politics in your presence?  A lot, a little, almost never?  S24) Aside from voting, were they very active in politics, somewhat active or inactive?

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

P1) Do you consider yourself a Republican?  Democrat?  Or other (what)?  P2) Do you consider yourself a strong Republican/Democrat/Other?  So-so or weak?  P3) If declares self independent:  Do you consider yourself closer to the Republicans or Democrats?  P4) What party's candidate did you vote for in the last gubernatorial election?  P5) In the gubernatorial election before that?  P6) If switched:  Why?  P7) What party's candidate did you vote
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for in the last presidential election? P8) In the presidential election before that? P9) If switched Why?
P23) Now, in politics, do you usually think of yourself as conservative or liberal? (Do not suggest other.) P24) Are you registered to vote?
P25) Do you belong or have you belonged to a political club or organization? P26) Do you give or have you given money or bought tickets or anything to help the campaign of a party or candidate? P27) Did you go to any political meetings, dinners, rallies or things like that, other than in doing your job? P28) Did you do any other work for any party or candidate? P29) If yes, who and what?
P30) Is there anything you particularly like about the Ohio Republican Party? If yes, what?
P31) Is there anything you particularly like about the Ohio Democratic Party? If yes, what?
P32) Is there anything you particularly dislike about the Ohio Republican Party? If yes, what?
P33) Is there anything you particularly dislike about the Ohio Democratic Party? If yes, what?

KESSEL

K1) What do you think is the most important or pressing problem facing the Ohio legislature and administration now?

K2) Why?

K3) What do you think the government should do?

PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICS

PE1) Do you believe most newspapermen covering the Ohio statehouse do so in a professional manner?

PE2) What, in your opinion, are the criteria of a profession as opposed to a trade? If stuck, how does a profession differ from just another way to make a living?

PE3) Which of the following statements do you agree with and which do you disagree with. (Hand over list V.) Please read the identifying letters and say "Agree" or "disagree" to each. (See Table 2, page 67.)

PE4) Now, I'll read some statements to you. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with each. (See Table 1, page 61.) Say to interviewee: We're getting near the end now.
ATTITUDE TOWARD POLITICIANS

Say to the interviewee: Here are a few statements that I'll read to you. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with each. Hand respondent list VII. (See Table 10 and 11, pages 101 and 102.)

ADVOCACY-NEUTRALISM

Hand the interviewee list VIII. Say to him: Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each on these statements. Read me the identifying letter and say "agree" or "disagree." (See Table 23, page 212.)

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE

LC1) I'll read some statements to you and ask you please to tell me if you agree or disagree with each. There are no right or wrong answers. Give me your first, gut reaction, without cogitation, because I want attitudes rather than reasoned opinions. Hand over list IX. (See Table 22, page 207.)

LC2) What would you say is the most conservative newspaper that covers the Ohio legislature and statehouse? The next most conservative? And the next?

LC3) What would you say is the most liberal newspaper that covers the Ohio legislature and statehouse? The next most liberal? And the next?
APPENDIX B

THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS,
SIGMA DELTA CHI

CODE OF ETHICS
(Adopted by the National Convention,
Nov. 16, 1973)

The Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, believes the duty of journalists is to serve the truth.

We believe the agencies of mass communication are carriers of public discussion and information, acting on their Constitutional mandate and freedom to learn and report the facts.

We believe in public enlightenment as the forerunner of justice, and in our Constitutional role to seek the truth as part of the public's right to know the truth.

We believe those responsibilities carry obligations that require journalists to perform with intelligence, objectivity, accuracy, and fairness.

To these ends, we declare acceptance of the standards of practice here set forth:

• RESPONSIBILITY: The Public's right to know of events of public importance and interest is the overriding mission of the mass media. The purpose of distributing news and enlightened opinion is to serve the general welfare.
Journalists who use their professional status as representatives of the public for selfish or other unworthy motives violate a high trust.

• FREEDOM OF THE PRESS: Freedom of the press is to be guarded as an inalienable right of people in a free society. It carries with it the freedom and the responsibility to discuss, question, and challenge actions and utterances of our government and of our public and private institutions. Journalists uphold the right to speak unpopular opinions and the privilege to agree with the majority.

• ETHICS: Journalists must be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know.

1. Gifts, favors, free travel, special treatment or privileges can compromise the integrity of journalists and their employers. Nothing of value should be accepted.

2. Secondary employment, political involvement, holding public office, and service in community organizations should be avoided if it compromises the integrity of journalists and their employers. Journalists and their employers should conduct their personal lives in a manner which protects them from conflict of interest, real or apparent. Their responsibilities to the public are paramount. That is the nature of their profession.

3. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published or broadcast without substantiation of their claims to news value.
4. Journalists will seek news that serves the public interest, despite the obstacles. They will make constant efforts to assure that the public's business is conducted in public and that public records are open to public inspection.

5. Journalists acknowledge the newsman's ethic of protecting confidential sources of information.

- ACCURACY AND OBJECTIVITY: Good faith with the public is the foundation of all worthy journalism.
  1. Truth is our ultimate goal.
  2. Objectivity in reporting the news is another goal which serves as the mark of an experienced professional. It is a standard of performance toward which we strive. We honor those who achieve it.
  3. There is no excuse for inaccuracies or lack of thoroughness.
  4. Newspaper headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles they accompany. Photographs and telecasts should give an accurate picture of an event and not highlight a minor incident out of context.
  5. Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free of opinion or bias and represent all sides of an issue.
6. Partisanship in editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth violates the spirit of American journalism.

7. Journalists recognize their responsibility for offering informed analysis, comment, and editorial opinion on public events and issues. They accept the obligation to present such material by individuals whose competence, experience, and judgment qualify them for it.

8. Special articles or presentations devoted to advocacy or the writer's own conclusions and interpretations should be labeled as such.

• FAIR PLAY: Journalists at all times will show respect for the dignity, privacy, rights, and well-being of people encountered in the course of gathering and presenting the news.

1. The news media should not communicate unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without giving the accused a chance to reply.

2. The news media must guard against invading a person's right to privacy.

3. The media should not pander to morbid curiosity about details of vice and crime.

4. It is the duty of news media to make prompt and complete correction of their errors.

5. Journalists should be accountable to the public for their reports and the public should be encouraged to
voice its grievances against the media. Open dialogue with our readers, viewers, and listeners should be fostered.

• PLEDGE: Journalists should actively censure and try to prevent violations of these standards, and they should encourage their observance by all newspeople. Adherence to this code of ethics is intended to preserve the bond of mutual trust and respect between American journalists and the American people.
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