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ABSTRACT

This study examined the nature of higher education news and how stories about higher education policy issues are constructed to better understand the influence of journalists' actions on the content of public deliberations of those issues. First, the project investigates how journalists write about state-level policy issues using framing analysis to examine the content of news stories. Second, it finds evidence of rhetorical devices and thematic structures embedded in the text. Third, some inferences are made about the relationship between media frames and policy outcomes.

Rhetorical devices and thematic structures help promote ideas and help audiences understand those ideas. These devices are part of a larger way to organize information, called frames. Frames are defined as cognitive devices used by journalists to organize large amounts of information, to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies.
Framing analysis, an interpretative content analysis, was used to examine 38 news stories published in two daily newspapers in Ohio. The stories covered three major higher education policy initiatives from 1992 through 1995.

Support for two of the hypothesis was found -- 1) Journalists were more likely to cover the political aspects of a policy proposal than the actual substance of the policy proposal as evidenced by the use of rhetorical devices; 2) Journalists were more likely to cover the concerns of policymakers than the concerns of education consumers, again as evidenced by rhetorical devices. State-level sources are not any more likely to borrow rhetorical devices from legislative sources than they were to borrow from campus sources. This, too, was evidenced by rhetorical devices in the news text.

This study found journalists' use of sources does shape stories and that journalists' choices of words presents or "frames" issues in a certain manner. If found that the relationship between the media and policymakers is a reciprocal one with each needing the other to do their respective jobs. And, finally, frames that appeared in the
news stories fit the policy outcomes linking news stories to policy outcomes.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are differing views on how media organizations provide news and information, in what form and to what ends (Bennett, 1988; Fallows, 1996; Gans, 1979; Kaniss, 1991; Linsky, 1986; Schudson, 1995; Tuchman, 1978; Underwood, 1993), but what remains certain is that the United States is a mass media society which impacts citizen's daily lives. Some believe the citizen-government relationship is the area in which mass media has the most influence (Cohen, 1963; Dunn, 1969; Gitlin, 1980; Kaniss, 1991; Linsky, 1986, 88; Reich, 1988).

The relationship between government and the media has been and continues to be an area in need of further understanding (Cohen, 1963; Dunn, 1969; Pico, 1985; Kingdon, 1984; Kaniss, 1991; Linsky, 1986, 1988; Protess and McCombs, 1991). Public policymakers and the media are not only fully enmeshed, but each actor relies on the other in order to do
his or her job. This relationship between policymakers and journalists (reporters and editors) is a symbiotic one: policymakers use the media as a source of information (Linsky, 1986) and reporters cultivate political sources for their stories (Gans, 1979). Media influence policymaking, policymaker interaction with the media improves coverage, and much of what the media write comes directly from policymakers (Gandy, 1982; Linsky, 1986). Journalists' actions are "a crucial influence on the nature and content of public deliberation" (p. 205, Linsky, 1988).

In order to better understand the influence of journalists' actions on the content of that important public deliberation, this study focused on the construction of news (Tuchman, 1972, 1978; Gans, 1979; Gamson and Modigliani, 1989; Entman, 1991) and the implications that has for public policy (Pan and Kosicki, 1993; McLeod, Kosicki, and Pan, 1991). Broadly, this study examined the nature of higher education news and how stories about higher education policy issues are constructed. (For another recent examination of this topic, See Public opinion, the press, and public policy, 1992, edited by J. David Kennamer).
Theoretical Framework

Journalists construct news every day. The content of the news stories themselves offer indications about how journalists create news -- what stories get published, how a story is structured, what comes first, second and so on, how long it is, what words describe the events or people being written about. Journalists don’t approach news haphazardly. They are guided throughout the news production process by work routines, socialization, organizational policies and external factors (Gans, 1979; Kaniss, 1991; Tuchman, 1972). But questions about news construction remain. How do journalists decide what is news? What choices do they make about whom to interview and how to structure a news story? The content of news stories has been used for decades to make inferences about news’ causes, effects, and characteristics (Holsti, 1969). This study uses the content of higher education news stories to examine how journalists construct news stories about state-level policy issues.

Public higher education, as subset of government, is an important area for a case study examining the construction of news and the impact of news on policy issues. For example, in the state of Ohio, higher education is a multi-billion dollar
industry and impacts nearly 700,000 students, faculty members, and administrators, as well as thousands of trustees, alumni and other interested individuals (Almanac, 1995, Chronicle of Higher Education). The Ohio State University alone claims an annual economic impact of more than $2.9 billion (The Ohio State University, 1992).

Higher education is often covered by the media as evidenced by the specific assignment of journalists to cover a higher education beat at the state's two largest newspapers. Individuals read and respond to that coverage in part because of its perceived personal and economic relevance. A type of mass communications research that examines the influence media has on its audience is termed agenda-setting research. Agenda-setting research has shown that the news media do not tell people what to think, but rather, such research has shown that the media tell people what to think about (McCombs and Shaw, 1972). The news media shape public knowledge by disseminating information people want, need, and should know (Tuchman, 1978). News transforms "mere happenings into publicly discussible events" (p. 3, Tuchman, 1978) and it does so through "a sociocognitive process involving all three players: sources, journalists, and audience members operating
in a universe of shared culture and on the basis of socially defined roles* (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). In essence, news is created, or constructed, through the interaction of three sets of players. Pan and Kosicki's (1993) model of the news media discourse process illustrates this.

Pan and Kosicki approach news stories or texts from a constructivist perspective: that is, they assume that news is created, or constructed, and negotiated by journalists, sources, and the public. News stories or texts are defined as systems of "organized significant elements that both indicate the advocacy of certain ideas and provide devices to encourage certain kinds of audience processing of the texts" (p.55-56, Pan and Kosicki, 1993). In other words, the way a news story is written helps promote some ideas as well as helps the audience understand those ideas. The current research examined news stories for evidence of the rhetorical devices and thematic structures that promote ideas and help audiences understand those ideas. Rhetorical devices include items like "professors back in the classroom", "boost teaching", or "more attention from senior faculty." These devices are part of a larger way to organize information, called frames.
Pan and Kosicki
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Figure 1. News media discourse process.
Goffman (1974) first conceived of frames as a way to classify, organize, and interpret occurrences in daily life in order to understand them. Frames are "interpretive schemata that simplify and condense the 'word out there’" (P. 137, Snow and Benford, 1992). Applying this concept to news, Gitlin (1980) conceives of frames as devices that organize the world for both the journalist and the audience:

"Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual" (p. 7, Gitlin, 1980).

Frames can be conceptualized in different, though overlapping conceptions and frames "function as both 'internal structures of the mind' and 'devices embedded in political discourse'" (Kinder and Sanders, 1990 in Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Frames are evident in news media text and different methods exist to document frames (Entman, 1991, 1993; Gamson and Modigliani, 1989; Gamson and Lasch, 1983; Gitlin, 1980), including the framing analysis method used in this study. Journalists use media frames as a way to manage all the information they collect. A news media frame is "a cognitive
device used in information encoding, interpreting and retrieving; it is communicable; and it is related to journalistic professional routines and conventions" (p.57, Pan and Kosicki, 1993). The proposed research project utilizes this news media characterization of framing. For the purposes of this study, frames are defined as cognitive devices used by journalists to organize large amounts of information, to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies. Journalists write stories using their personal frames and media frames appear in the text. This research examines media frames as characteristics of news stories.

Research Questions

Two interrelated questions guide this study. They are:

1. What media frames are evident in news coverage of state-level higher education policy issues in Ohio?

2. Does a relationship exist between media frames and policy outcomes?

Framing analysis can show "how an issue is discussed in the news and how the ways of talking about the issue are related to the evolution of the issue in political debates"
Framing analysis differs from other framing methods, but shares some similarities:

"First, unlike the traditional approaches to content analysis, framing analysis does not conceive of news text as psychological stimuli with objectively identifiable meanings (See Livingston, 1990); rather it views news text as consisting of organized symbolic devices that will interact with individual agents' memory for meaning construction. Second, framing analysis is not constrained with the content-free structuralist approach of news discourse. Rather, it accepts both assumption of the rule-governed nature of text formation (van Dijik, 1988) and the multidimensional conception of new texts that will allow for cognitive shortcuts in both news production and consumption. Third, the validity of framing analysis does not rest on researchers' resourceful readings of news texts (See Anderson and Sharrock, 1979). Rather, it retains the systematic procedures of gathering data in news texts in order to identify the signifying elements that might be used by audience members. Finally, framing analysis differs from its closest conceptual ally -- William Gamson's (1988) work on news discourse -- in that it does not assume the presence of frames in news texts.
independent of readers of the text" (p.58, Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

The implications of news framing are important to policymakers because news is constructed through the interaction of sources, journalists, and audience members (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Policymakers have an opportunity to shape a news frame through information subsidies (Gandy, 1982; Turk, 1986, 87), but once established, a news frame can thwart any changes in policy as seen in the Gulf incident (Entman, 1991). Policymakers must pay close attention to efforts to frame news -- their own and that of journalists.

Three hypotheses are tested in this research. They are:

Hypothesis 1

Journalists are more likely to cover the political aspects of policy proposals than the actual substance of policy proposals.

Hypothesis 2

Journalists are more likely to cover the concerns of policymakers in higher education news stories than to cover the concerns of consumers.
Hypothesis 3

State-level sources are more likely to borrow rhetorical devices from legislative sources than they are to borrow rhetorical devices from campus sources.

Scholars and policymakers alike worry that the public is not receiving a complete story of the workings of government and that public policy is hampered by incomplete information (Kaniss, 1991; Keefer, 1993; Linsky, 1988; West, 1994). The media provide most people with their information about government (Orren in Linsky, 1986). Gaining knowledge from the news media can be thought of as a form of adult education. If that information is lacking in any way, serious implications for policymaking abound, including solving public problems (Linsky, 1988). This study investigates the media-policy process link by examining how journalists construct news stories about higher education policymaking.

Significance of the Study

In a representative democracy, citizens elect individuals to represent their interests in the work of government, including public higher education. Citizens rely on information from their elected officials, members of the
bureaucracy, and the media in order to be informed about their government services. For many Americans, however, media stories are their only source of information about governmental activity (Orren, 1986). A decade of research shows that the media shape public opinion and public discourse (e.g. Gitlin, 1980; Kennamer, 1992; Lippmann, 1922; Linsky, 1986, 88) and can impact collective action (Gamson, 1992; Klandermans, 1992; Snow and Benford, 1992). Therefore, how the information is presented in news text is central to the public's understanding of an issue or a policy proposal, or perhaps even the outcome of an election, by influencing the standards by which officials and policies are evaluated (Iyengar, 1991). Mass media influence "not only how we talk about, but also how we think about" public policy issues (Kosicki, 1991):

"Media influence the bases on which our thinking and talking about public policy issues take place. In this framework (framing analysis), consistent with both the interpretive sociology and cognitive psychology, individuals are positioned as active agents. They are engaged in activities of thinking and talking about public policy issues. Mass media function to provide the raw materials, conceptual
frames and vocabulary for such cognitive and communication activities. As a result, the mass media are no longer to be treated as the causal agents in the sense of a stimulus-response model; rather, they are placed more realistically in the position of providing the informational, conceptual as well as semiotic contexts for which individuals carry out their public-policy reasoning activities. Media discourse concerning public policies supplies the materials and signs of public discourse and contextualized cognitive processes of policy reasoning* (Kosicki, 1996).

Framing analysis is one way to look at how this information is presented. Traditional content analysis could be used to analyze news stories, but it lacks the interpretive nature that is inherent in framing analysis:

". . . Framing analysis ... calls for an interpretive approach rather than an explanatory approach toward the data. Researchers are in the position to mediate via sociological concepts between actors' activities and their consciousness (Giddens, 1984), to make sense in a sociological concepts of what the actors are doing and what they think they are doing.

How information is presented through the news media is important to policymakers as well as to the public.
Policymakers use the media to test reactions to policy proposals and to garner public support for programs and policies. Mass media influence public opinions by how it frames issues (Iyengar, 1991). Public opinion and support is important to policymakers, so they employ strategies in order to shape the framing of news coverage to best represent their proposals, policies, or programs (Bennett, 1988; Gans, 1979; Kaniss, 1991; Stegall and Sanders, 1986).

Frames appear in at least four locations in the news production process -- the communicator's message, the news text, the public's interpretation, and the culture of shared beliefs among the communicator, journalist, and the public (Entman, 1993). This study focuses on the frames located in news text.

The way journalists use framing devices in news stories can have a great impact on the policy-making process (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989). For example, news stories about the faculty workload policy proposal in Ohio used phrases like "spend more time", "hike time", or "too little time", to characterize the issue. The final policy outcome did indeed do what those characterizations called for -- it increased the
percentage of time faculty were required to spend in the classroom.

Framing analysis offers an interpretative approach to very complex issues. Higher education policy is replete with complex issues in general, and funding issues in particular. The recent Ohio Board of Regents Managing for the Future task force report was initiated because of funding issues. As a policy document, the report arrives when there is close scrutiny of the use of state dollars by the Governor and the Ohio General Assembly, and at a time when Ohio dollars per student have averaged 17-20 percent below the national average for more than a decade (Goodman, 1992).

This is the first work to use framing analysis to examine news coverage of statewide higher education policy issues in Ohio. Ohio is an excellent state to study because of the size, diversity, and financing of its higher education system.

Ohio has 13 state universities with 24 regional campuses, two medical schools not affiliated with a university, four state community colleges, 19 other two-year public colleges and 68 independent colleges and universities. More than 530,000 students participate in higher education at some level from attending a two-year community college to a major
research university. Ohio ranks 6th in the nation in terms of the percentage of the state operating budget that is devoted to higher education (Ohio Board of Regents, 1991).

The Managing for the Future Task Force report, a major policy document which was a year in the making, offers recent policy initiatives to study, many of which have been the Ohio Board of Regents' priorities for several years as evidenced by their appearance in Ohio Board of Regents' Master Plans (Treyens, unpublished, 1993). The Task Force which wrote the report was created by the Ohio Board of Regents at the request of Governor George Voinovich to examine the "workings" of the state's public higher education system.

Broadly, this study will add to the understanding of framing in the news production process by adding another case study to the existing work on framing. Reform in higher education exists throughout the nation. A case study of Ohio is important on its own merit as a historical look at higher education. It offers state policymakers an increased understanding and a different perspective on their work. And, it provides an example to consider when examining similar ongoing activity in many others states. Additionally, many more case studies are needed in mass communications:
"... case studies are particularly likely to yield the rich contextual data that is necessary to the deep understanding of the construction of these issues and their contexts, and their multifaceted links to media (e.g. Trumbo, 1995; Friedland, 1996; Best, 1995; Goode and Ben-Yuhuda, 1994; Gusfield, 1981; Nelson, 1984; Pertschuk and Schaetzel, 1989, Protess et al, 1989)" (Kosicki and Pan, 1996).

More knowledge about the relationship between the media and the policy process may lead to increased flow of information both to and from journalists and sources and to better link the public to the higher education policy-making process (Kaniss, 1991). This study will help both policymakers and journalists better understand media production -- specifically the use of news media frames in higher education news. This increased understanding will allow policymakers to give media information in ways that present the sender's message and it will help journalists enhance news coverage by understanding their own use of framing devices. Although it is the responsibility of the participants to decide if and how to improve news media coverage of higher education policy issues, it is necessary to
examine coverage of higher education policy issues, and by so doing to understand, and identify problems in that coverage.

Design of the Study

Since the 1970s, a great deal of mass communications research has focused on media effects (Becker, 1975; Becker, Blood, and Greenwald, 1984; Becker, McCombs, and McLeod, 1975; Cook, Tyler, Goetz, Gordon, Protess, Leff and Molotoch, 1983; Kosicki and McLeod, 1990; Lazarfeld, Berelson and McPhee, 1944; McCombs and Shaw, 1972, 1977; Protess and McCombs, 1991; Nelson, 1984; Weaver, McCombs and Spellman, 1975), and recently, the discipline has developed a renewed interest in media performance -- the news production process (Bennett, 1988; Gans, 1979; Kaniss, 1991; McQuail, 1992; Tuchman, 1972).

Government reporter-source relationships have been studied for more than 30 years to understand the news making process because media play an important role in providing citizens with information in a participatory democracy (Cohen, 1963; Dunn, 1969; Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989; Fico, 1985; Linsky, 1986; Stegall and Sanders, 1986). The use of framing analysis, however, is relatively recent and rapidly gaining acceptance in mass communications as a theoretical perspective.

News discourse is central to the framing of public policy issues and shaping of public debate (Gamson, 1988). Pan and Kosicki’s model, adapted for use here, provides a method to "examine news discourse with the primary focus on conceptualizing news texts into empirically operationalizable dimensions... so that evidence of the news media’s framing of issues in news texts may be gathered" (p. 55). Like content analysis, it provides a systematic and rigorous way to handle large amounts of data using identical rules for data selection and recording. Case studies, such as this proposed work, are needed in this area to understand the shape/form, and size of news stories as well as their frames.

As with any theoretical perspective, however, framing analysis has some limitations. It is well-suited to interpretive studies, but the fit is less exact with traditional statistical analysis.
Data Collection

Stories from The Columbus Dispatch and the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer were chosen for three primary reasons: they are the only newspapers in the state to designate exclusively a reporter to cover state higher education issues; these two papers are widely read by policymakers; and they are circulated daily to nearly 700,000 Ohioans and almost one million on Sunday (Dispatch - 255,390 daily and 416,000 Sunday; Plain Dealer - 424,300 daily and 553,140 Sunday). The print medium was chosen for study because individuals gain much of their political knowledge from the print media (Becker, Blood and Greenwald, 1984; McCombs and Shaw, 1977) and because higher education policy issues are seldom covered by local television. Therefore, newspaper stories are of more importance to higher education policymakers because of circulation (availability to the public) and readership knowledge.

Public documents will be examined to provide a context for the news coverage and to add richness and detail to this case study. Documents which detail or explain the report and its recommendations, include the Regents' Managing for the Future report; Securing the Future report, State of Ohio
biennial and capital budgets; public comments by the chancellor, governor, and Managing for the Future task force chairman. Other public documents which provided background on the issues contained in the report were examined as well including other public documents from the Ohio Board of Regents, the Legislative Office of Education Oversight, and Ohio's colleges and universities.

Because multiple methods enhance framing analysis, and qualitative methods in particular (Kosicki and Pan, 1996), two reporters (one from each newspaper) were interviewed about the nature of their work to add a first-person perspective to this study.

Chapter Two presents a review of the appropriate literature. Chapter Three offers the methodology followed to conduct this study. Chapter Four will present the results of the analysis. Chapter Five is a case study of the workload policy issue. Chapter Six presents the conclusions and limitations as well as recommendations for further work.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to this study and provides formal definitions for the terms which support the broad hypothesis that journalists frame higher education stories in ways that can impact the policy-making process.

While news can be defined as information transmitted from sources to audiences (Gans, 1979), it has several characteristics that set it apart from other media, such as books or movies. News has "particular qualities: it needs to be new, timely, and dramatic; it helps if there are elements of conflict and if it has short-term rather than long-term interest" (Linsky, 1976). News can be anything "new, dramatic, and is visible or audible, such as an event or something sensational" (Linsky, 1988). It is a "depletable consumer product made every day" (Tuchman, 1972).
News also provides "a window on the world" (Tuchman, 1978) by trying to present an accurate picture of reality on which the citizen can act. News gives happenings their "public character" as it changes them into public discussion (p. 3, Tuchman, 1978) and "it claims the right to interpret everyday occurrences to citizens and other professionals alike" (p. 5). News tries to explain the world to its citizens. Its ultimate criterion is "the potential for audiences to learn about reality" (p. 197, McQuail, 1992).

There is a tension between these two ideas of news that creates an ambiguity about what news is. This ambiguity is related to individual media organizations' and journalists' sense of newsworthiness. Hence, a journalist from ABC World News Tonight and one from The McNeil-Lehrer Report may agree on what is news in some cases but not in others.

The qualities of news are important to understand because they impact the interactions of sources and journalists and how journalists do their jobs. For example, the time element in news can impact how and when a journalist writes a story as the following vignette illustrates. Journalists call the type of decision-making illustrated below "news judgment."
A Statehouse journalist is following two pieces of legislation -- one was just introduced and would have far-reaching impact on technology in schools while the other died that day in committee.

Both have news value, but the journalist has two hours until deadline and must prioritize writing the two stories. The journalist knows the school-technology legislation will move from committee to the House floor to the Senate and must make its way into the final budget bill before it becomes reality -- almost a three-month period. The journalist can afford to write a brief story about that legislation for tomorrow's paper while searching for information about other state's technology legislation, and seeking additional sources to interview for a later story.

The journalist still needs to write another story about a bill that died in committee. As the journalist schedules interviews for the day, the "dead" legislation receives priority because tomorrow it will not be news; it is depleted of value. The pending technology legislation has a longer life and does not need immediate attention. Journalists call the type of decision-making illustrated above, news judgment.
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News is a representation of "authority." In the contemporary knowledge society news represents "who are the authorized knowers and what are their authoritative views of reality" (p. 3, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989). The legislation mentioned in the vignette become news when they appear in a news story. They now have "public legitimacy" (p. 19, Schudson, 1995). The technology education initiative is just the "capitol talk" of a few special interests until it moves into the public discourse by appearing as a news story. Now it has legitimacy, it is "amplified" (Schudson, 1995) by the media and instead of 20 people knowing about it, 200,000 know about it. It has become "public knowledge" (p. 5, Schudson, 1995).

This interpretative approach to defining news sees both news and newsworthiness (the importance assigned to information or an event) as socially-created phenomena: i.e., they would not exist without interactions among individuals (Tuchman, 1978; Schudson, 1995). News is "the product of a social institution, embedded in relationships with other institutions," and it is created by professionals in a news organization (Tuchman, 1978). News is a form of contemporary
culture created by the interactions of sources, journalists, and audience members (Schudson, 1995). Each actor in the news creation process brings certain cultural aspects to the process that shape the end product, the news story. This research focuses on journalists' role in the news production process.

**News as Knowledge: A Constructivist Approach**

How journalists do their jobs impacts the public’s understanding of news text (Gans, 1979; Gitlin, 1980; Kaniss, 1991; Tuchman, 1978). These work practices, "standard operating procedures" (Kaniss, 1991), or "routines" are socialized behaviors that shape definitions of news, newsworthiness and objectivity (Gitlin, 1980; Tuchman, 1972). Journalists often don’t stop to think about how they do their jobs, they just do them, which embeds these practices into their daily work outputs. Sometimes these practices may be as simple as choosing words in a story, but the choices themselves may have much larger impacts.

Tuchman cites the use of the phrase "bra burners" in early coverage of the women's movement as an example of how "in the process of describing an event, news defines and shapes that
event" (p. 184, Tuchman, 1978). In other words, meaning is constructed by how the story is "framed" and sometimes the specific words used in the news story. Pan and Kosicki call this action "rhetorical choices." Or, in a current example, the way the media portrayed the "ebonics" issue. Most news coverage tended to reverse the program's intent, implying that schools were teaching Black English, rather than using Black English to teach Standard English.

The term "bra burners" used in the 1970s portrayed members of the women's movement as challenging norms, including women's undergarment norms. By coining the term "bra burners" and using it to describe members of the women's movement, the movement became characterized as radical because women who would make a spectacle of themselves using their undergarments as a symbol of lack of freedom were acting in a radical manner. The act of burning bras may have challenged common decency at the time, but in reality, the term "bra burners" provided a derogative but distinctive characterization for members of the women's movement. Similar words have fallen into symbolic media use -- pro life, anti abortion, Cold War, anti-nuclear, draft dodgers. These words represent much more
than simple description of people, events, or conditions. They suggest whole concepts or ideologies.

Word choice is one way to use framing in a news story. Standard operating procedures based on the qualities of news are another. For example, due to the timeliness of news, journalists must make decisions about "validity and reliability or 'truth'" almost immediately. They rely on a routinized notion of objectivity to "minimize the risks imposed by deadlines, libel suits, and superiors' reprimands" (p. 662, Tuchman, 1972). By verifying facts, presenting conflicting possibilities (aka "both sides of the story"), presenting supporting evidence, using direct quotations, and structuring stories in a certain sequence, journalists believe they are objectively reporting news (Tuchman, 1972). By embedding or establishing the routine news gathering practice of obtaining more than one perspective into daily activities, journalists create a certain structure for news stories. Typically a story begins with a claim and then a counter claim is presented. By following this claim-counterclaim structure, a journalist will present the information as unbiased or objective. Training and on-the-job socialization embed this

This operationalization of objectivity, however, doesn't require that the second perspective receive equal treatment nor does this method of creating objectivity take into consideration that the perspective presented first often becomes the salient or meaningful perspective to the audience.

For example, many perspectives may exist on college tuition increases, but we'll look at two of them here -- that of a university president and that of a student. Audiences, and more importantly, editors tend to accept the president's rationale for tuition increases, and discount or ignore the college student's perspective although both are involved daily in the education process and both are impacted by the tuition price. The legitimacy, however, resides with the official (Dunn, 1969) and not the everyday person because the official is a "known" (p.9, Gans, 1979) and the student is unknown. Therefore, a journalistic routine is to find a known source to add legitimacy to a story. Simultaneously, news organizations add to their own authority or legitimacy by the sources they use in news stories. The news media show "the place of authorized knowers in the knowledge structure of society and
convey the knowledge that gives them that place* (p. 5, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989).

But as mentioned previously, different perspectives exist. The university president's perspective could be that without a tuition increase, several courses will need to be canceled, thus limiting the education available. This presents or "frames" the tuition increase as a necessary evil which the president is forced to commit and typically the audience accepts this rationale. If the student perspective comes first in the story -- "previous tuition increases caused financial hardship and Joe Student had to work two jobs to afford his college degree. Now he may have to drop out of college" -- the issue is framed as a lack of access. Presented in this manner, the student perspective may lead audience members to sympathize with the student and be concerned about college costs rather than accepting the increase as a "necessary evil."

When journalists present two sides to a story, they believe they provide objectivity. But in reality, Tuchman says, these procedures "constitute an invitation to selective perception, mistakenly insist the 'facts speak for
themselves', are a discrediting device and a means of introducing the journalists' opinion, and are bounded by the editorial policy of a particular news organization" (p. 676, 1972). In other words, objectivity does not really exist even though journalists strongly believe their routines insure objectivity. Instead, news pages tend reflect communities' majoritarian values or the dominant hegemony (Gitlin, 1980) -- e.g. communists are the enemy; fringe candidates are not covered because they don't win elections; tuition increases are necessary evils.

Two types of values are expressed in news stories -- topical and enduring values (Gans, 1979). Topical values are timely and relate to the person or situation described in the story, whereas enduring values can be found in news stories over time. Gans (1978) lists these values as ethnocentrism, altruistic democracy, responsible capitalism, small-town pastoralism, individualism, moderatism, social order, and national leadership. Journalists use media frames to reflect these values and policymakers who want to communicate with journalists "must share values, including the core values of the dominant culture" (p.14, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989).
Let's look at an example of ethnocentrism, one of those core values, in higher education news. The English-speaking abilities of foreign teaching assistants has been the subject of many news stories and an issue in state-level higher education for more than 10 years. This issue arises in part out of a lack of shared values between academicians, particularly scientists, and policymakers.

The "story" goes like this. Scientific endeavor knows no national lines as research advances are publicized and shared among scientists regardless of nationality. Major research universities share this belief. Although many nations create and share scientific knowledge, the United States has the largest and most comprehensive system of higher education in the world, particularly graduate education. Students from all over the world come to the United States to study. Universities value these students for their knowledge and abilities, and offer them jobs (assistantships) to help support their education. Hence, in large universities, many undergraduate courses are taught by teaching assistants (TA), some of them non-native speakers of English.

And, because these teaching assistants are not native English speakers, their speech may be accented. Some may not
speak English well. Undergraduate students are consumers of education. And, as consumers, they believe in "getting their money's worth" however that is defined. What occurred in Ohio and many states was that the speaking skills of foreign teaching assistants came under legislative scrutiny, prompted by complaints from consumer constituents, and legislation was passed in 1986 to force foreign TAs to successfully pass a spoken English language test prior to holding a position as a teaching assistant. The implied value or frame in this situation was that the English spoken by native-born Americans was more conducive to teaching and learning than the English spoken by foreigners -- a prime example of ethnocentrism, "our country is the best."

This study looks for evidence of media frames to illustrate how journalists construct news and the impact framing can have on policy discussions and outcomes. In the case of the foreign TA, the framing led to the law requiring all universities to test foreign TAs' speaking abilities before putting them in the classroom. Most interestingly, although that legislation passed in 1986 and universities are implementing it, this English-language issue remains a part of campus discourse. This evidence suggests that the real issue
may not be language competence, but something else. Universities certify the speakers, but the student complaints continue perhaps because the issue is foreigners teaching classes, especially in certain subjects like mathematics.

Relationships Between the Media and Policymaking

Sources, journalists, and audiences together impact what appears on television or in the daily newspaper. While several theories exist regarding story selection, i.e., how certain things become news and others do not, most theories rely on some characteristics or routinization of news work (Tuchman, 1978). (For a more complete discussion of story selection see, Gans, 1979, Chapter Three.) Both internal and external factors influence story selection. Three examples of such factors would be: journalists' professional news judgment, which determines what information becomes news and what is not newsworthy; media organizations' determinations of stories, based in part on economic imperatives or organizational demands (Underwood, 1993); and the "mirror theory," which suggests journalists merely hold a mirror to society and report what the mirror reflects.
Among the factors considered to have an external impact on news selection are technology, the economy, and our national culture as factors in determining what makes news (Gans, 1979). All three theories contain elements of truth, Gans says, and at a minimum, what appears on television or in the daily newspaper comes from sources, journalists, and audiences co-existing in a system of interrelated activity resembling a tug-of-war, or as Linsky (p.37, 1986) suggests, a "waltz" in which the "press and policymakers are engaged in a struggle to control the view of reality that is presented to the American people," "a strategic ballet" (Schudson, p. 3, 1995), or as Weber (1946, in Ericson, 1989) suggests, an "elective affinity or Wahlverwandschaft" -- a sharing of ideas and interests between journalists and sources. This affinity is an important part of news construction and hence, of the policy-making process.

This research assumes, as do Ericson et al. (1989) that the complex relationship among journalists, sources and the public is "regulated and controlled in complex ways. It entails both positive and negative freedoms for both journalists and sources, and for citizens, who are left to spectate and speculate" (p. 16, Ericson, Baranak and Chan,
1989). For example, media have multiple sources from which to gather information. And, sources have many media sources through which to disseminate information. The public, therefore, can choose what information it wants to access and through which medium.

In recent years, newspaper management has moved from journalists to business managers, and news text has changed as well. Underwood notes that in a "market-driven world of easy-to-digest events, news often becomes a parody of the term... a commodity that can be passed off as something interesting or original. Unfortunately, the lack of real news in the newspaper -- news that gives a sense of depth and insight and context to surface events -- is the one solution market-minded managers won't consider" (p. 145-46, Underwood, 1993).

Regardless of who runs the newsroom -- an MBA or a journalist -- one key to the creation of news remains the interactions among journalists and sources. When these interactions occur among journalists and sources during the policy-making process, they can impact the construction of news stories. Policymaking is often described as a process with five stages -- problem identification, solution formation, policy adoption, implementation and evaluation.
Research suggests that not all problems move through all five stages. Others describe the process as a "stream" of problems, policies, and politics which may or may not couple resulting in change (Kingdon 1984) or a "garbage can" in which problems and solutions couple depending on which ones are in the can at the same time (Cohen, March and Olson, 1972). Media coverage can occur at any point in the process. Media can track an issue from its first appearance on the agenda through evaluation or sporadically throughout the process or only at one stage in the process. No "rules" exist to determine when media become involved, but certain factors can affect involvement, including who makes the decisions, when, the focus of the media stories, and if coverage was positive or negative (Linsky, 1988). Such factors could include legal action, as was the case in the faculty workload issue.

News coverage at certain times in the policymaking process can impact the process in different ways (Linsky, 1986). For example, most Members of Congress tend to believe that coverage during the problem-identification stage has the most impact, but executive branch members think that coverage in the evaluation stage has more impact on policymaking
that point in the process and can benefit from positive coverage in this stage of the policy process. Congress members need to let their constituents know about their activities in Washington. Media coverage is one way to accomplish this goal. For Congress, the media is a "familiar and regular presence, and an important part of their work" (Linsky, 1986).

Members of the executive branch are the most exposed during the evaluation stage. The policy has been decided and now it is being judged for effectiveness, and negative stories at this point are harmful to the administration. For the executive branch the media "is much less known, more to be feared, and its conventions less comfortable and less integrated into policymaking" (Linsky, 1986).

The implications are likely to be similar for higher education policymaking. The Ohio Board of Regents may be more concerned about coverage after it has implemented a policy change and when its effects are being felt at the campus level rather than when the problem and policy are identified. As
for legislators, the same would hold true as for Congress; positive media coverage identifying a legislator as a problem solver would be beneficial to individuals. In this study, a policy process chronology was created as part of the analysis to investigate this potential linkage among sources, the policy process, and news coverage.

For many years, the relationship between the media and the public was studied in the dominant manner of media effects -- what impact does the media have on the public? Agenda-setting research studying this relationship resulted in the widely-accepted belief that media tells us what to think about, not what to think (McCombs and Shaw, 1972). More recent media-effects research extends beyond traditional agenda-setting into the area of media agenda building (Weaver and Elliott, 1985). Agenda-building theory supports a dynamic story selection process involving journalists and policymakers in which the relationship between the two sets of actors as well as various internal and external events influence news coverage (Berkowitz, 1992). External factors such as crises and conflict can impact the journalist-source relationship to shape the media agenda, as the O.J. Simpson trial stories continue to illustrate. Internally, journalists have various
organizational influences, or news work factors, that also can impact story selection, including time and economic demands (Gans, 1979; Kaniss, 1991; Tuchman, 1972).

"Media subsidies" or information given directly to the news media from policymakers in the form of news releases or news conferences, are another way to look at media-source relationships (Gandy, 1982). Every level of government has specialists who "generate public information that produces or reinforces ... government competency and efficiency" and "ensure that the nation's public media carry the desired message forward to the general public" (p. 74, Gandy, 1982). Turk (1986, 87) found that the majority of the information supplied by public relations specialists was used in news stories, but that journalists still used routine practices to seek out additional information.

Attempting to link the media agenda, the policy agenda, and public opinion, Cook et al (1983) found that audience exposure to an issue increased its salience, but did not move the issue up the policy agenda. Further, they found that the public wasn't really involved through the airing of the story, but rather through the "active collaboration" (p. 32) between
journalist and policymaker that created the policy outcome. This active collaboration is coming under greater scrutiny.

The public, the group most impacted by policy, is the least active in the policy process. Media critics have called for many changes to improve coverage, including "multiperspectival" news, depth and breath in sourcing, and a move away from "horse race" journalism in which a campaign story merely covers who is ahead in the election and not the policies and programs of a candidate (Gans, 1988; Kaniss, 1991; Patterson, 1993). Journalists will admit the public perspective is often absent from stories, but seem unable to make change due to time and job restrictions (personal conversations with John Funk, Roger Lowe, and Keith White, January 1997).

The definitions of news -- "new," "timely," "dramatic," and "conflictual," -- cited early in this chapter are "limiting and confining...[a] major barrier to enriched political debate" (Linsky, 1988). The very idea of timeliness forces journalists to create the story fast which in many cases results in single-source reporting (Kaniss, 1991). Deadlines often impact story selection. If a story can be written by the deadline, then it gets written; but if a story takes two
days to develop, it may not become a story. The "public knowledge" remains private, a dynamic which former journalist and legislator Martin Linsky says can have disastrous results for public policymaking. Linsky acknowledges that the media are not part of government, but journalists' actions have an "enormous direct impact on public policymaking and a crucial influence on the nature and content of public deliberation" (p.205, Linsky, 1988). "At stake is the very nature of the conversation about public policy; what is discussed and how it is discussed" (p.208, Linsky, 1988). Because the media are so essential, he says, both the content and the process of the dialogue on public issues are influenced by the nature and qualities of the medium itself, as well as by the story form. In other words, the fact that the media chose to cover a story impacts the policy process because the mere coverage "amplifies" (Schudson, 1995) the issue in the public arena. The story form, or framing, adds additional salience to the policy process. The amplification comes from appearing in a 400,000-circulation daily newspaper; as Linsky says, "It would be a different dialogue if it took place primarily through the
political parties or primarily through small community meetings" (p.210).

But while the news media have this potential to impact policymaking, they seldom provide the information citizens need to have any impact on the policy-making process (Keefer, 1993). Examining coverage of several U.S. House of Representative floor votes, Keefer found news stories may have provided political information and politicians' views on the issues, but they lacked information relevant to voters -- how to participate in the political discussion or what impact the legislation would have. And while politicians' views were represented, stories seldom cited local politicians, instead favoring "knowns" (Gans, 1979). Further, the stories reflected journalistic economic and organizational constraints (Kaniss, 1991) -- reactive, not proactive reporting, for example, reinforcing that news "reflects a search for what consumers want to know and what will be commercially successful, rather than what consumers ought to know to be good democratic citizens" (Linsky, 1988).

So, while it is a commonly held belief that the news media are a social force in shaping public opinion, discourse, and policymaking (Gitlin, 1980; Linsky, 1986, 88), much work
still remains to be done to understand what goes into that shaping. Evidence of media frames are one very important key to that understanding. Media frames are important because "journalists, news organizations and elected officials all know what is published and broadcast has a powerful influence on policymaking. It affects how legislators vote, what policies are considered, and how decisions are made" (p.12, Linsky, 1988).

**Media Frames as Information Processing Devices**

The combination of the media’s influence in policymaking and its seeming inability to present useful information to citizens desiring to participate in the policymaking process raises questions about the impact of news stories. For a policymaker or politician who knows the influence the media can have in the policymaking process, the question becomes, "How can I understand media use of frames and make them work for me?" Concomitantly, as a member of the voting public, the question is "How can I see through media frames to find the information I need to participate in government?" And finally, reporters might ask, "How do I use frames and how
does that impact my reporting?" The answer to each question lies in the ability to identify and analyze media frames.

Goffman (1974) first conceived of frames as ways to classify, organize, and interpret occurrences in daily life in order to understand them. Frames are "interpretive schemata that simplify and condense the 'world out there' by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events or experiences, and sequences of action without one's present or past environment" (p.137, Snow and Benford, 1992). Applying the concept to news, Gitlin (1980) describes media frames as devices that organize the world both for journalists and audience members. "Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual" (p.7, Gitlin, 1980). Journalists use frames to recognize, process, and package large amounts of information quickly. Frames are cognitive devices used in information encoding, interpreting, and retrieving; they are communicable; and they are related to journalistic professional routines and conventions (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies. Frames can happen at
four places in the communications process -- the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture (Entman, 1993). Culture here is defined as "the empirically demonstrable set of common frames exhibited in the discourse and thinking of most people in a social grouping" (Entman, 1993). In this research project, specifically, they are thus found with the policymaker, the journalist's story, the reader's understanding of the story and in our cultural and societal norms. The only frames under investigation in this research are those located in the journalist's story. Frames select and highlight certain information and use that information to construct an argument about problems, causes, and solutions (Entman, 1993).

For the purpose of this study, frames are defined as cognitive devices used by journalists to organize large amounts of information to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies.

Gamson and Modigliani (1989) tracked public opinion and news discourse about nuclear power to see how news frames changed over time by looking at news text as a combination of metaphors, catch phrases, visual images, moral appeals and other symbolic devices organized into "interpretative packages"
(p.2). Each package had a central organizing "frame" that helped the reader or viewer make sense of the news story. Initially, nuclear power was seen through a positive "progress" lens but this lens shifted to a cautionary "runaway" or "public accountability" lens (p. 34) following the near melt-down at Three Mile Island. A second nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the 1980s reinforced the dangerous side of nuclear power and leaves us with a "nimby" lens (p. 34), characterized by the belief that nuclear power is good as long as it's "Not In My BackYard" (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989).

While a news frame establishes the "common sense, wide spread" interpretation, it also describes attributes of news (Entman, 1991). Frames encourage readers to develop a particular understanding through the use of "keywords, metaphors, concepts, symbols and visual images" embedded in the news text, such as "bra burners", "anti abortion", "Cold War", and "draft dodgers". Frames can be found by analyzing news text for "words and visual images that appear consistently" and convey the same meanings across media and time (Entman, 1991).
Looking at two similar international incidents Entman (1991) finds four places in which the text became salient in creating a moral frame -- "the consistent use of words and images that portrayed responsibility for the reported action, or agency; that encouraged or discouraged identification with those directly affected by the act; that advanced a participation categorization of the act and that stimulated or suppressed broad generalization from the act" (p.11, Entman, 1991).

Entman examined national news coverage of the 1983 downing of a KAL airline by the Soviets and the 1988 downing of an Iran Air flight by a the U.S. Navy ship Vincennes. He found interesting differences in the news coverage of two very similar accidental shootings.

For example, responsibility or agency in the KAL incident was leveled at the shooter, the Russians; in the Iran incident, however, responsibility was shifted from the shooter -- the Americans -- to the plane being in the wrong place. Headlines contrasted the KAL "Murder in the Air" and "Shooting to Kill/The Soviets Shoot Destroy an Airliner" with the "Why it Happened" and "What Went Wrong in the Gulf" of the Iran Air
incident. Additionally, the dead were identified as "victims" in the KAL incident and were humanized throughout the text. In the Iran incident, stories were more technical, less humanistic (Entman, 1991).

Frames are not just useful to readers and viewers, but to news organizations as well. "News organizations shape their reports to elicit favorable reactions from readers and viewers, and the anticipated reactions of the public also affect the rhetoric and actions of political elites, who are the primary 'sponsors' of news frames" (Gamson, 1989). For example, linking news text to the rhetoric of the Reagan administration, Entman (1991) found the frame used supported the administration's positions.

Framing has been related to collective action (See Gamson; Klandermans; Snow and Benford in Frontiers in Social Movement Theory) in that certain frames often motivate individuals to action. For example, characterizing a government action as "unjust or immoral" as in the U.S. bombing of Cambodia, moved many Americans to protest in the late 1960s. The frame itself does not motivate individuals to action, but blame must be specified for action to take place (Snow and Benford, 1992).
This type of "call to action" hasn't appeared in higher education in Ohio. Nor has collective action, for example, an organized student group protesting tuition increases, occurred. In fact, higher education nationwide had few massive protest movements since the 1970s.

While news media frames in higher education stories may not be linked to social movements, the implications of news framing are important to policymakers because news is constructed through the interaction of sources, journalists, and audience members (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Policymakers have an opportunity to shape a news frame through information subsidies (Gandy, 1982; Turk, 1986, 87), but once established, a news frame can thwart any changes in policy as seen in the Gulf incident (Entman, 1991). Policymakers must pay close attention to efforts to frame news -- their own and that of journalists.

As one approach to analyzing news construction and processes, Pan and Kosicki's method of framing analysis has much to offer research in this area, including analysis of the political language that is the heart of policy discourse. Language is powerful in government, politics and policymaking (e.g. Edelman, 1964, 70; Laswell, 1949; Meadow, 1980; Graber,
Framing analysis can provide evidence of the word choices journalists make (rhetorical devices) as well as insight into news stories' thematic structures. Pan and Kosicki's framing devices -- syntactical structures, rhetorical structures, script structures and thematic structures -- offer a systematic way to gather evidence of journalists' use of frames. Framing analysis offers an important way to gather evidence and analyze media frames in order to offer suggestions about the implications of those frames in the policy-making process.

**Research Questions**

This study is guided by two research questions. They are:

1. What media frames are evident in news coverage of state-level higher education policy issues in Ohio?
2. Does a relationship exist between media frames and policy outcomes?
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter describes the research methods used to test the hypotheses posited. First, the design is outlined. Second, the coding process is described in detail. Finally, the measurements are detailed to illustrate the evidence gathered to support the hypotheses.

Research Design

News stories were gathered from two newspapers, The Columbus Dispatch and the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer. The print medium was chosen for study for two reasons: First, individuals gain much of their political knowledge from the print media (Becker, Blood and Greenwald, 1984; McCombs and Shaw, 1972); secondly, policy issues are not typical topics of local television news (Orren, 1986).

Stories were collected from these two newspapers because they have designated higher education reporters, are read by
higher education policymakers, and are distinctly different. Specifically, The Columbus Dispatch is generally accepted to have a conservative, parochial outlook (Personal conversations with Keith White, 1997 and Cliff Treyens, 1996). It has been and continues to be a family-owned and operated newspaper. Local news in Central Ohio is the focus of the paper as is evidenced by its slogan, "Ohio's Greatest Home Newspaper." The Dispatch has a daily circulation of 255,390 and a Sunday circulation of 416,000.

The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer also focuses on local news, but it maintains the largest Statehouse news bureau with seven reporters divided into beat areas within state government. In general, policymakers think it provides the most comprehensive coverage of state government (personal conversation with Bill Napier, 1996). While not a liberal newspaper, when compared to The Dispatch it is less conservative. Both newspapers will support Republican and Democrat candidates through editorials, but The Dispatch is more likely to support Republican candidates on the statewide and presidential ballots. The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer is the larger of the two papers, with a daily circulation of 424,300 and a Sunday circulation of 553,140. The two newspapers were coded and analyzed 53
independent of each other. This allowed for interesting comparisons between the newspapers. These comparisons are important for two reasons: 1) the two papers are distinctly different in political outlook and 2) because of the personal nature of relationships between policymakers and the media. Each policymaker is an individual; each reporter is an individual making each relationship distinct. Therefore, it is important to keep the distinctions between newspapers during analysis.

Three data sets of 38 stories (hereinafter referred to as task force, capital debt, and workload) were used for the analysis. The task force data set contained 12 stories printed in the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer (N=7) and The Columbus Dispatch (N=5) published between July, 1992 when the Managing For the Future report was released and December, 1992 when the Securing the Future report was released by the Ohio Board of Regents. The workload data set contained 11 stories printed in the Cleveland Plain Dealer (N=4) and the Columbus Dispatch (N=7) from April 1993, to August, 1994. The capital debt data set contained 15 stories printed in the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer (N=10) and The Columbus Dispatch (N=5) from March, 1994 to December, 1995 when the Regents released the first Capital
Budget utilizing the new policy. All news stories analyzed were printed between July, 1992 and December, 1995.

Additionally, editorials and op-ed articles printed in the two newspapers during the same time frame were examined for inclusion in the case study. News stories were located using the Nexis files.

Several methods were combined to provide a thorough analysis to examine the construction of news text. Pan and Kosicki's framing analysis model (1993) was adapted to examine news text in empirically operational dimensions of thematic structures and rhetorical devices. Headlines from the news stories were examined for thematic structures and used to create a policymaking chronology (See Chapter 5). Sourcing was examined by categorizing the sources cited in news stories by level of policymaking activity -- that is, at the state level; the executive, legislative, and bureaucratic branches; and at the local level, the presidents, faculty members, and students at Ohio's public higher education institutions. News stories about the two policy issues -- capital debt and workload -- and the report itself from both The Columbus Dispatch and The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer were coded according to the schemata developed consisting of eight analyses (See 55
Appendix A). Of all the issues in the *Managing for the Future* report those two were chosen because of their impact on Ohio's colleges and universities. The proposed capital debt policy, if enacted, would change dramatically the way the state had funded college and university buildings for the past 30 years. The second issue, faculty workload, had already become a national issue and as a "people" issue, it was almost guaranteed to garner much news coverage. Both issues were of personal interest to the researcher as well from her perspective as a policy analyst and former faculty member.

A single story was the unit of analysis. News stories were coded for the following: (1) newspaper; (2) date; (3) issue; (4) word count; (5) source cited; and two distinct framing devices; (6) rhetorical devices; (7) sharing of devices and (7) thematic structures. A blank space was left on the sheet for researcher "notes" that would be relevant to the analysis. The researcher's coding of the stories was checked for inter coder reliability on nine stories (nearly one quarter) by a graduate research associate in journalism. The comparison rater had previously coded projects using interpretive content analysis methods and was familiar with this methodology which increased the likelihood of intercoder
agreement. Moreover, as Holsti (1969) recommends the coder was well trained and given clear, concise instructions to increase reliability.

Table 3.1 shows a high intercoder reliability rating. Two categories -- newspaper and topic -- had a 100% agreement. All other categories were above 90%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Devices</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Debt Devices</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Devices</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Intercoder Reliability

This table illustrates the agreement on coding items between the researcher and the second coder.

**Constructed Week**

A random sampling method known as a "constructed week" (Jones and Carter, 1959) was used to measure the news hole as it related to state government stories. A week was constructed for *The Columbus Dispatch* and the *Plain Dealer* in 1993 and 1994. The 1993 week consisted of Monday, Jan. 4;
Tuesday Feb. 9; Wednesday March 17; Thursday, April 22; Friday, May 28; Saturday, June 5 and Sunday, July 11. The 1994 week consisted of Monday, Jan. 3; Tuesday, Feb. 8; Wednesday, March 16; Thursday, April 21; Friday, May 27; Saturday, June 4 and Sunday, July 10.

**Coding Categories**

Most coding categories were structured following commonly accepted news media content analysis. For example, date, newspaper, topic, and word count are traditionally examined in content analysis of news stories. Sources, thematic structures and rhetorical devices also are used in news story analysis. Establishing these categories was more of a creative process which is explained in the following sections.

**Date**

Date refers to the date the newspaper was published. For example, the first *The Columbus Dispatch* story detailing the release of the Managing for the Future Task Force report is dated July 25, 1992 and would be coded 7.25.92.
Newspaper

The news stories were coded by which paper the story appeared in either The Columbus Dispatch (1) or the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer (2).

Topic

Topic refers to the policy issue covered -- the Managing for the Future task force report, the workload issue or the capital debt service issue. They were coded accordingly 1 - task force report; 2 - workload; 3 - capital debt.

Headline

Headlines on news stories from both newspapers were examined in terms of thematic structure and were then used to create the workload news chronology that formed the structure of the case study in Chapter 5. Headlines were not assigned a numeric value, but were written on the coding sheets.

Word Count

Word count simply refers to the number of words in a news story. Word count for many of the stories was provided by the Nexis service and was manually tabulated for some stories.
Word count was included because a story's length is some indication of the importance of that story.

Sources

Sources refer to the individuals interviewed by the journalist to create the news story, for example, the governor, the chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents or a specific college president. Sources were separately coded. It was expected that each story would have several sources cited. Journalists use a variety of sources, including veiled sources, such as "one interested party" or anonymous sources. These were coded as well.

To create the Source categories, every story was first read and then a list created of all the sources identified in the 38 news stories. This list was then categorized by functional area. For example the traditional political science grouping of Executive, Legislative and Agency was used to categorize sources such as Governor Voinovich (Executive) Senator Gene Watts (Legislative) and Ohio Board of Regents Vice Chancellor Bill Napier (Agency). College and university presidents and other administrators were categorized as Campus sources. The two associations -- Inter-University Council
Thematic Structures

Thematic structures function as hypothesis-testing structures in which a journalist focuses a story around a theme for which he or she presents evidence in terms of observations or quotations from a source (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Thematic structures represent the "gist" of a story. In a casual retelling of what appeared in the newspaper, the inherent logic structure that one individual would use to tell another about a news story would represent the thematic structure. By examining all 38 stories in this manner, a common perception emerges of the policy issues.

For example, in the July 25, 1992 The Columbus Dispatch story announcing the release of the Managing for the Future task force report, three themes emerged: One, that the Regents needed to make major changes across the board in Ohio's higher education; two, making changes in higher
education was political; and three, the Regents need more authority to make these changes. These themes were evidenced by source comments such as the following one by Governor Voinovich: "I know this is controversial, supporting legislation that gives (the Regents) more authority to make some of the tough decisions that need to be made" (The Columbus Dispatch, July 25, 1992).

Each story set was read independently of the other. All 11 workload stories were read together to create the workload thematic structure. All capital debt stories were read together, and so on. Stories were compared to each other to look for commonalties. These commonalties formed the basis for the thematic structures. For example, all of the workload stories contained language that related to the broad theme of "time." Several stories made the claim that faculty do not teach enough hours. One story made the counter claim that quality was the prime issue. The thematic structures presented in Chapter 4 came from examining all these claims and counterclaims.
Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical devices reflect the word choices journalists make in constructing news stories and include metaphors, catch phrases, exemplars, depictions and visual images (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989). Word choices "hold great power in setting the context for debate, [and] defining issues" and creating mental images of the policy issues (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). Each story was analyzed for existing rhetorical structures. Again, the July 25 news story offers examples of such rhetorical devices, including in paragraph one the words "restructuring, "refocus', and "mixed reactions."

Paragraph two offers "year in the making"; paragraph three, "governor and legislative approval"; and paragraph four, the governor's full quote which within itself is full of apparently conscious rhetorical choices, including words like "controversial," "authority" and "clout."

Taken together, these rhetorical choices offer a picture of a change that -- while taking a long time to surface -- is not liked by everyone and will take government action to implement.
The devices were pulled directly from all 38 news stories and categorized by commonalities. For example, the workload categories are Time, Quality, Measurement, Autonomy/Accountability and Political/Conflict. The Chart below shows how similar rhetoric was collapsed into categories.

For example, devices such as "force professors" "slackers" and "enraged faculty" were considered political devices because the words suggest conflict. They are the "rhetoric of war" in policymaking. Other devices such as "professors in front of the freshman" or "improving quality" or "count as teaching" were categorized into Time, Quality or Measurement devices, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hike time</td>
<td>Count as time</td>
<td>Force Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend more time</td>
<td>standards to meas.</td>
<td>misdirected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too little time</td>
<td>tough standards</td>
<td>slacker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.1 Workload Devices

For all three story sets, the categories were organized by commonalities apparent in the text. Each rhetorical device in the story set was examined to see how it matched or did not
match with every other device. Much of this was related to the context in the story. For example, in stories discussing the universities' relationship to capital debt, words such as "staggering" or "awash in borrowed funds" were used to depict the debt. These devices were then categorized as Debt.

Similarly, devices describing the campuses as "overbuilt" or "empty monuments" or "tremendous investment" shared the commonality of depicting the buildings themselves and were placed in a category titled "Buildings."

Chronologies

Since policy is often impacted by external events (Berkowitz, 1992; Gans, 1979; Linsky, 1986). The researcher created a time line of state government events such as legislative budget enactment, Regents' actions, news conferences, publication of news stories, and so forth to add an additional dimension to the analysis. In both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 the time lines were related to the policy process in which the story appeared because the impact of media coverage can vary depending on when it occurs during the policy-making process (Linsky, 1986).
Journalists Interviews

Two journalists were interviewed by telephone about the nature of their work to add an individual perspective to the interpretative content analysis. The journalists were interviewed after the initial analysis was done. Questions ranged from "Where do you get story ideas?" to "Who do you use as sources?" to specific questions that following up on comments made by the journalists. Their comments are reflected in Chapters 4 and 5. The interview questions are in Appendix C.

Documents

Public documents were examined to provide a context for the news coverage and to add richness and detail to the case study in Chapter 5. Documents analyzed included those which describe or explain the report and its recommendations, include the Regents' Managing for the Future report; Securing the Future report, as well as State of Ohio biennial and capital budgets, and public comments by the chancellor, governor, and Managing for the Future task force chairman. Other public documents which provided background on the issues contained in the report were examined including, other
documents from the Ohio Board of Regents, the Legislative Office of Education Oversight, and Ohio's colleges and universities. Articles from professional journals which offered academic research insight to the workload issue also were used.

**Research Time Line**


**Measurement**

This section details the operationalization of the concepts under study; political aspects of policy; policy-making concerns and consumer concerns; sources; and policy issue definition or framing.

**Political aspects of policy**

The political aspects of policies were measured in three ways. First, political aspects of policy were measured using the rhetorical devices (Pan and Kosicki, 1992). For a
complete listing of the definitions of these components, see Appendix A.

Second, a chronology of external events occurring during the lifetime of the policy -- i.e. legislative actions, release of Regents' reports, and so on -- was created and compared to the news stories that were printed during the same time frame.

And third, all the news stories that were printed about one of the three issues (report, workload or capital debt) were chronologically compared to the steps of the policy-making process (Linsky, 1986). Those steps are problem identification, solution formulation, policy adoption, implementation and evaluation.

Policy-making concerns and consumer concerns

Rhetorical devices also were used to measure policy-making concerns and consumer concerns. In each issue, the concerns were identified. In some issues a rhetorical device was both a consumer concern and a policymaker concern. Political rhetorical devices were always identified as policymaker concerns because of the political nature of
policymaking. A complete index of these measures is located in Appendix A.

In the task force story set, consumer concerns were defined as those concerns that related to efficient or effective use of public dollars. Devices such as "blueprint for improving" or "provide better service" were characterized as consumer concerns. Policymaker concerns were defined as those related to the money available, the efficient use of that money, and the political climate. For example, phrases like "focus limited resources", "doing more with less", or "streamline and cut costs" "choke hold on Higher Education", "polite outrage", or "give up a little freedom" are all examples of policymaker concerns.

In the capital debt stories, consumer concerns were defined as those concerning accountability and money well spent, and included devices such as "be more prudent" or "link payment to use". The policymakers' concerns included accountability, money well spent and the political climate. Examples include phrases like "make schools more accountable", "eaten by debt service", and "awash in borrowed funds" while
political devices including phrases like "monumental waste for taxpayers", "Ivory Tower", and "high-pressure tactics".

For the final issue, workload, consumer concerns were defined as time spent teaching and the quality of that teaching. Devices ranged from "restore classroom time" to "shoulder the burden of undergraduate teaching" and quality devices like "decent education" and "reward for quality instruction". The policymakers' concerns were defined as time spent teaching, accountability and the political climate. Devices such as "full-time faculty" "monitored and enforced" and "misdirected" or "dangerous precedent" were used.

Sources

Journalists' use of sources in the creation of news as well as the sources themselves can impact the actual story written. Sources were measured in two ways. First, a simple frequency count per story of what sources journalists used was conducted -- i.e. how many times was the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents the source for information regarding workload policies?

Second, comparisons were made to determine if any sharing of rhetorical devices existed among state-level sources and
campus-level sources. This was done by coding the source first and the device second. For example, the Governor was coded 01 and the rhetorical device used was coded 72 "controversial...authority".

**Policy issue definition or framing**

Rhetorical devices were analyzed to identify political and consumer aspects of policy proposals detailed in news stories. Rhetorical devices and thematic structures also were used to look for any change in how journalists initially define, describe, or frame policy issues, and how those same issues are defined, described, or framed at the end of the issue's life cycle. Additionally, thematic structures were compared to the five steps in the policy-making process (problem identification, solution formulation, policy adoption, implementation, and evaluation) to see if the changes are related to any part of the process.

**Political aspects of policy**

Research suggests that journalists are often "caught up" in conflict or political aspects of an issue to the detriment of straightforward reporting of an issue (Bennett, 1978; Kaniss, 1991; Linsky, 1986). For example, an analysis of
several city economic development stories in Philadelphia showed that they often discussed the political concerns of projects rather than their economic contributions to the city (Kaniss, 1991). Campaign news certainly devotes more text to the analysis of the campaign than to the issues (McCombs and Shaw, 1972; Patterson, 1993). If, as Gans (1978), Linsky (1986), and others suggest, the relationship among reporters and sources impacts the news created and the "press and policymakers....control the view of reality presented to the American people," it is logical to assume that politics enters into the news text and relationship which Hypothesis 1 tests.

**Hypothesis 1:**

Journalists are more likely to cover the political aspects of policy proposals than the actual substance of the policy proposals.

**Policy-making concerns and consumer concerns**

Previous research has shown that the concerns of everyday citizens, including how to participate in the policy-making process, are often overlooked in news stories (Kaniss, 1991; Keefer, 1993; Linsky, 1988; McCombs and Shaw, 1972; West, 72
1994), perhaps because the public is not a full participant in the construction of news or because marketing whizzes help determine news (Underwood, 1993). The "waltz" is primarily between the journalist and the source; the public remains a wallflower and is left to "spectate and speculate" (p. 16, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989). More recent research, however, suggests that relevance to consumers is the focus of many news stories, but journalists remain concerned about the quality of those stories (Underwood, 1993). Journalists may be worried that shifting from a reactive to a proactive or consumer-oriented focus would jeopardize their objectivity. But Linsky argues (1988) such reactive reporting "reflects a search for what consumers want to know and what will be commercially successful, rather than what consumers ought to know to be good democratic citizens".

Hypothesis 2:

Journalists are more likely to cover the concerns of policymakers in higher education news stories than to cover the concerns of consumers in higher education news stories.
Sources

News presents a "window on the world," and it would not exist without the interactions among individuals (Tuchman, 1978). News is a representation of "authority." In the contemporary knowledge society, news represents who are the authorized "knowers and what are their authoritative versions of reality" (p.3, Ericson, Baranek, and Chan, 1989). Individuals can greatly impact the tone of news coverage so policymakers become sources in attempts to shape the news (Linsky, 1986), and reporters tend to use "knowns" as sources (Gans, 1979). Policymakers use the media to float proposals or to garner public support for their programs. This complexity in the news-gathering and writing process creates a reporting context in which certain sources may be easily available to reporters while others are less available, thus impacting the news story.

Hypothesis 3:

State-level sources are more likely to borrow rhetorical devices from legislative sources than they are to borrow rhetorical devices from campus sources.
Policy issue definition or framing

Downs' (1972) idea of the "issue attention cycle" suggests that news media coverage and public attention ebbs and flows on policy issues. Other research supports this theory (Nelson, 1984). Problems typically fade in importance once they need a redistribution of income to solve them, or they fade from view just because the media and the public are bored with those issues. For those who define the problems -- typically they are policymakers -- it is then important to get a problem defined in the appropriate manner early in the news coverage, often through media subsidies (Gandy, 1982; Turk, 1986, 87). Media tend to rely on the initial frame or definition and not to move from that position unless something significant occurs. Policymakers realize in turn that once established, a news frame can thwart any changes in policy (Entman, 1991). The published story has a significant effect on policymaking (Linsky, 1988).

Summary

The three hypotheses presented support this project's central hypothesis that journalists use framing devices in the construction of news, and that they way in which journalists
construct news stories has an impact on the policy-making process. The stories selected represent the entire population of higher education news stories. In essence, the entire population received the same treatment. Classical experimentation and statistical testing methods are no longer feasible (Wright, 1979). No generalizations are made to other states or other content areas. No statistical tests were applied to this population as the traditional questions that statistics answer regarding sampling and inferences are not asked in this study.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis. First, stories detailing the task force report, the workload issue, and the capital debt issue are examined in terms of the political aspects of policymaking (H1), the concerns of the policy world versus the concerns of the consumers (H2) and the use of shared sources (H3). Framing analysis' impact on time is examined through a higher education matrix and a case study of the workload issue, which is Chapter 5. Conclusions, limitations, and recommendations comprise Chapter 6.
Footnote: The following commands were used to search the Nexis News database for policy stories in *The Columbus Dispatch* and *The (Cleveland) Plain Dealer*. Total N once duplicate stories was removed was 38. Newspaper codes -- Coldis, Clevpd.

- Regents and capital w/20 building \( N = 15 \)
- Regents and workload/20 faculty \( N = 27 \)
- Regents and capital w/20 budget \( N = 32 \)
- Regents and future w/10 task force \( N = 21 \)
- Regents and task force \( N = 50 \)
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the analyses that test the hypotheses set up in previous chapters. The first analysis examines the use of rhetorical devices in higher education policy news stories. The first three hypotheses are examined in this manner. Then the three policy issues (task force, capital debt and workload) are analyzed by examining the thematic structures present in the stories. Lastly, an events chronology and a story chronology are created to examine how higher education policy issues in Ohio are defined or "framed," and also to examine the effects of time on media frames.

Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical devices reflect the word choices journalists make in constructing news stories, and include things like metaphors, catch phrases, exemplars, depictions and visual
images (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989). Words used as direct quotes from sources were considered rhetorical devices as well because reporters make decisions about what direct quotes to include in news stories, thus influencing the construction of the story. Word choices "hold great power in setting the context for debate, defining issues" and creating mental images of the policy issues (Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

**Hypothesis 1**

*Journalists are more likely to cover the political aspects policy proposals than the actual substance of the policy proposals.*

Previous studies have shown that news stories tend to focus on political aspects of issues rather than on the substance of an issue (Kaniss, 1991; Keefer, 1993; Patterson, 1993). The political aspects of higher education policy stories were operationally defined through rhetorical devices (See Appendix A for a complete listing of rhetorical devices).

As posited, simple frequency counts show that political rhetorical devices appeared more often in the news stories when compared to each of the other rhetorical devices.
Table 4.1 shows the support for Hypothesis 1 with a categorical breakdown of the rhetorical devices for all three policy issues. Beginning with the first issue, the Managing for the Future task force report, it is evident that political rhetorical devices appear more frequently in both newspapers (59% Dispatch and 63% Plain Dealer) as compared to the other rhetorical devices, Efficiency (23% and 20%) and Money (18% and 17%).

### Managing for the Future Policy Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Dealer</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=55</td>
<td>N=20</td>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>N=91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Debt Service Policy Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Dealer</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>N=19</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>N=105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workload Policy Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Dealer</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Political Rhetorical Devices Compared to Non-Political Rhetorical Devices for All Three Policy Issues
The same is true for the debt service issue, but only in one newspaper. Political rhetorical devices in the Plain Dealer (38%) appeared more often than Buildings (14%) Money (32%) and Accountability (16%). But interestingly enough, The Dispatch rhetorical devices focused more on the Buildings (48%) than on Political (17%) or Money (9%) or Accountability (26%). This is probably due to a consumer affairs focus of The Dispatch higher education reporter.

Finally, concerning the workload issue, political rhetorical devices appeared more in both newspapers (Dispatch 34% and Plain Dealer 61%) when compared to the other rhetorical devices of Time (19% and 15%); Quality (19% and 3%); Measurement (17% and 12%) and Accountability (11% and 9%).

As expected, the political nature of state higher education news reporting is illustrated by the use of political rhetorical devices. This focus on politics detracts from what impacts individual lives -- the quality of education, the adequacy of chemistry labs, or the efficiencies gained from reform -- all of which are arguably more important to a taxpayer than the political battles between the Regents and the colleges and universities.
Political Devices by Newspaper

As an interesting secondary point, the use of political devices by reporters at each of the newspapers was compared. More than twice as many political devices appeared in the combination of all stories in the Plain Dealer (N=93) than in all stories in The Columbus Dispatch (N=36) (See Table 4.2 below). This comes as no surprise to casual readers of the two newspapers political coverage as the Plain Dealer has a reputation as a liberal and politically-involved newspaper, especially when compared to the more conservative Columbus Dispatch. Higher education Reporter A was previously a political reporter and perceived the higher education beat as a political beat. These perceptions of the beat would influence the word choices made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Political Devices</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain Dealer</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>N=93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Political Devices by Newspaper

Note: Various Political Rhetorical Devices appeared 108 times in the full 38 story set.

*I have developed this beat as a statewide beat...an issues beat. I saw it as a political beat. Funding of public higher
education is an important area we have neglected."
Reporter A, January, 1997

Concomitantly, Reporter B who wrote many of these stories approached the beat from a consumer affairs perspective. Reporter B felt that the public needed to know how its tax monies were spent in higher education so his stories focused on the consumer's perspective. The rhetorical devices used by both reporters certainly reflects their personal philosophies as well as those of newspaper management.

"I approach the beat from a consumer affairs standpoint. My goal was to find stories that would be important to the consumer of higher education....And in the broadest sense. That includes a lot of people...students, parents any anyone paying for college. I carry the aspect of who is paying?"
Reporter B, January 1997

Political Devices By Policy Issue

When the political devices were compared across the policy issues, the task force report contained more political devices than the other two issues (See Table 4.3). This is because the task force report was the first call for major reform to Ohio's higher education system. As the table shows, more than half of the devices (62%) appearing in the 12 task force stories were coded as political. The report itself was
controversial in that the Governor asked the Regents to examine the workings of higher education. A request like this from the Executive Branch is seen as a threat to the autonomy of the independent colleges and universities. The perceived threat forced the colleges and universities to politicize the request and the actual implementation of that request. And, not unexpectedly, the colleges and universities reacted in a political manner as is evidenced by their rhetorical devices used in the news stories. The substance of the report -- that higher education could become more efficient -- was not substantially challenged, but rather the causes and solutions were challenged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issue</th>
<th>Political Devices</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>N=55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>N=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>N=32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Evidence of Political Rhetorical Devices by Policy Issue

Nearly half of the workload devices were political in nature (47%). It is not surprising that a "people" issue like
faculty workload would be seen as political. Issues involving individual's pocketbooks, and in this case, work lives, can tend to be politically-charged. Issues involving state employees, which faculty members are, or defined another way, individuals whose earning comes from tax dollars, certainly have more public scrutiny than do employment issues at private corporations.

And finally, the debt service story set contained 31 political devices (33%). As previously discussed, the building aspect of this issue outweighed its political nature.

**Political Rhetorical Devices Summary**

Analysis of stories by political rhetorical devices results in four major findings: 1) the political aspects of policy issues often are reported in more detail than the substance of policy issues as evidenced by the amount of political rhetoric embedded in the news stories; 2) stories reflect both the journalists' perspective and that of newspaper management; 3) the nature of the news story is related to the use of political rhetorical devices -- i.e., some issues are more political than others; and 4) once political rhetoric frames a story, it is very difficult to
shift the story focus to the substance of the policy issue. The capital debt set is a good example. The building set of this issue could be considered political when words like "empty monuments" and "wasted space" were used to characterize the campuses. A far broader issue of the quality of buildings was never addressed in the stories.

Policymakers’ Concerns and Consumer Concerns

Hypothesis 2

Journalists are more likely to cover the concerns of policymakers in higher education news stories than to cover the concerns of consumers in higher education news stories.

Rhetorical devices were categorized into those that represent consumers’ concerns and those that represent policymakers concerns (See Chapter 3). Political rhetorical devices were defined as policymaker concerns in all three issues because policymaking occurs in a political environment; i.e., an environment in which decisions must be made about scarce resources and competition for those resources exists (Ripley and Franklin, 1991). In some issues policymakers and consumers shared concerns -- for example, in the task force issue, both policymakers and consumers are concerned about the
efficiency of the higher education system. Therefore Table 4.4 reflects this numerically and the comparisons (100% to 22%) appear highly divergent but do reflect the appropriate data.

As Table 4.4 illustrates, for the task force report, policymaker concerns outweighed consumer concerns (100% to 22%). Although legislators and policymakers claimed the whole examination of higher education was forced upon them by the taxpaying public -- i.e., by consumers of education, or at least by consumers of governmental services -- the rhetoric does not substantiate this claim. It could be, however, that even though the policymakers and legislators felt that they were responding to consumer demand, the newspapers just did not focus on the issue as a consumer issue. Instead the focus was on the political nature of the issue. This finding probably says more about how reporters construct news than about how policy issues are framed by policymakers.

Again, looking at Table 4.4, policymaker concerns as evidenced by rhetorical devices outweigh the concerns of consumers (100% compared to 44.8%). If the two items of major importance in this issue were the political aspects and the buildings themselves, neither of which were defined as
### Task Force Report Rhetorical Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policymaker Concerns</th>
<th>Consumer Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>100% N=91</td>
<td>22% N=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Debt Service Rhetorical Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policymaker Concerns</th>
<th>Consumer Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>100% N=105</td>
<td>45% N=47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workload Rhetorical Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policymaker Concerns</th>
<th>Consumer Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>88% N=61</td>
<td>29% N=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.4 Consumer Concerns and Policymaker Concerns as Evidenced by Rhetorical Devices

consumer issues, this finding comes as no surprise. Once again, the policymakers' concerns as evidenced by rhetorical
devices outweigh the consumers' concerns (88% compared to 29%).

**Policymaker and Consumer Concerns Summary**

As posited with each policy issue -- task force, capital debt and workload -- frequency counts of rhetorical devices show that the concerns of the policymakers as defined above are more evident by at least two-to-one in all 38 higher education news stories. This supports previous work on consumer concerns (Kaniss, 1991) and fits the theories regarding the political nature of the policymaking world (Kingdon, 1984; Ripley and Franklin, 1991; Marshall, Mitchell and Wirt, 1989).

When the political devices are removed from the comparisons, however, the hypothesis still holds for the task force set of stories (30% policymaker concerns compared to 22% consumer concerns), the capital debt issues (67% policymaker concerns compared to 45% consumer concerns and for the workload issue (42% policymakers and 29% consumer concerns). Lawmakers were vocal that the need for workload reform arose out of public complaints and the data would fit this claim. These data also reinforce the ability of policymakers to frame
an issue and at the same time to locate the consumer (and consumer issues) far outside the policy process.

**Sources and Rhetorical Devices**

**Hypothesis 3**

*State-level sources are more likely to borrow rhetorical devices from legislative sources than they are to borrow rhetorical devices from campus sources.*

Sources are integral to the construction of news. News presents a "window on the world" and it would not exist without the interactions among individuals (Tuchman, 1978). In the contemporary knowledge society, news represents those who are the authorized "knowers and what are their authoritative views of reality" (p.3, Ericson, Baranek, and Chan, 1989). Individuals can greatly impact the tone of news coverage so policymakers become sources in attempts to shape the news (Linsky, 1986). Hypothesis 3 suggests that this shaping of news occurs not only by who speaks, but also by how they speak -- i.e., the actual words they choose.

Little evidence was found to indicate that sources borrowed rhetorical devices from each other; i.e., in a single news story, two separate sources used the same rhetorical
devices. The belief that the state-level sources, such as the Board of Regents, would not borrow devices from the campuses turned out to be not much different from the device-borrowing of state-to-legislative sources. Legislative and state (Regents) shared three devices and state and campus shared two devices. It was hypothesized that since state-level sources and legislative sources often seek the same policy goal, they would speak the same policy language. This data can be interpreted in two ways: 1) that a "disconnect" occurs, and 2) that when devices are shared among policymakers it is more likely that policy will be implemented.

First, the disconnect issue. It appears that the very people who are guiding policy development are not talking to each other. The state groups and campus groups appear to be talking past each other as opposed to talking with each other as evidenced by the lack of borrowed rhetorical devices.

Second, the devices that were borrowed are those that fit the framing of the workload issue. The legislative and state-level or agency sources shared the following rhetorical devices: 1) "spend more time", suggesting the need for faculty members to be in the classroom more; 2) "quality of education", suggesting that an increase in faculty time spent in the
classroom would increase the quality of education provided; and 3) "decrease quality" suggesting the opposite argument that an increase of time would result not in an increase of quality, but in a decrease of quality.

It is interesting that two of the devices which were borrowed support the framing or thematic direction of the entire workload issue. That is, they imply that: 1) faculty don't spend enough time in the classroom, and 2) if they spent more time in the classroom, the quality of education would be enhanced. This framing defines the problem, diagnoses the causes, makes moral judgments and suggests remedies (Entman, 1993).

This evidence could point to the delicate balance a coordinating board strikes. The agency is an advocate for the institutions of higher education, but the agency also must maintain a cooperative relationship with the Legislature, the regulatory body for higher education in Ohio. It is necessary, therefore, for the agency to balance between potentially conflicting goals of the campuses and the legislature and when possible, to be the consensus builder between the two.
A common ground had to be found for sharing of devices between the campus and the state level. The devices borrowed were "improve quality" -- a goal of both the campus and the state -- and "grants flexibility," which refers to the political aspects of the policy. For the policy to be accepted by the campuses, their differences in missions had to be reflected in a workload policy. The campuses and state have now framed the issue in the same manner. While the time issue is ignored, because they could not reach agreement on it, the two issues on which they could reach agreement -- quality and flexibility -- are there. The problem may not be defined in the same manner, but the remedy is shared so the policy can be implemented.

Summary of Device Sharing

Broadly, the evidence of device sharing may suggest that each separate group is so busy trying to control the framing or definition of an issue that no one is listening to anyone or that what they hear they prefer to ignore. This does not appear to be the case, rather, both groups are focusing on a broader, public appeal.
Edelman (1970) terms this "hortatory language":

"Hortatory language is especially conspicuous in appeals to particular audiences for policy support....In all these settings people try constantly to persuade others that the policies they espouse should be accepted generally. More directly and clearly than any other, this language style is directed at the mass public" (p. 134).

Thus, the content of the argument in this political communication style is not important, but the appeal itself is important:

"If the content of hortatory political language draws out different responses from different groups, its form...calls out the same responses from the mass audience exposed to it. By reinforcing their confidence in the reality of public participation in policy-making and in the central role of reason, it promotes their acceptance of policy. Even in the face of defeat on a particular issue, the assumption is strengthened that debate and reasoning have appealed to the public and protected it, avoiding or minimizing arbitrary, irrational, or self-serving public policy" (p. 138, Edelman, 1970).

In other words, as a nation, we feel good because by the mere evidence of rhetoric we believe we are serving democracy. The appearance of rational life is maintained.

The absence of common talk is a situation that begs a larger question: Suppose the groups did talk together and share devices. How might that impact policy outcome?
It is plausible that a shared understanding of the complexity of an issue might result in a "better" policy outcome. Journalists would suggest that the very nature of news gathering brings forward two opposing sets of information and allows the audience to draw its own conclusions about an issue.

The fallacy in this belief, however, is that by presenting two sides of an issue, enough information exists in a typical news story for the audience to make an informed decision about an issue. Journalists will agree that seldom is enough space devoted to a single news story. And, many stories remain a "one-day story": that is, the issue appears in the newspaper only once. No follow-up story is ever written. This lack of public discourse on policy issues hampers the understanding of complex issues. The small amount of coverage devoted to these three major issues that had such a potentially large impact on the future of higher education indicates a lack of commitment to higher education state news.

An examination of the two newspapers using the constructed week random sampling method showed that state news was a small portion of both papers news coverage. State news was further broken down into government news and state news
which included any news from across the state. Table 4.5 below illustrates that both newspapers cover national and local news more prominently than state government news.

One explanation for this coverage may lie in the organizational structure of the news operation. At the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer the higher education reporter is considered part of the Metro or local news staff rather than part of the state news staff. The position in the organization therefore forces the reporter to focus more on local colleges and universities, rather than the complex statewide policy issues. The organization is similar at The Columbus Dispatch as the higher education reporter is part of the city desk staff and reports to an assistance city editor responsible for education news.

A second interesting point about the coverage of the two newspapers is that the Plain Dealer tended to publish longer stories overall than did The Dispatch as evidenced by word counts of the news stories. Total word count for all 38 stories equalled 13,753 Plain Dealer (21 stories) and 7,886 words Columbus Dispatch (17 stories). The Plain Dealer news stories for the task force (N=7) contained 5286 words compared to The Dispatch news stories (N=5) of 2509. For the capital
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Int’l</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>St.Gvt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4/93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1993</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS 94</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5a Constructed Week 1993, 1994 Columbus Dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Int’l</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>St.Gvt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4/93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 93</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS 94</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5b -- Constructed Week 1993, 1994 Cleveland Plain Dealer

Tables 4.5a and 4.5b illustrate the number of stories devoted to state government news in each newspaper. *April 22, 1993 carried news of the release of hostages at a major state prison. Each paper published special reporting sections on this issue.
debt issue the Plain Dealer published 10 stories totalling 4,398 words compared to The Dispatch's five stories totalling 2,966 words. The Dispatch, however, seemed to like the workload issue and devoted more space to that issue stories \( N=7 \) and words \( N=4069 \) than did the Plain Dealer, stories \( N=4 \) and words \( N=2411 \).

Regardless of the number of stories published or the length of the stories, the influence of the media remains high. The power of public ideas is the sharing of language and ideas for policy that has a meaningful impact on people's lives and a government that is responsive to individual's needs (Reich, 1988). The evidence presented above suggests that higher education policymakers in Ohio have mixed results that direction. When common outlooks are as important as in the workload issue, rhetoric is more likely to be borrowed or share than when commonalties are not apparent (Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989). No borrowing of devices existed in either Capital Debt or Task Force issues in all stories.

Sources and Agenda Shaping

Use of sources also showed some other interesting points. (A complete listing of the sources identified in all news
stories can be found in Appendix A.) Sources were organized into nine categories by work (See Chapter 3). The type of source used most frequently by both newspapers in all stories was the Agency (OBR) (See Table 4.6). This includes Board members, staff members, or anyone affiliated with a Regents' committee (i.e. Managing for the Future Task Force).

This is hardly surprising, as the state agency is a "known" (Erickson, Baranek and Chan, 1989) and policymakers influence the media agenda (Cohen, 1963; Berkowitz, 1992; Gandy, 1982; Linsky, 1986). Access to the media allows the policymakers to shape how and what the media chooses to write about. As a public agency, all members of the Ohio Board of Regents are accessible to journalists, perhaps much more so than an individual faculty member or student. Also, the Regents fit into the "traditional" types of sources journalists are taught and socialized to seek out for comment on public occurrences.

Using the Regents as a primary source of information influences the policy created because the Regents can create the initial frame on the issue. The Regents were sourced 51 times (See Table 4.6) in all 38 stories and the Managing for the Future report was sourced 17 times. Therefore, nearly one
third of the time the Regents' perspective was presented in news stories (32%). Lobbyists for the colleges and universities and legislators were the next level of sourcing used (Lobbyist 8%; Legislative 8%). Oftentimes the lobbyist source was used to counter the agency source in an attempt to "balance" the news story. Legislative sources tended to present the same side of the news story as the Regents. In the workload issue, legislators were vocal about the need for change and they represented regulatory authority.

Initiating the news coverage was a successful strategy on the part of the Regents. As the primary source for the news stories, they defined the frame by their authority, their place in the policy process, and their level of accessibility. This put the campuses in the reactive position rather than a proactive position and made it difficult for them to influence the media frame. The single time a campus tried to change the workload frame from time to quality, the campus was unsuccessful because the time frame was already so embedded into the news discourse by the Regents, the Legislature, and the media itself.

As a secondary issue of the workload policy, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was successful in
creating their own frame for the workload policy as a collective bargaining issue. The AAUP initiated the media contact, had no opposition from the Regents because the Regents have no role in collective bargaining, and they were able to obtain media coverage because of the legal suit (three of the 11 stories focused on collective bargaining). This illustrates the influence external events have on reporting. It is less likely that the AAUP issue would have received so much coverage had a legal suit not been filed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Cited</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbyist</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Sourcing Frequencies Cited in All 38 News Stories

Note: University denotes 4-year baccalaureate institutions and college denotes two-year associate degree institutions.
Thematic Structures

Thematic structures function as hypothesis-testing structures in which a journalist focuses a story around a theme for which he or she presents evidence in terms of observations or quotes from a source:

"A thematic structure of a news story, therefore, is a multilayer hierarchy with a theme being the central core connecting various sub themes as the major nodes that, in turn, are connected to the supporting elements" (p.61, Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

Thematic structures were identified for the three story sets -- task force, capital debt and workload (See Examples 4.1 through 4.3). Some stories contained several claims and counter claims. Others contained only one set of claims or counter-claims. Several of the supporting elements appeared in each story, but not all appeared in all stories.

What is represented in Examples 4.1 through 4.3 are the "gists" of each policy issue. In a casual retelling of what appeared in the newspaper, the inherent logic structure that one individual would use to tell another about a news story would represent the thematic structure.
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This type of analysis is important to understanding what knowledge individuals might gain from the newspaper. Without matching public opinion data or experiment data, it is impossible to say conclusively that this thematic representation is an accurate match to knowledge gained; however, it does allow for some inferences.

**DOMINANT FRAME : HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDS REFORM BECAUSE MONEY IS NOT WELL SPENT**

The dominant frame of all 38 stories was that higher education reform was necessary because higher education was inefficient. The rhetorical devices combined with the thematic structure evident in every story support this frame. Each story set had a theme which was supported by several claims or remedies to the problem presented in the theme. As is typical of newspaper reporting, each set of claims was matched by counterclaims. This matching of claim-counterclaim is the standard journalistic method or procedure for establishing objectivity (Tuchman, 1972).

The overall theme of the task force stories was the same as the dominant theme for all the issues -- reform of higher education. The task force report was requested by Governor
Voinovich so it is no surprise that it echoes his themes of "working harder and smarter" or "doing more with less." The report places all the reform in a context of decreased funds and a flat funding outlook which suggests that the universities and colleges must adapt to change, rather than that they have been "living high on the hog." The task force report presents a snapshot of the higher education system today. The reform measures are proposed strategies to strengthen the higher education system for the future.

Each sub-theme for reform carries with it a counter claim that represents the campuses' resistance to the change. For example, reducing the number of doctoral programs across the state would reduce excellence across the state. In reality, as doctorates have been removed from state funding, excellence has not decreased, as pointed out recently by Governor Voinovich in his state-of-the-state address, in which he noted that 10 of Ohio's 13 universities were nationally ranked.

The overall theme of the workload issues was a time issue -- i.e., how much time was spent with students, who spent time with students, definitions of time, and so forth. At one point in the series of stories, administrators at The Ohio State University tried to frame the issue not as one of time,
but rather as one of quality. This attempt to refocus the workload issue was unsuccessful, as all stories beyond that date reinforced the time aspect to the workload issue and not the quality aspect. In fact, the final legislation included in the biennial budget refers only to a time mandate, not any type of quality issue at all.

Example 4.1 -- Thematic Structures Evident in Task Force Stories in Two Major Ohio Newspapers.

TASK FORCE REPORT

THEME: Hypothesis: Too many campuses do too much of the same thing. Dollars are limited; Colleges must operate more efficiently

Remedies/sub themes (Claims)
1) Merge branches and 2-years "co-located"
2) Tier system into research/teaching/community
3) Reduce duplication (doctoral programs)
4) Increase Regents' authority
5) Remove unconditional job security in tenure
6) Set faculty workload and performance standards
7) Set institutions' missions
8) Curb construction (Capital Debt policy)
   a) make campus responsible for debt

Remedies/subthemes (Counter-claims)
1) Creates a two-tiered system --"class"
2) Reduces excellence
3) Creates bureaucracy
4) Damages Ohio's economic development
5) Reduces local identification with state universities
Example 4.2 -- Thematic Structures Evident in Workload News Stories in Two Major Ohio Newspapers.

FACULTY WORKLOAD

THEME: Hypothesis: Faculty don’t teach

Remedies/sub themes -- (Claim)
Increase teaching time
Supporting elements
a) Public concern
b) Legislative concern
c) Standards don’t exist
d) Undergraduates must be taught
e) Benchmark must be created
f) Jr/Sr before student sees full professor
g) Foreign TAs
h) Teaching is the heart of education
i) Emphasis on research (detract from teaching)

Remedies/sub theme -- (Counter-claims)
1) Quality is the issue
Supporting elements
a) Time is not equal to quality
b) Time is not equal to classroom time

2) Change reward system
Supporting elements
a) Promotion & Tenure emphasizes Tenure
b) Depts are developing policies
c) Schools have differences that must be recognized in a workload policy

This could be explained in many ways, but one simple way is that time is easier to measure than quality. Campus administrators, however, argued that measuring time was not a simple solution to the workload problem. Another way to explain this is that the universities lost the policy battle
to keep the issue focused on quality. Perhaps, the faculty issue of quality was merely lost in the debate. This is plausible because as Table 4.6 illustrates, faculty were seldom story sources (1%), university administrators were used 13 percent of the time, compared to agency sources who were used nearly a quarter of the time (24%).

The secondary issues of quality and the nature of faculty work also were more difficult to explain to the public and did not appear as often in news coverage, nor were they dominant in the frame.

The capital debt issue split the focus between the buildings and the financial side of the reform issue. The focus on finances helped the Regents' shift the funding from the state to the individual campuses. The focus on buildings as "wasted space" or "empty monuments" made for interesting reading and supported the need to curb construction, but missed an important aspect of college and university buildings -- their current physical condition.

Effects of Time on Media Framing

Downs' (1972) issue-attention cycle suggests that news media coverage and public attention ebbs and flows on policy
issues. Problems typically fade in importance once they need a redistribution of income to solve them, or they fade from view because the media and the public are bored with these issues. Media tend to rely on the initial frame or definition of a policy issue and are not likely to move from that position unless something significant occurs. Policymakers realize that once established, a news frame is not only hard to change, but an established frame can thwart any changes in policy (Entman, 1991).

Example 4.3 -- Thematic Structures Evident in Capital Debt News Stories in Two Major Ohio Newspapers.

CAPITAL DEBT

THEME: Hypothesis: Colleges build too many buildings because they don't directly feel the financial burden.

Remedies/sub themes - (Claims)
1) Add debt service to each school's operating budget
2) Schools must decide what to build
3) Offer incentives to conserve
4) Link maintenance payments to student use
5) Eliminate overbuilding
6) Prohibit using higher Ed bonds to finance community projects
7) Give capital as part of operating

Remedies/sub themes - (Counter-claims)
1) Current system works well
2) Recognizes differences among schools
3) Aggregate investment controlled by state
4) Institutions must control construction-related projects
A matrix was created representing the 38 stories (See Example 4.4) and the matrix was mapped to policy outcomes. Second, a policy process chronology positions major public events -- political events, agency meetings, legislative action, court actions, etc. -- against the workload, task force, and capital debt news stories appearing in The Columbus

Example 4.4

Higher Education Reform Matrix Showing Packages, Core Frames and Examples of Rhetorical Devices Used by Journalists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Core Frame</th>
<th>Rhetorical Device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>Faculty Don't Teach</td>
<td>Time - Shoulder the burden of teaching, Quality - TAs barely speak English, Measurement - tough standards, Autonomy - retain flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Debt</td>
<td>Campuses don't feel financial burden</td>
<td>Accountability - put brakes on the boom, Money - staggering debt; awash in borrowed funds; suck money from the formula, Buildings - pork projects; 25-year building spree; empty monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Report</td>
<td>Higher Ed must operate efficiently</td>
<td>Efficiency - streamline; cut costs; Money - focus limited resources; skinny down; doing more with less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dispatch and the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer from 1991 through 1995. The case study in Chapter 5 is organized around this chronology.

A master frame (Snow and Benford, 1992) is evident when all 38 stories are examined together. This frame indicates that reform of higher education is necessary as evidenced by the inefficiencies in the system. The Managing for the Future task force report supports the frame by calling for various types of changes in the 'operations' of higher education. Problems that need addressed range from too many doctorate degrees offered to too many buildings built to too few college-educated Ohioans to too few teachers in the classrooms. All of these problems exist in an environment of scarce resources and this continual competition for these scarce resources adds the political aspect to the policy problems and proposed solutions. The reform frame continues to live through the two specific policy issues that arose from the Managing for the Future task force report -- workload and the capital debt issue.

Each set of stories -- task force, workload and capital debt -- fits into this frame by providing separate interpretive packages which use a single theme or 'core frame'
(Gamson and Lasch, 1983) to support the master frame. The previously identified rhetorical devices then offer specific catchphrases, depictions, or images that build on and support both the thematic structures and the core frames.

**Linking Media Frames to Policy Outcomes**

When the matrix is mapped onto the policy outcomes the core frame of each package maps directly onto the policy outcome. For example, the workload package core frame "faculty don’t teach" maps to the policy outcome of a 10 percent increase in undergraduate teaching activity. The capital debt package core frame "Campuses don’t feel the financial burden" maps to the Regents' 1995 debt policy in which each campus is directly responsible for its debt service as opposed to in the past where debt service was deducted from the total state higher education budget. And finally, the Task Force report package core frame "Higher Education Must Operate Efficiently" maps to the reduction of doctoral programs, the workload policy, the capital debt policy, performance funding, more central reporting from the campuses to the Regents, and to today's current budget and tuition constraints.
Inferences can be made about the link between media frames and policymaking. First, the rhetoric used by media does set the context for debate. Media frames were central to the both the thematic structure and the rhetorical devices used in these stories. Second, the rhetoric does define the issue. Workload certainly became a "time" issue rather than a "quality" issue. Third, the rhetoric was related to the policy outcome. In all three issues, the media rhetoric was carried forward into the policy outcome in identifiable ways. More will be said about these inferences in Chapter 5.
Throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s, a slow and steady din of discontent by a few rose to become a clamor for major reform. Stories from the university campuses across Ohio began to reach the ears of legislators -- senior faculty were passing their classes along to teaching assistants! Some of these students could barely speak English! Faculty were seen mowing their lawns in the middle of the day! Oftentimes, said the rumors, students did not even see a professor in the classroom until they were at least a junior or a senior almost ready to graduate. And even if students saw that professor in
the classroom during class time, they never saw him or her outside the classroom.

Something had to be done. Parents and students were complaining. As former Speaker of the House Vern Riffe said:

"Professors were going to have to spend more time in the classroom because we were catching all kinds of h-e-l-l all over the state. Every time you go someplace... 'These guys are not in their classrooms half the time. I got a niece down there or I got a son or daughter down there telling that you never see the professor.' Here this guy is getting all that money...And they want more money for higher education and all that kind of stuff. I insisted something had to be done. We had to move in some direction to get some people to understand we were not just thinking about it... I've got to give the governor credit for that. He's the one who really brought attention to that. If we didn't do it we're sitting there hurting higher education because people were gonna get to the point that they weren't even going to support it."

Former Speaker of the House
Vern Riffe, 1995

Journalists saw the perceptions of faculty in this manner as well. A higher education reporter for a major Ohio daily newspaper:

"I figured this, that Voinovich was elected in 1990 thinking that higher education was an area that had to be economized. It was an area with waste, fraud, and abuse. An area than had not been reviewed recently. So, it becomes apparent to me within a few months that big things, changes were going to happen.

"In January 1991, Voinovich took a big cut out of the existing higher education budget and I remember covering
Cleveland State University and they were out of their minds. What the hell were they going to do in FY91 and 92? He took it out halfway through (the first year of the biennium).

"So, I didn’t really know what was happening, but I was sensitized to it. That higher education was under critical review. I don’t think I understood the importance of the Managing for the Future task force. It would be nice to say I did, but I didn’t."

Reporter A, January, 1997

The proverbial writing was on the wall for higher education. The Legislature had a duty to protect the educational investment of Ohioans. So, working with the Ohio Board of Regents, the Legislature and the Governor raised the issue of how much time faculty spend in the classroom and moved it squarely onto the policy agenda. It stayed there for nearly four years. At times the issue topped the policy agenda while at other times it was merely one more example of how higher education in Ohio needed reform.

This case study chronicles what became known as "the faculty workload issue" in Ohio. Using news stories, editorials and letters to the editor from The Columbus Dispatch and the (Cleveland) Plain Dealer, along with Regents documents, legislative testimony, legislation, public remarks and personal conversations, the issue of how much time faculty members should spend in the classroom is chronicled from 1991
through implementation of a legislative mandate to increase faculty productivity in 1994.

**Awareness: Raising Questions About Faculty Workload**

U.S. colleges and universities have grown and changed significantly since Harvard University was founded in 1636, but the very nature of faculty work, but, has changed little. At public institutions across the nation, faculty struggle to define "work" or what fits instruction, research, public service and institutional governance and operation (Bowen and Schuster, 1986). As recently as 1990, faculty at Ohio's public colleges and universities reported to the Ohio Board of Regents that they spent 36.9 hours on instruction, 3.7 hours advising students; 10.5 hours on departmental research; 2.3 hours on public service and 4.2 hours on administration for a total work week of 47.6 hours -- certainly a full work week. Compared to the same reporting system a decade, earlier, however, the instruction part of the faculty work week seems to have decreased (Ohio Board of Regents, 1992).

The workload issue was a national issue by 1990 and the general public was beginning to take notice. Books like *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* and
Impostors in the Temple questioned not only how faculty did their work, but more importantly, what they called work and its relevance to everyday individuals.

The State Higher Education Executives Organization (SHEEO) a national group of governing and coordinating board leaders that studies trends in higher education, prepared a paper on the relationship between state policy and productivity in higher education for a national symposium on higher education finance and management issues held in January 1991 that was sponsored by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) (SHEEO, 1991). With a primary audience of financial officers, the report explained the complexities of tying funding to performance. But rather than offer any innovations, the report merely relied on Charles Lindbloom's old (1968) "muddling through" explanation for incremental changes in policymaking and the report continued to question whether productivity even is a "valid concept in higher education, or a compatible objective in the political process of resource allocation at the state level" (p. 1, SHEEO, 1991).

In Ohio, recently elected Governor George Voinovich began to look at higher education as critically. As a former mayor
of Cleveland, he approached all government looking for waste and fraud. Once elected, he first created a task force to examine the operations of all the other state agencies (Operations Improvement Task Force). Next, he called for a task force to examine the "operations" of higher education. So, the Ohio Board of Regents put together a 19-member committee of business, industry, state government and university people to study the operations of higher education and report back to the Governor their recommendations for change.

Governor Voinovich was elected on a efficiency-in-government campaign with a slogan of "working harder and smarter." Voinovich, a former mayor of Cleveland, was known as a no-nonsense manager who sought out and rid government of waste. Higher education was a ripe target for an "efficiency study." Voinovich was not interested in the philosophy of conflicting values and purposes in higher education. He was looking for wide, sweeping reform of higher education in light of the economic conditions and his passionate crusade for his version of "efficiency."

In an op-ed article that was printed in the Columbus Dispatch just two days after the release of the Managing for
the Future report, Governor Voinovich raises questions about higher education in Ohio.

"...Is there costly and unnecessary duplication in subject matter, degree programs, professional colleges and research specialties? Are professors spending enough time in the classroom? Are our colleges and universities truly doing all they can to trim costs and improve efficiency without hurting students?"...

Columbus Dispatch, July 26, 1992

Watching all this from the media sidelines one higher education reporter thought the process was worth paying attention to:

"That task force, you could say, was the wake up call or death knell depending on your point of view, to the higher education system. The governor was critical of the way money had been spent and he wanted to bring efficiencies to this area. And, of course, you know this is hindsight. I could see that happening all across the U.S. I don't know why so simultaneously. State governments were strapped for money and looking for places to get it. You can't take it out of prisons. The social services need more. Secondary education needs more money everywhere. So, it could be that higher education took an unnecessary beating. It could be described that higher education had no constituencies to defend it."

Reporter A, January, 1997

History has shown that times of budgetary stress are often coupled with public cries for accountability. Two decades earlier Ohio and the nation had gone through a accountability period (Hines, 1988). And again, in the early
1980s as Ohio struggled to recover from a recession and move from a rust belt economy to a service-oriented high technology economy, the tension between institutional autonomy and government intrusion was evident (Newman, 1987).

The economy was the central public policy issue again in the early 1990s. Candidate Clinton became famous campaigning in 1992 for the behind-the-scenes slogan "It's the economy, stupid." Ohio was no different from many states with respect to education budget cuts. Higher education remained a target for budget cuts although it was less than 15 percent of the state budget (Ohio Board of Regents, 1992). In 1991, the cuts were coupled with the governor's press for governmental efficiency. Budget cuts to higher education in FY 93 totaled $170.2 million -- or nearly 54 percent of the total state budget cut (Ohio Board of Regents, 1992).

In July 1992 the Managing for the Future Task Force released the results of its year-long examination of higher education. The Cincinnati Post characterized the Managing for the Future report as "surprisingly hard-hitting" although the task force was "dominated by Ivory Tower interests." According to the editorial, the report itself "advocates a host of
reforms exemplifying Voinovich's oft-stated goal of working harder and smarter" (Cincinnati Enquirer, July 28, 1992).

Newspapers across the state were strikingly similar in their editorials about the reform report. The Plain Dealer termed it a "blueprint for change" whose "suggestions will go down like castor oil" (Plain Dealer, July 29, 1992). The editorial supported reducing duplication of programs, acknowledging one or two world-class research universities, merging technical colleges and university branch campuses where they share a campus, and increasing the Ohio Board of Regent's power to organize a comprehensive system of higher education.

An Akron Beacon Journal editorial focused on the Regents' expanded power issue. Calling the report a "catalyst for dramatic change" the paper supported some additional power for the Regents, but questioned the extent of that power (Akron Beacon Journal, July 26, 1992).

And in the state capitol, The Columbus Dispatch followed suit, terming the report "first rate" and supporting recommendations for two major research universities, reducing duplication of programs. The newspaper concluded that "while
not all the task force's recommendations will be strongly embraced, it would be a serious mistake if this document were not in some manner acted upon" (The Columbus Dispatch, August 2, 1992).

Awareness was raised. A problem existed in higher education and the report offered 70 different recommendations for change, and among them the issue of faculty work.

The Policy Problem Identified: Faculty Don't Teach

By Winter 1992, the workload issue had made the academic journals. Massey and Wilger (1992) introduced the term "academic ratchet" to describe the shift from teaching to research that was ongoing at major research universities. They believe this shift occurs because of departmental processes including pursuing faculty lines, leveraging faculty time, destructuring the curriculum and moving cultural group norms toward rewarding research. All these process are designed to increase a department's financial strength. A focus on research usually means external dollars to the university and department. This skewing of the rewards system is what produced the shift toward research and away from teaching.
Their was an early study with limited data, but if Massey and Wilger are correct about the nature of the ratchet problem, then the Regents' solution of departmental control over workload standards offers the problem a more fertile ground on which to flourish rather than the accountability measure desired by the Legislature.

By December 1991, the workload issue was rising on the higher education policy agenda in Ohio. The Regents' Study Committee on Faculty Workload brought together 13 provosts, deans, and faculty members from Ohio's two- and four-year public colleges and universities who met six times between December 1991 and April 1992. Assisted by three long-time Regents staff members, including two vice chancellors, the committee's brief eight-page report recommended changes to "enhance the quality of teaching" and "increase the overall amount of instruction provided by university faculty."

The structure of the report itself is interesting to note. Following nearly a full page of introduction, the next five pages define and summarize faculty work leaving only one-and-a-half-page for recommendations. The report certainly was designed not to ruffle any faculty feathers. It appears as
though it was written with an ear toward "how this will play on campus". The recommendations are to

1) Identify and Eliminate Current Inconsistencies

2) Preserve Institutional Decision-Making on Workload

3) Maintain Existing Institutional Patterns in Two-Year Colleges

4) Set Departmental Expectations in All Other Institutions

5) Ensure that Incentives and Rewards Follow Mission Expectations

The issue of amount of time spent teaching is only addressed in a quantitative manner by reporting time spent on instruction by two-year college faculty, not university faculty. University faculty were the target of most of the complaints and of later legislation. The appendices of the Managing for the Future report do contain a preliminary faculty productivity report from Kent State University, one of the six Ohio universities with a collective bargaining agreement. Collective bargaining later became an issue in the workload debate. The caveat on this report is that it is a "work in progress" because of the "accelerated timeframe under which Kent’s pilot productivity study was conducted" (p. 5, KSU report, 1992).
At the national level, SHEBO surveyed its 55 members that same spring (1992) and released a draft report entitled "Faculty Workload: State and System Perspectives" in October. Again, placed in the context of financial constraints and public demands for accountability, faculty workload was addressed as a quality issue as well as a productivity issue. The study found that standards were being established by governing boards and that coordinating boards also were examining the issue. In 1992, seven states had addressed workload through legislation and seven others had pending legislation at the time of the report. Most legislatures chose to reform the workload issue through the appropriations process. The workload amendment had not yet been introduced in the Ohio General Assembly in 1992.

Media Frame: Hike Teaching Time

While the Regents were busy framing the workload issue as a quality issue and supporting institutional authority, the media framed the issue differently once they began writing about it. The initial Columbus Dispatch and (Cleveland) Plain Dealer stories published after the release of the Managing for the Future Task Force report on July 24, focused on the
breadth of reforms, but highlight the reference to tenure: "Tenure is not a lifetime guarantee of employment, but it is a commitment to academic freedom" (p. 55, Managing for the Future Report, 1992).

Report calls for higher education focus

"...The 64-page report that was a year in the making also called for altering faculty tenure rules, consolidating some university regional campuses and technical colleges, modifying the state's funding formula and designating Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati as the state's comprehensive research institutions."

The Columbus Dispatch 7/25/92

Education blueprint: consolidate

"...Tenure, or lifetime employment would be replaced by job contracts. Professors' productivity would be periodically evaluated." Plain Dealer 7/25/92

Interestingly enough, although early stories mentioned the tenure issue, it quickly dropped from sight and was not mentioned in the implementation plans. After a summer of "town meetings" across Ohio to hear various perspectives on the Managing for the Future report, the Regents released the follow-up implementation report Securing the Future in December, 1992. Describing the Regents' commitments to

126
fulfilling the recommendations of the Managing for the Future report, Chancellor Elaine Hairston made the following points:

"...It is important that the provision of high quality undergraduate instruction at reasonable costs be the highest priority for all of Ohio's public colleges and universities. No activity is more essential to serving the instructional needs of Ohio's citizens...

...The issue of undergraduate instruction, as presented by the Task Force, combines concerns of effectiveness and efficiency with that of accountability. To address these concerns, the Regents strongly endorse the recommendation of the Task Force that faculty time must be allocated in the most effective manner, consistent with the mission of a college or university. The Regents are asking all state supported colleges and universities to develop faculty workload policies that are consistent with missions. In addition, the Regents are asking that each college and university institute annual reviews of performance for all faculty and administrators...

...It is important that we recognize that our recommendations on faculty workload evaluation are consistent with the Regents' strong support for tenure as the essential method for preserving academic freedom. Tenure for faculty is absolutely necessary for this reason and any action that would diminish tenure would directly contradict the Board's responsibility for ensuring excellence in higher education."

Chancellor Elaine Hairston, December, 1992

The news coverage of the Securing the Future report began in earnest the media framing of the workload issue, although it did not become a continuing news story until Spring 1993. News stories from both the Cleveland Plain Dealer and The Columbus Dispatch illustrate the beginnings of the
time frame. Both stories relate the Regents' strong support of tenure but tie it directly to a performance evaluation, and the Plain Dealer quoted Chancellor Hairston's written statement. In a summary paragraph about 75 words into the story, the Plain Dealer characterized the recommendations of the report as "reduc[ing] costly duplication of programs and put[ing] professors back in the classroom." By Spring 1993 the "increase time" media frame was in full evidence. Quoted in The Dispatch, Rep. Wayne Jones (D-Cuyahoga Falls) said of his amendment, "It was not meant to be a punitive measure. It was a concern of many legislators, students and their parents that full-time professors are not spending enough time in the classroom."

"Spend enough time" or similar phrases framed the workload issue by Spring 1993. An analysis of the rhetorical devices used by journalists writing on the workload issue in The Dispatch and the Plain Dealer found that rhetorical devices categorized as "Time" were used more frequently to describe workload than other rhetorical devices (34.6%): e.g., "hike time", "spend more time", "valuable time" "Broaden definition of
time", "too little time", "restore classroom time", and "amount of time teaching."

While the Regents also referred to quality as a part of the workload issue, it was never given the amount of "space" in the news stories as the time frame. An Ohio State administrator tried to frame the issue as a quality issue in an April 7, 1993 Dispatch story by saying "We are already doing a lot to improve the quality of undergraduate education, so we really don't need this," referring to the amendment requiring an increase in teaching time.

... "'Efforts should be made to improve the quality of education,' Rudd said, 'but improving quality is not a matter of spending more time in the classroom.'"

The Columbus Dispatch 4/7/93

Time was the main theme based on an analysis of the thematic structures, including claims and counter-claims about the problem, appearing in the workload news stories.

So, the die was cast. The tenure issue was set aside. The faculty workload issue moved forward framed as a "time" issue.
The Policy Solution: Faculty Should Teach More

While university administrators tried to frame the issue as a quality issue (with limited Regents support) as well as an issue of time in the classroom, members of the Ohio General Assembly had different thoughts on the issue. Rep. Wayne Jones (D-Cuyahoga Falls), the amendment sponsor, cited "public concern" as what prompted him to create the workload amendment. Other legislators agreed with Jones. According to a Columbus Dispatch news story (5/16/93), Rep. Robert E. Netzley (R-Laura) "has complained for years that professors spend too little time in the classroom, leaving those duties to graduate assistants, while teachers write articles and do research." And, Senator Eugene Watts (R-Galloway), a professor of history at The Ohio State University and chairman of the education subcommittee, agreed with Netzley.

..."I believe our universities, in some instances, have gone too far on the research side...part of the emotion of this comes from not a very clear understanding of what universities do," said Watts. "If you go overboard and insist that they have to spend every waking minute in the classroom, you're not going to have anybody left in the classroom."

The Columbus Dispatch 5/16/93
Reporter A offered an explanation why professors were taking so much heat in the midst of a reform report that also focused on program duplication, capital debt, student achievement, and a host of other problems in higher education.

"Many of the public think that professors are getting away with something. (Representative) Dan Troy, he’s an everyman. He is down-to-earth and represents the best of the worst of ordinary people. He said to me ‘Well, do you know we’re paying those people to write books!’ It’s a wonderful quote. He said what was going to happen to those book-writing people and it expressed a whole philosophy. He took a lot of heat for it, but he said it. It summed up the attitude of the politicians and the policymakers and they make public policy.

"And why would they be pissed off at professors? The cost of tuition was going up 6 percent each year after year. No matter how much you like the academic community, that will set off alarm bells. Parents are angry and parents are voters. People like Dan Troy, Roy Ray and Pat Sweeney were going to be looking at higher education with a critical eye.

"I don’t think they had been (looking critically at higher education) in those early years -- from the 60s expansions. The baby boomers moved in and we had to create a whole new set of Ph.D. people to teach them. On the other hand, I looked at Academe, that comes out every year from AAUP (American Association of University Professors) and faculty don’t really make that much money for the amount of education they have to obtain before they become professors."

Reporter A, January, 1997

And, so the first legislation to increase the number of hours faculty spend in the classroom was introduced on March 25, 1993 by Rep. Wayne Jones. News coverage the next day of
the budget bill focused on the political nature of the budgeting process, but deep in the story (11 paragraphs in) the workload amendment is reported by The Columbus Dispatch veteran Statehouse reporter, Lee Leonard.

"...One major amendment inserted by the committee with the blessing of the Ohio Board of Regents calls for a 10 percent increase in the faculty teaching workload in undergraduate classrooms at state-assisted college and university campuses by June 30, 1994

The amendment calls for the Board of Regents to develop guidelines by Sept. 1, 1993. Individual institutions will establish policies to meet the guidelines."

The Columbus Dispatch, 3/26/93

The workload issue moved off the news media agenda until after the legislation is passed on June 30, 1993. No stories appear in either newspaper. The following language was passed into Ohio law (Am.Sub.H.B. No.152) and the Regents were left with the implementation task:

SECTION 84.14 Faculty Workload Policy

Pursuant to section 3345.45 of the Revised Code, the Ohio Board of Regents shall work with state universities to ensure that no later than fall term 1994, a minimum ten per cent increase in statewide undergraduate teaching activity be achieved to restore the reductions experienced over the past decade. Notwithstanding section 3345.45 of the Revised Code, any collective bargaining agreement in effect on the effective date of this act shall continue in effect until its expiration date.
Employee Performance Review Procedures

The Ohio Board of Regents shall work with the state-assisted colleges and universities to ensure that each institution has in place, by no later than June 30, 1994, specific procedures for annual performance reviews of all members of the faculty and all administrative employees.

Am.Sub.H.B. No.152

Media Frame: A Faculty Issue or a Policymaker's Issue?

An examination of the sources used by higher education reporters in all 38 stories analyzed found that in only three stories were faculty members quoted. One of these faculty sources, was a veiled source, where the individual was only identified as a faculty member and the issue was the merging of co-located branch campuses with technical or community colleges. The other two times faculty members were quoted in stories were stories about the AAUP court fight against the workload policy. Importantly, these faculty as sources was not the result of journalist initiative: instead, the journalists were quoting AAUP members who were bringing the suit -- i.e., a provided source.

The lack of faculty input into all 11 stories concerning the workload issue suggests one of the most significant problems in journalism today -- using single sources or sources easy to contact (Gans, 1988; Kaniss, 1991).
asked if he talked to run-of-the-mill faculty about this issue, one higher education reporter said:

"I talked to AAUP and to the faculty on those committees... the Regents faculty workload committee. They were captive people. If they are on a committee at least when you talk to them at the end of the process -- after they have been on a committee with administrators and other, business folks -- they aren’t going to have the same things to say as they might have said going in. Their eyes have been opened, the have seen another point of view. There are not as likely to come out as firebrands...

..."Frankly, I worried for a long time that I did not do enough with the workload issue. It’s a political game. The perception is that professors get away with something because they are writing books."

Reporter A, January, 1997

An analysis of the news stories shows that the workload issue and subsequent policy mandate was defined by lawmakers and policymakers. This begs the question: What if faculty had a voice in this issue? Would the media frame be any different? Would the policy outcome have changed? It seems very likely that an additional perspective, and a different perspective as presented by faculty members who balance teaching, research, service in their daily lives may well have influenced the outcome of this policy. The addition of faculty as a source in the news stories most certainly would
have improved news coverage by providing something closer to a multiperspective (Gans, 1988).

**Policy Implementation: Faculty Will Teach More**

As the Ohio General Assembly worked toward a budget bill including the workload language, the workload issue remained a policy issue at the national level that spring (1993). Jossey-Bass, the major higher education press, published *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000* as part of its New Directions for Higher Education series. The report focused on the faculty reward system and how to change it to enhance teaching.

Ohio's Legislative Office of Education Oversight (LOEO), a 1989 creation of the Ohio Legislature to provide staff support to the Legislative Committee on Education Oversight, released a report in July 1993 with similar findings: faculty are rewarded for research work, not teaching work. LOEO suggested that changing the faculty rewards system would take external pressure as well as internal and external incentives. They suggested that (1) universities examine their missions and align promotion and tenure decisions accordingly; (2) evaluate teaching and service in promotion and tenure
decisions; (3) offer separate teaching and research tracks; and (4) expand the current definition of scholarship. By 1997, little has changed on the campuses.

Following the June 30, 1993 passage of the biennial budget bill (Am.Sub.H.B. No.152) the Regents convened an Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload comprised of faculty, administrators, policymakers and legislators. It was staffed by Chancellor Hairston and two assistants. Only one faculty member, a geographer from Ohio State, served on both the Study Committee on Faculty Workload which created the 1992 report and the new Advisory Committee. The Regents' staff assistants were different for the two committees as well. While the change in faculty and administrators seems natural and allows for a breadth of opinion, the change in Regents' staff would seem to hamper the process. Faculty workload is a very complex issue with much background knowledge needed to provide adequate staff support. Additionally, two of the previous staff assistants had university-level teaching experience which would sensitize them to the issue. They had been in the classroom and knew the time and effort necessary to teach at the collegiate level. Only one of the staff member on the second committee had that experience.
Addressing the Board of Regents in January 1994, Chancellor Elaine Hairston summed the committees’ work in this manner:

"...1) ... service to students in general -- and undergraduate students in particular -- must be the highest priority of Ohio’s state colleges and universities and 2) that Ohio’s public university faculty do indeed have a deep and genuine concern for their students.*

The document that was presented echoed all the Regents’ themes from the April 1992 report looking at faculty work. Chancellor Hairston sums it up well:

*places special emphasis on the importance of the undergraduate learning experience
*contains clear guidelines for universities to determine a range of acceptable undergraduate teaching by faculty
*recognizes differences in university missions
*outlines a framework for increasing faculty time spent in instruction.

The Columbus Dispatch and the Plain Dealer coverage of the February 1994 Regents meeting still maintained the media “time” frame in their headlines and throughout the stories. Efforts by the Regents to broaden the frame to include more traditional higher education philosophical issues has failed.

“Regents to send Prof back to class New regulation would require 10% more teaching time - Plain Dealer 2/18/94
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The Ohio media continued to track the issue throughout 1994 as the policy moved toward implementation by fall term, 1994. Each newspaper published four stories between January and September 1994. Stories tagged to external events -- Regents meetings (January, February and June) -- or the AAUP battle (August). Only one enterprise story appeared and even it was more than likely brought on by an external event -- the beginning of fall term. This story (Plain Dealer August 29, 1994) was headlined "Colleges plan for bigger workloads" and in journalistic terms it was a long story -- 1,238 words. A "wrap-up" type of story, this one is interesting in that the headline suggests the story would tell about the impact of the workload policy, but it meanders around so much that the focus on increased teaching is lost. Instead, it reads as follows:

"College Students returning to campus this fall at Ohio's public universities will pay about 5% more than they did last spring, on average.

Slightly fewer freshmen will be at many of the schools, because Ohio's public high school since June graduated the
fewest seniors -- about 101,000 -- since the baby boomers began attending college back in the 1960s.

Universities should have slightly more money this year. The Ohio Board of Regents has allocated $1.56 billion, up from $1.47 billion last year for the entire higher education system.

And best of all, freshman can expect more attention from senior faculty members.

At least that is what the state's lawmakers envisioned last year when they ordered a 10% overall increase in faculty teaching of undergraduates by the start of school this fall. Plain Dealer, August, 29, 1994

The story, however, shifts to talk about faculty retirements due to lack of funding. Many state schools offered incentives to senior (often highest paid) faculty to retire early. These faculty would then be replaced by junior faculty at least half the annual salary. A round up story like this surveys the universities to see what conditions are across Ohio. The comments by administrators regarding the impact of the workload policy are very interesting. For example:

"...students will notice change only incrementally and only in a moderate way." -- at the University of Akron

"new workload policy will not have much obvious impact on incoming freshman because campus enforced workload since 1980." -- at Kent State University.
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However, at OSU -- "incoming freshmen will see more full professors than their counterparts four years ago because of the new policy."

"freshmen would not see an immediate appreciable difference in class experiences because of the new standards"-- at Miami University.

"Students at OU [Ohio University] are not likely to notice a change....because OU has increased its faculty involvement with students over the last decade."

Plain Dealer August 29, 1994

Given the strength of this evidence, the headline could read "New policy not expected to have impact" which certainly could raise Regents' and lawmakers' ire! It appears that headline is merely a coincidence and was written by a copy editor who did not read the entire news story rather than a deliberate political ploy.

The time media frame was always evident in the news stories throughout the policy process. It seems that legislators, policymakers, and the public all agreed that the central issue was the amount of time a professor spent with students and not the type or quality of that time. This fits a larger accountability frame which is how Governor Voinovich posed the examination into higher education when he began it in 1991.
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Both newspapers also devoted space to the collective bargaining issue. The AAUP, the union representing faculty at six public colleges and universities, took the stance in the fall of 1993 that in concept the increase was fine as long as it remained a collective bargaining issue.

"...This is a tremendous weakening of the collective bargaining law," Borus said. "We are willing to support a 10 percent increase and we are willing to work with the state on that. First, we need to get this part about the collective bargaining law out of there."

If a change in the law doesn’t happen, said David Rubin, chairman of the committee campaigning to change the law, the members of the association who met in Columbus Sept. 11 suggested the group file suit. Rubin is a biology professor at Central State University.

Columbus Dispatch 10/1/93

The union began its fight by trying to effect change by amending the law contained in the biennial budget bill. They proposed changes to the guidelines created for the Regents to consider in February 1994. They also sought legislative help through Rep. Wayne Jones who sponsored the original amendment to the budget bill. Rep. Jones offered an amendment to change the original mandate, but it was not successful. State Senator Gene Watts, who offered the Senate version of workload in the biennial budget, tried to explain in a February 2 Plain Dealer
story that collective bargaining was not to be impacted by the guidelines. After trying to work within the system for change, the AAUP filed with in the Ohio Supreme Court on August 19, 1994. The court, however, dismissed the case on March 1, 1995.

Aftermath: Are Faculty Teaching More?

Some Perspectives on the Media and Policy Formation

The public policy process has five identifiable stages -- problem identification, solution formation, policy adoption, implementation and evaluation (Linsky, 1986). This case study so far has tracked the workload issue through problem identification, solution formation, policy adoption and implementation. The next step is to ask a good evaluative question "Are faculty teaching more?" There are no news stories indicating that the policy has been a success. Asked if he thought the policy changed anything, Reporter A said:

"I thought that the end result was that nothing really happened. The way it ended up, the faculty instruction of undergraduates would improve systemwide by 10 percent. I checked and there is no way to measure it. Voinovich and company wanted to kick butt and the Regents absorbed it. They came up with some "black box" methods."

Reporter A, January, 1997
Reporter A offered the following explanation of why a story was not written pointing that out to the public.

"Too busy with the next thing. Someone at CSU gave me a tool to use to measure faculty productivity. Look at things in each discipline -- a record of nationally-known publications -- pubs as they call them. Certain journals that would count in each discipline and they keep track of that at the department level."

Reporter A, January, 1997

Another higher education reporter at a major daily newspaper shared that opinion of the workload policy and its impact on higher education in Ohio:

"I think that was one of the goofiest things that came out of the Statehouse discussions. 10 percent of what? They never established who professors are. No one had a handle on that one. The Regents asked the universities to put in place vague requirements for fulfilling those goals. It's just like trying to get your arms around a cloud."

Reporter B, January, 1997

And why no follow up story?

"I had a million other things to do and then I switched the beat. They spent two years or so fiddling around with a meaningless measure."

Reporter B, January 7, 1997

So while both reporters felt the policy did not add anything to higher education, neither one wrote a story or followed up on the policy in any manner. Reporter A still
believes tracking the policy change and its impact (or lack thereof) might make an interesting story:

"...The paper would support that kind of a study. I have written a proposal...here's there's a thing called a beat note...I talk about the thesis of what I want to find out. what I am trying to work out. I put in an encapsulated version with sources or records that indicate this or that. And then there's a lot of discussion...yeah, it's the selling of a story, but you can't sell bullshit. I usually sit down in the cafeteria with one of my editors and talk about it. Each of use will have a print out of the story ideas. What's frustrating to me is that I don't always get to do what I want to do."

...I have developed this beat as a statewide beat...an issues beat. I saw it as a political beat. Funding of public higher education is an important area we have neglected...The point I am trying to make is reluctance on the part of the paper. I am really a metro reporter, not a state reporter.

Reporter A, January, 1997

The reporter's comments mirror what Kaniss (1991) found in economic development reporting in Philadelphia. Reporters move on quickly to the next day's news and longer-term follow up, which issues stories require, is often hard to accomplish. Newspaper management functions in a "market-driven world of easy-to-digest events" which does not allow "news that gives a sense of depth and insight and context to surface events" (p. 145-46, Underwood, 1993). But not all reporters follow that logic, as Reporter A again:
"I believe that newspapers are a part of the (policy) process. What I decide to put in the story becomes bigger than just you reporting. It is something. And something in the paper often can become part of the process. It does become part of the political process; what we write. But we can't write fiction. It has to be based on fact. However you write... in the way in which [you] present it is also a part of the process... If you present something in a smirky manner, this case was borderline smirky, in hindsight."

Reporter A, January, 1997

This presentation that Reporter A mentions is a frame -- a way of describing something to an audience (Iyengar and Kinder, 1987) or a cognitive device used by journalists to organize large amounts of information (Pan and Kosicki, 1993) to define problems (faculty don't teach, for example), diagnose causes (they write books), make moral judgments (they are getting away with something), and suggest remedies (10 percent increase in workload) (Entman, 1991). This presentation of news arises out of a schema or a mental framework that is used to make sense of information. Most political reporters tend to use a game schema (Patterson, 1993). Everything a candidate does is believed to be strategic to place the candidate ahead in the game.

Issues, on which Reporter A constructs the higher education beat, are much harder to apply the game schema to
and as such, do not receive as much coverage. A study of *New York Times* election stories from 1960-1992 illustrates a shift from policy and game schemas to the more predominant game schema today (See Patterson, 1993, p. 74). Frames and schema are embedded in newswork. Reporter A explains it well in everyday terms.

"...What I am trying to reveal to you is the way I work. I try to form a relationship with whomever I am covering. Years ago I was interviewed by *Cleveland Magazine* about my role in a strike. I said a lot of things over a 45-minute period and the only thing he used was some obscenities about the publisher. I was quoted out of context. I try not to do that to people.

"...What I am saying is I cover a beat, any beat, political, this one. I want the people to trust me and I want to know the whole story. I want to know where they fit it and then I’ll present it in a way that is objective. That doesn’t let people get hurt as much as it might, but I’ll inform the public. I’ll let the public know what is going on. That involves a lot of trust in me, that I’ll get it right and not screw them."

Reporter A, January, 1997

Like most journalists who use "standard operating practices" (Kaniss, 1991), Reporter A verifies facts, presents conflicting possibilities and supporting evidence, uses direct quotes, and structures stories in certain sequences to create objectivity (Tuchman, 1972). When questioned about his presentation and objectivity, he responded.
"Objectivity is just a certain kind of subjectivity. I interpret what everybody tells me. The only way to do it successfully is that I try to talk to a lot of people and get all their points of view and then go down the middle."

Reporter A, January, 1997

Tuchman (1972) might counter that objectivity doesn’t exist and instead what Reporter A presents are the state’s majoritarian values or the dominant hegemony (Gitlin, 1980). This certainly holds true for the workload issue. The public, lawmakers and even some policymakers certainly believe that professors who write books are getting away with something. The entire set of workload stories bears this out. By using the time media frame, both higher education journalists reflected these values.

"I help the policy process. That’s what I try to do. Most of what we do ends up pushing public policy formation further ahead by letting people know what is proposed. I have to be aware of the demand to do it fairly."

Reporter A, January, 1997

While Reporter A may "help the policy process" Reporter B has a different perspective.

"I write stories for the broad audience and that includes people on campus as well as the Statehouse. What they do with that information is up to them."

Reporter B, January, 1997
Reporter A and Reporter B may be on opposite sides of the spectrum, but both represent traditional news reporting. What Reporter A calls "pushing policy formation" Cook et al (1983) refer to as the "active collaboration" between journalists and policymakers that influences a policy outcome. Reporter A's presentation of any policy issue does "influence the nature and content of public deliberation" (Linsky, 1988). Certainly, with both major newspapers writing about the workload issue with the time media frame, the policymakers could not help but keep that central to the policy created -- a 10 percent increase in teaching activity.

The active collaboration is just that -- active -- with participants on both sides, a dynamic which Reporter A recognizes.

"You could get criticized looking to the dialectic... the natural tension that occurs whenever two people are talking about anything marriage, family, newsroom or if you are talking to a federal bureaucrat and a state bureaucrat.

...I try to look for a counterpoint. If it is a state representative or lawmaker, I try to get the administration's point of view and weigh that. I try then to present the story evenhandedly. Maybe they are coming at it from a different perspective."

Reporter A, January, 1997
Long after the workload issue left the media agenda, The Columbus Dispatch takes a slightly different look at faculty work. The Dispatch ran an "expose" set of stories in November, 1995 with the following headlines: "Professors moonlight on taxpayer time. Jobs seen as beneficial, but OSU admits lax oversight." "Beyond the classrooms: Some OSU professors skirt rule to hold second jobs," and "Business connections raise questions." The tone of all the stories was that professors were getting away with something -- another way to address the "we're paying them for writing books" issue -- only worse. For example, note the first few paragraphs of the front page story follow:

"Hundreds of state-paid college professors moonlight at sometimes lucrative second jobs -- with taxpayer support and the blessings of their colleges.

"Some colleges and universities encourage the outside work. Many have policies allowing professors to take one day of the workweek for a second job, but how much time professors spend on outside work is anyone's' guess.

"At Ohio State University, top officials don't know. In fact, some of the university's academic leaders, hold second jobs without reporting them as required by university rules."

The Columbus Dispatch, 11/12/95
This story was not included in the original data set of workload stories, but it certainly addresses the workload issue -- time. If faculty are holding second jobs, who is in the classroom is the unspoken question. The Dispatch higher education reporter says it all began with a tip from "someone:"

"Yeah, it came to me as a tip from someone who was upset about what they were seeing in an off-campus situation, where a professor was spending a lot of time working at a job that didn't necessarily relate to his university work. This person was perplexed about how it could happen and was allowed.

"I worked on it off and on during and in-between beat assignments. I think I started off by calling up the administrator in charge -- Nancy Rudd -- and asking her if faculty who worked off campus had forms to fill out. What were the polices about holding second jobs. She gave me the policy manual statement. There is supposed to be a report somewhere. I went to look at the reports and computerized it into a data base and when I ran through the list...some people came up missing. Folks we knew about through casual conversations, news releases... and we did not see their names on the list. It begged the big question, 'Is anybody paying attention?'

Dispatch Reporter, January, 1997

The story may have had an impact on campus, but no additional coverage, nor legislative interest, occurred.

As an interesting side note: sometime after the series ran, a quote from the reporter and his picture were used in an advertising campaign for The Columbus Dispatch. The campaign, both print and television, featured various Dispatch reporters
talking about their beats. The culture of print reporters typically does not allow them into a story or into the spotlight. Broadcast reporters are much more recognizable to the public because their faces are on television. Although they are identified with a by-line, print reporters experience much less "celebrity" than television reporters. An ad campaign featuring reporters is atypical. The reporter was comfortable with the campaign, saying "I have never sought the limelight. But by the same token, it’s good to put a face with the news that they read. I don’t feel there is anything wrong with (the public) knowing there is a person behind the by-line."

Conclusions

This case study of the faculty workload issue in Ohio raises several concerns regarding the news media and policymaking. First the issues about the media are discussed.

Media Frames and Newswork

Journalists use media frames to organize, interpret, and communicate large amounts of information. And, at some levels they understand they use these frames. Certainly, Reporter A understood the framing dynamic as evidenced by the comments
("smirky") about how a story was constructed had an impact on the source and on the policy-making process. This potential impact held the reporter to some standard of reporting.

Comments by legislators reflected in the news stories illustrated that readers could easily adapt these frames into their own ways of thinking. While it is impossible to track when and where Rep. Netzley’s ideas and later complaints about "time" in the classroom spent by professors first began, his comments fit into the time media frame.

Journalists also are aware that the standard operating practices they use -- for example, "getting both sides of a story" -- enhances framing. Both reporters comment on their skepticism about the information provided by sources. Reporter A refers to faculty members whose viewpoints are changed by sitting on a committee with business leaders and administrators while Reporter B’s comments about an administrators’ viewpoint of a policy representing the "party line." Both reporters fail to acknowledge that either mode of presentation of information is not significantly different from their own presentation of information. All information
is embedded with meaning and audiences will further construct meaning based on their own cognitive devices or frames.

**Media Frames and Policymaking**

Examining an issue over time as done with Ohio's faculty workload issue offers a logical rendering of how audience members might perceive an issue. The chronology at the end of this chapter organizes the news stories alongside other external events to offer a picture of the evolution of one major higher education policy issue.

Placing the stories within an events chronology shows the initial framing of each issue and attempts to alter the initial frame. For example, the workload issue was framed as a time issue, with subissues of quality of teaching, measurement standards, and autonomy arising out of both the thematic structure and rhetorical devices. An unsuccessful attempt was made by The Ohio State University to focus on the quality of teaching rather than the actual time spent in the classroom (*The Columbus Dispatch* April 7, 1993). Six of the following seven stories supported the time frame with one story supporting the quality frame.
An interesting sidenote to the workload issue is the focus on time as a collective bargaining issue in the later workload stories (The Columbus Dispatch - August 26 and 28, 1994). Faculty unions across the state are concerned that the legislative mandate is outside of the bargaining process. The American Association of University Professors took the issue to the Ohio Supreme Court and lost.

The Problem Identification/Awareness stage could be defined as 1990-1992 and during that time five news stories mentioned faculty work in some manner. During the Solution Formation stage (January - June, 1993) only two stories appeared. One story discussion the passage of the workload legislation appeared during the Policy Adoption stage (June, 1993).

As expected, the bulk of the news stories (a total of eight) were printed during the Policy Implementation stage (June, 1993 through August, 1994). At this stage, the policy has the most impact on whomever it is supposed to impact. Stories at this stage, however, do not help the persons impacted by the policy. They no longer are able to shape the policy. If the intent of news coverage is to inform citizens about activities that will impact their daily lives then the
coverage should be enhanced during the solution formation process, not during policy implementation. No evaluation stories were written.

Journalists’ story selection is definitely impacted by external events and in this case, Regent’s meetings provided the events. Few true enterprise stories were written about the workload issue. The Plain Dealer’s round-up story in August, 1994 and The Dispatch stories of November, 1995 fall into this category.

Many more policy issues need this type of in-depth, time-spanning examination. Framing analysis offers a unique method to look at all policy issues. It offers a “diversity and fluidity in how issues are conceptualized and consequently allows for more fruitful analysis of the conceptual evolution of policy issues” (p. 70, Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

The knowledge gained from a case study like this one is beneficial for both journalists and policymakers alike. Journalists can be more aware of the influence of their word choices and story construction. Policymakers, too, can better understand the media’s use of rhetoric and their own in policymaking.
POLICY EVENTS CHRONOLOGY

Note: This chronology lists events, publications, and headlines from the 38 news stories to offer a snapshot of a few years of policymaking in Ohio.

1990

Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate - Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published

1991

January -- Governor Voinovich inaugurated

Faculty Productivity - SHEEO Draft report released

1992

February
2/15 Colleges must learn to get by on less, says state task force

Ohio Board of Regents Subsidy White paper released

June

6/17 Campus mergers considered
combining of branches, 2 year colleges
under study

July

7/15 Chronicle of Higher Education - Explaining What Professor Do with Their Time

7/24 Higher education report faces fight
Managing for the Future report released

7/24 Education blueprint: consolidate

7/25 Report calls for higher education focus

August

8/4 OSU, Cincinnati proposal opposed
group wants to concentrate research

8/19 Autonomy threatened
More central controls urged for Ohio colleges

September

9/10 Questions remain on mergers
Branch campuses, technical colleges await OSU action

October

SHEEO Draft Workload Report released

10/28 OSU’s 4 regional campuses fight proposed merger

10/28 Hearings seek comment on state college system

10/29 Ohio college report criticized at hearing

10/29 Plan to sever OSU branches is opposed

December

12/9 Regents plan to change higher education

Securing the Future report released by Regents

12/10 Regents stress idea of efficiency;
want Ohio’s universities to be more accountable
12/10  Regents map college reform

1993

April

4/7  Colleges may hike teaching

May

5/16  Universities hope to modify proposed hike in teaching time

5/22  EDITORIAL -- Dictates on Class Teaching Time Will Hinder Education

June

Am. Sub. H.B. 152 -- Biennial budget passed with workload language

July

Legislative Office of Education Oversight (LOEO) Faculty Reward Report released

September

9/13  Wall Street Journal - College Teachers the New Leisure Class

October

10/1  Collective bargaining change rules professors
December

Filipic Briefing Paper on Debt Service

1994

January

Hairston/Bruning Workload Statements - Draft report released

1/14 Amendment urged for teaching law
  Group aims to guard against overload

1/26 Chronicle of Higher Education - Association of University Professors Challenges the Belief That Professors are Underworked

February


Regents workload standards and guidelines released

2/18 Regents to send profs back to class

2/19 Regents approve standards
  Goal is to increase time professors teach

2/19 Plan will boost faculty teaching, libraries link

2/23 EDITORIAL Teaching First Regents draw the line on absentee profs

2/24 EDITORIAL A Good Teacher Is Hard to Find
March

3/7 No More Free Lunch (Rooms)
Reform Targets College Construction

3/10 Panel Backs Separate College Construction Bills

April

Higher Education Facilities Commission Policy Statement

June

Regents release Faculty workload report

6/17 What's in a Name? In a Word: Funding

6/18 Plan would recognize teaching professors

6/24 EDITORIAL Focus on Teaching: Pointing Higher Education in the Right Direction

August

8/26 Professors union fights workload law

8/28 Faculty union asks court to block law banning workload bargaining

8/29 Colleges plan for bigger workloads

1995

January

1/20 Chronicle article - Regulating Faculty Workload
March

Supreme Court Dismisses AAUP Workload challenge

Regents Debt Service "nutshell" paper

May

5/12 Building by colleges termed wasteful

5/13 Colleges’ space waste shocking, regent says

5/14 Ohio regents attack rising debt, empty classrooms as buildings rose on campuses, so did tuition rates

5/17 Battle rages over regents' report on overbuilding

5/18 Study of room criticized colleges say report by regents paints inaccurate picture

5/23 Senators may delay regents’ plan on buildings

June

6/6 OSU pens building wish list the university seeks $117 million from the state budget

6/14 New wording for campus bill sought

August

Debt Service Progress Report

October

10/31 CSU Building budget exceeds cap
November

11/12 State willing to hear CSU's capital bid

11/12 Professors Moonlight on taxpayer time

11/12 Beyond the Classrooms
   Some OSU professors skirt rules to hold second jobs

11/12 Business connections raise questions

December

Regents release Capital Budget w/new debt service policy

12/16 Regents pass buck to colleges on paying off construction debt

12/16 State schools may get $577.3 million
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

This study has two purposes. The first is to investigate how journalists write about state-level policy issues using the content of news stories. The second is to examine the news stories for evidence of rhetorical devices and thematic structures that promote certain ideas and help audiences understand those ideas. The news media are central both to how policymaking is done in America, and to the public conversations about policy when policy is defined as what government "says and does about matters it wishes to effect" (Ripley and Franklin, 1991). This study also comments on the relationships among the media, policymakers, public discussions of governmental actions and policy outcomes.

A review of the literature indicated that the relationships between the media and policymakers are complex. In the policy-making process, journalists and policymakers are involved in an "active collaboration" (p. 32, Cook et al., 163).
1983) that often omits the public -- the entity which is most affected by that collaboration. News stories frequently drive the policy process by impacting the policymaking agenda (Schudson, 1995), limiting the public conversation about the policies (Linsky, 1986), and framing the policy issues (Entman, 1991; Gitlin, 1980; Gamson and Lasch, 1983; Gamson and Modigliani, 1989; Kosicki, 1996; Pan and Kosicki, 1993). The media have an "enormous direct impact on public policymaking and a crucial influence on the nature and content of public deliberation" although they are not part of government (p. 205, Linsky, 1988). The content and process of the dialogue on public issues are influenced by the nature and qualities of the medium and the story form.

Hence, the story form, or content, as well as the relationships between media and policymakers, are important areas of study.

Mass media influence "how we talk about, but also how we think about" public policy issues (Kosicki and Pan, 1996). The results of this study provide both evidence and understanding of media frames as a way to organize the social world for journalists and audience members. This new knowledge can lead to enhanced public discussion of ideas.
(Linsky, 1988), which in turn may improve policy solutions to today’s pressing problems.

**Overview of Results**

This study was guided by two research questions.

1. What media frames are evident in news coverage of state-level higher education policy issues in Ohio?

2. Does a relationship exist between media frames and policy outcomes?

This study uses three hypotheses to test beliefs about the use of media frames in the construction of news and the impact of those frames on state-level higher education policymaking in Ohio.

**Support of the Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1:**

Journalists are more likely to cover the political aspects of policy proposals than the actual substance of the policy proposals.

Support was found for Hypothesis 1 in all three data sets -- task force, capital debt, and workload. Political rhetorical devices appeared more often in news stories when compared one-on-one to the other rhetorical devices in the same news stories. The devices varied from story set to story
set, so comparisons were made within story sets. The support was strongest for the task force report story set (61.2% Political, 17.2% Money, 21.6% Efficiency). It was strong for the workload story set (47% Political, 10.1% Autonomy, 14.4% Measurement, 11.2% Quality, and 17.3% Time). The support was less strong, however, for the capital debt story set (27.6% Political, 31.2% Buildings, 20.2% Money, and 21% Accountability).

This suggests that the newness of a policy activity might enhance its being seen as political. Political here is conceptualized in Lasswellian (1958) terms of "distribution of benefits and costs." New policy ideas take time to become accepted in a policy community (Kingdon, 1984). As policy activity remains on the agenda it loses some of its impact. It becomes an "old story" for reporters and the reading audience which is not known for a long fascination with policy issues. The first set of stories published were the Managing for the Future Task Force stories. These initial stories suggested change was necessary in the operations of Ohio higher education. Within the schema of the five stages of the policy-making process (problem identification, solution formation, policy adoption, implementation and evaluation, 166
(Linsky, 1986) these stories represent problem identification stage. The policy-making process is in the early stages; an outcome is unknown. Many unspoken questions permeate the environment. Will a policy outcome occur or will the idea die on the vine? If an outcome occurs, will it be related to the initial discussion? Will the outcome have a positive or negative effect? And on whom? This high level of uncertainty creates a level of instability, and instability can lead to political behavior, and in particular, self-interested behavior (Kingdon, 1984). The rhetoric of the stories illustrates this quite well.

For example, the initial stories from the Managing for the Future task force report contained conflictual language. Some examples:

"creating a ruckus"  "slap in the face"
"clout"  "increase the powers"
"choke hold on higher education"  "give up a little freedom"

All of these examples suggest conflict or struggle. Conflict is instability. The entire set of task force stories is full of this type of language.

Second, the topic of the story influences the political nature of the story. Again, the Managing for the Future task
force stories all contained some type of reform recommendations in them. The next two sets of stories, capital debt and workload, were outgrowths of the task force stories. In policy process terms, the capital debt and workload stories went beyond problem identification to solution formation, policy adoption, and implementation (regulatory legislative language was passed for both capital debt and workload). Once a policy issue moves from problem identification and solution formation into adoption and implementation, much of the uncertainly is removed and the issue often becomes less political. Framing analysis provides a useful approach for researchers to examine political language in communications throughout the policy-making process.

"Framing analysis pays close attention to the systematic study of political language, the coin of the realm in political communication that is ignored or dealt with in a highly abstract manner. Framing ought to sensitize researchers to examine political language as used at various stages of the political communication process: statements from policymakers, media content, and representations in audiences'
minds as well as the operation of the political system." (p. 70, Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

Analysis of the story sets in this manner is interesting because of the implications for the media, policymakers, and the public.

**Implications for the Media:** In recent years, the media have been criticized for the political nature of reporting and a lack of substantive reporting (Kaniss, 1991; Linsky, 1988; Patterson, 1993). This criticism could be combated if members of the media were to examine news stories they write early to insure that the substance of the policy is covered. The media can work to create less political stories. Gans (1980) offers several examples of how to create "multiperspectival" news including national grants funding to facilitate reporting from a variety of perspectives. A change of this magnitude in the nature of today's news-gathering processes, however, is contrary to the ingrained cultural and socialized work routines of journalists.

**Implications for Policymakers:** Policymakers can realize that information presented to the media in the problem identification stage of the policy process tends to carry its own political weight. By acknowledging that an issue will be
political by its very appearance on the policy agenda, policymakers can try to influence media coverage away from the political nature and toward the policy implications of the problem identified.

Implications for the Public: As audience members, the public can recognize the political aspects inherent in problem identification stories and attempt to read around the political rhetoric presented by the media and policymakers on both sides of an issue.

A careful reading of several of these stories finds that the actual substance of a policy proposal is absent from the news stories. Instead, the conflict between opposing sides is reported. For several years, the public has complained that news coverage of presidential campaigns focuses on the "horse race" between candidates, rather than on the candidates' qualifications or programs (Patterson, 1993). The public, as consumers of the media, can demand more substance and less political rhetoric in the content of news stories by calling reporters and editors, or by writing letters to complain about news coverage. This is often done in small town newspapers and in particular it is done about sports coverage in both small and large towns. The implication here, however,
is that the story must have personal relevance to the reader, which perhaps many of educational policy stories does not.

Hypothesis 2 -- **Journalists are more likely to cover the concerns of policymakers in higher education news stories than to cover the concerns of consumers in higher education news stories.**

Using rhetorical devices to define both the concerns of the policy-making world and the concerns of education consumers, strong support existed for Hypothesis 2 across all three story sets. In each story set, the concerns of the policy-making world outnumbered the concerns of the consumers by two-to-one (Task Force: Policymakers 100%, Consumer 22%; Capital Debt: Policymakers 100%, Consumer 47%; Workload: Policymakers 88%, Consumer 29%). While these data support previous work on the absence of consumer concerns in news stories (Kaniss, 1991), they also fit theories about the political nature of the policy-making world (Furhman and Rosenthal, 1981; Kingdon, 1984; Marshall, Mitchell and Wirt, 1989; Mazzoni, 1991; Ripley and Franklin, 1991). Policymakers work in a political environment and can spend years trying to match policy problems to solutions. Oftentimes in the chaotic mix of policies, problems, and solutions, the reasons why an
issue rose to the agenda (such as consumer concerns) often becomes lost and unresolved.

These findings also illustrate a media access issue which has important policymaking implications. In today’s fast-paced, information-based society, nearly every American has some access to the media. For example, the "new media", as President Bill Clinton called the talk shows and other participatory media, became a major access point into political dialogue for the general public during the 1992 campaign (Patterson, 1993). This hypothesis shows, however, that those who directly interact with the media are more likely to have their concerns represented in media stories. Education consumers -- students, parents, alumni and perhaps even faculty -- do not enjoy the direct and interactive relationship with media that of state-level policymakers do. Certainly, the public debate over higher education policy issues suffers from this lack of perspective.

The public debate over higher education also suffers due to the lack of news coverage on these issues. Both newspapers tend to cover state government news less frequently than they do national and local news as evidenced by a count of news stories over a two year period (See Chapter 4). These three
policy issues only rated a total of 38 stories from the two largest newspapers in the state over three full years!

Implications for the Media: Media must understand that by the very nature of their construction of a news story, they add bias to policy issues. Even in attempts to obtain objectivity, media introduce some biases oftentimes through sourcing (or lack thereof), which impacts the framing of an issue. Media must be more aware of this problem and strive to broaden information gathering skills. Single source stories, or single position stories present the weakest, least-useful information to the public and hamper "the very nature of conversation about public policy" (Linsky, 1988). Gans (1980) suggests "multiperspectival" news in which sources would not just be the "knowns" but also the people who are impacted by policies -- average Americans, or in the case of higher education stories, students, faculty and staff at colleges and universities, parents, alumni and taxpayers.

Implications for Policymakers: If policymakers' goals are to find support for a given policy to move it forward in the policy-making process, then full and unbiased representation of that policy issue is not compatible with garnering the necessary support for policy implementation.
Certainly, in the workload issue, it can be said that the state-level policymakers were not sufficiently interested in hearing faculty members' opinions on the issue until the implementation stage when the Ohio Board of Regents created a Workload Advisory Committee to assist in the implementation of a legislatively mandated 10 percent increase in productivity.

If fully-informed policymaking is the goal of higher education in Ohio, then state-level policymakers need to be more cognizant of the underrepresented sides to all policy issues (for example in workload, university faculty) and then include them in the policy discussions and, more importantly, represent their positions in the media discussions (Gans, 1980).

**Implications for the Public:** The public at large is perhaps least knowledgeable yet most impacted by the outcomes of these broad policy discussions. It is difficult for audience members to know what is missing in a news story. Most adults' policy and political knowledge comes directly from the media. For public discussions to better represent the needs and wants of the public, the public must participate in the discussion. A lack of media access, coupled with news stories that may not offer enough information to prepare a
citizen for participation, much less give any indication how to participate: these dynamics do not offer much hope of increased citizen participation in policymaking.

Hypothesis 3 -- State-level sources are more likely to borrow rhetorical devices from legislative sources than they are to borrow rhetorical devices from campus sources.

While limited support existed for this hypothesis, the findings were enlightening. Of the more than 85 rhetorical devices identified for the workload issue alone only five were shared in all 38 stories (another 85 were identified for the task force issue and 97 for debt issue).

It was hypothesized that if groups shared the same policy goal, they would speak the same policy language. Instead, it appears that a "disconnect" occurs among the very people who are guiding policy development. The two groups -- state sources and campus sources -- are talking past each other as opposed to talking with each other. Perhaps each group is too busy framing an issue from its own perspective to connect with the other side. As campus-level officials talk about issues they focus on the impact on the campuses. State-level officials take a different perspective, "What is the impact on all the campuses." Perhaps these perspectives keep them from
finding a common perspective. Understanding how rhetoric is linked to policy outcomes has implications for the media and policymakers such as the importance of choosing rhetoric carefully both in terms of talking about policies as policymakers do and in terms of communicating about them as the media do.

Implications for the Media:

Journalists are aware that their word choice can impact how audience members understand an issue. By each active rhetorical choice made, journalists frame what they write about. Journalists have a responsibility to be thoughtful and diligent in seeking accuracy in their own reporting.

Implications for Policymakers:

It is important for policymakers to frame their policies carefully before they present them to the media/public. Not many things could be worse for a policymaker than to cause the wrong framing of an issue and then try to change a frame, which may not be possible to do. Careful attention to detail, an understanding of meaning and context, and certainly a broad perspective is called for as policymakers attempt to frame issues. Policymakers "must share values, including core
values of the dominant cultures if they want to successfully communicate with journalists (p. 14, Ericson, Baranek and Chan, 1989).

Although significant rhetorical "borrowing" is not evident between state and campus sources, the sharing of positions, or frames, is certainly evident when thematic structures are examined. For example, in the workload issue the legislators, executive branch members, and the state-level bureaucracy tend to frame this issue as a time issue -- professors do not spend enough time in the classroom. The campus-level sources were more likely to frame the issue as a quality issue or to adapt the meaning of time to include out-of-class time and any time spent working with students.

Links to Policy Outcomes

More importantly, as the matrix in Chapter 4 (Higher Education Reform Matrix) presented, the thematic structure of news stories can be mapped directly to the policy outcomes for the workload and capital debt issues. The core frame of the workload news stories -- "Faculty don’t teach" -- mapped to a legislative mandate to increase teaching activity by 10 percent. And the capital debt core frame -- "Colleges don’t
feel the financial burden of new buildings -- mapped directly to a new budget policy in which each college and university campus bore the fiscal responsibility for its own buildings.

The research question, "Does a relationship exist between media frames and policy outcomes?" is answered in the affirmative by this thematic linkage. How an issue is framed by the news media can be linked to the policy outcome. The thematic evidence bears this out as do the rhetorical devices.

The legislative language refers to the workload issue devices of time, measurement and accountability, but it does not address the quality issue. The language of the capital debt issue addresses the rhetorical devices of money, buildings, and accountability. And, overall, all the reform issues stress efficiency and money, two of the task-force rhetorical devices.

It is significant that the content of media stories can be linked directly to policy outcomes. Policymakers know that media coverage of proposals can help or hamper a policy wind its way through the legislative process, but evidence such as this study provides further reinforces the need for strong media relationships and the need to carefully construct media conversations regarding policies. This further illustrates
how active and powerful the collaboration between media and policymakers has become.

**Impact of Time of Policy Issues:**

An examination of the thematic structure of each story set illustrated the impact of time on the framing of policy issue. In each story set (task force, workload, and capital debt) the media frame that appears in the first story continues throughout the run of the stories. Additionally, headlines maintained the initial frame as well. An in-depth examination of the evolution of the workload issue is presented in Chapter 5 as a case study.

**Summary of Results**

This project was designed to investigate the factors that influence journalists as they construct news stories. Influential factors identified included the individual journalist's approach to the beat; the newspaper's organizational structure -- where the beat resides (Metro, State, and so on); the use of sources; and the time available to devote to an individual story. Each factor can and does influence news coverage in different ways.
This work supports other recent work examining news coverage of government and policy issues in three main areas: 1) reporters' use of sources; 2) reporters' framing of issues, and 3) the relationship between news and policymaking (Linsky, 1986; Kaniss, 1991; Keefer, 1993; Kosicki, 1993). This study found reporters' use of sources does shape stories and that reporters' choices of words presents issues in a certain manner. It found that the relationship between media and policymakers is a reciprocal one and each relies on the other for assistance in pushing the policy process (Reporter A, Reporter B, 1997). Policymakers need coverage of their proposals and journalists need news stories. The relationship is complex, but it is a necessary one for each party to meet his or her goals.

Public discussions about policy issues are influenced by the mere existence of news coverage (or lack of coverage) as well as by the content of that coverage. Media frames influence public discussions about policy issues. Public discussions about policy issues are influenced by the absence of the actual substance of a policy in a news story (Kosicki and Pan, 1996). Individuals who want to understand or
participate in the policy process may not find the news coverage helpful for either goal.

The near invisibility of state-level higher education policy stories also was raised by this study. Many in higher education believe the Managing for the Future task force report and the policy changes that came from it were the most significant developments in higher education in the decade. However, if a count of these news stories were used to try to support this belief, it would fall flat. Although other newspapers in the state published stories, editorials and letters to the editor about these important higher education issues, the amount of coverage remains small.

Another issue that hampers higher education news coverage in Columbus, is that the higher education at The Columbus Dispatch beat turned over twice in the period from the release of the task force report in 1992 to the release of the capital budget in 1995. Three different reporters covered higher education in those three years. Not only does that turnover result in inconsistencies in reporting due to a lack of historical beat knowledge, but it also creates three different "styles" of reporting or three different approaches to the beat. Reporters define their beats in very individualistic
manners and seldom will two reporters cover a beat in the same way. Each person will develop his or her own sources of information based on personal relationships. Each reporter's "take" or "angle" to a story comes from the training, socialization, and background of the reporter. None of this bodes well for consistent, quality coverage of complex higher education issues.

And finally, the relationship between policy outcomes and news coverage was further delineated. Frames that appeared in the news stories fit the policy outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

This study is an early work applying framing analysis. The adaptation of Pan and Kosicki's (1993) rhetorical devices and thematic structures offers a promising lens from which to examine policy issues and document the evolution of a single issue over time as was evidenced in the case study of the workload issue.

Any new method can be limited by its relative lack of "accepted use" within the discipline. Although qualitative framing methods first appeared in the mass communications methodology less than 20 years ago, they continue to gain
supporters. Traditional quantitative research still dominates the field but many researchers are mixing qualitative and quantitative methods to strengthen research results.

**Sampling Limitations**

By limiting the sample to the release of the *Managing for the Future* report in July 1992 and ending the sample with the release of the Ohio Board of Regents' capital debt budget with the new policy process, the study itself may be limited. Certainly higher education news stories were published both prior to and after these events. The *Managing for the Future* task force had been working for a year before the recommendations were released and the news media did write stories about this task force. The window chosen, however, presents the most relevant parts of the media coverage of the report, the debt service issue and the workload issue.

Additionally, *The Columbus Dispatch* and the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* are not the only major newspapers in Ohio to write about higher education issues. As the case study notes, several other papers expressed opinions or published news stories about these issues (*Akron Beacon Journal; Cincinnati Enquirer; Toledo Blade*). Certainly, the other newspapers
would add other perspectives to the news media coverage which could result in additional or different news media frames. Again, valid reasons existed for choosing the two newspapers analyzed. Television was not considered for this study as policy issues are seldom covered because they are not visual, not easy to explain in a 30-second sound bite.

**Interview limitations**

Two groups are missing from the interview portion of this work -- Policymakers' opinions are absent from this work as are those of editors/publishers of newspapers. Policymakers' view would add a rich dimension to the case study by completing the comments on the relationship between the media, policymakers and the policy process. Editors and publishers may have differing views from the reporters interviewed and their perspectives on news coverage may be more global.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

More case studies like this one are needed in mass communications research to better understand the use of framing in the construction of news and the impact framing has on the policy process and the eventual policy outcome. Story sets of this size allow in-depth study which results in rich
data for interpretation and inference making. Other kinds of issues need the level of analysis that framing analysis offers, from the Gulf War to presidential campaigns. Unfortunately, story sets about major national issues are too large to study. However, framing analysis is important to understand everyday news stories like crime, education, and local government issues. Certainly the knowledge gained from framing analysis is also important to the policymakers involved in policy creation and public expenditures.

An additional level of qualitative interviewing could enhance this study. Interviews with policymakers to obtain their perspectives on the evolution of the workload and capital debt issue would add an element of "real actor" perspective that the interviews with reporters added to the workload case study.

Mapping public opinion data to the interpretive content analysis in the project would offer another look at the policy-making process. Also, a measure of the audience interpretation of media frames would add significantly to the current study by linking journalists’ actions to the content to public deliberation about policy issues.
A sample of this size would lend itself to a close reading and different kind of rhetorical analysis such as is typically used by rhetoricians. This was not the intent of this study, but would add another dimension to this work.

Further, if an issue could be tracked from the outset, rather than backtracking as this study has done, a richer case could be created with the addition of participant observation as well as a regimented interview schedule.

State government is full of complex issues that could benefit from further studies designed like this one: school financing, higher education budgeting, welfare reform, jobs programs, and a variety of others. The results of this study offer many ways policymakers and the media can enhance their relationship to improve the policy.
Appendix A

CODE BOOK

Newspaper
1 -- Columbus Dispatch
2 -- Cleveland Plain Dealer

Topic
1 -- Task Force report
2 -- Workload
3 -- Capital Debt

Date
Code month-day-year ex. 01-28-94

Word Count
Number of words in story
Provided by Nexis

Sources Cited

01-02 Executive Source
  01 -- Governor
  02 -- Executive Branch member

03-11 Legislative Source
  03 -- Sen. Cooper Snyder
  04 -- Rep. Wayne Jones
  05 -- Speaker Vern Riffe
  06 -- Sen. Stanley Aronoff
  07 -- Sen. Gene Watts
  08 -- Rep. Robert E. Netzley
  09 -- Rep. Patrick A. Sweeney
10 -- Sen. Roy Ray
11 -- Rep. Ron Gerberrry

12-23 Agency Source
12 -- Chancellor Hairston, OBR
13 -- Board Chairman Ray Sawyer
14 -- Gerald Gordon, board
15-- N. Victor Goodman, board
16 -- Paul Dutton, board
17 -- Bill Napier, Vice Chancellor
18 -- Matt Filipic, Vice Chancellor
19 -- Garry Walters, Vice Chancellor
20 -- Howard Gauthier, ex asst
21 -- MF2 task force member
22 -- Other Regents comm. member
23 -- Other state-level policy makers

24-44 -- Campus Sources
24 --Gordon Gee, OSU
25- Joseph Steger, UC
26- Charles Ping, OU
27 - Paul Riser, Miami
28 - Frank Horton, UT
29- Peggy Gordon Elliott, Akron
30 -Richard Ruppert, MCO
31- Carol Cartwright, Kent
32 - Claire Van Ummerson, CSU
33 -Other University official
34 - Bryon Kee, North Central Tech
35 - Harold Nestor,Columbus State
36 - Al Salerno, Clark State
37 - Lynn Willett,Muskingum Area Tech
38 - Dave Ponitz, Sinclair
39 - Roy Church, Lorain
40 - Richard Bryson, Marion Tech
41 - Other college official
42 - Charles Bird, OSUM
43 - Julius Greenstein, OSUN
44 - Other college official

45 - 47 Lobbyists
45 -- IUC spokesperson
46 -- OACC spokesperson

188
47-- AAUP spokesperson

48 -- Student
49 - Community member
50 - Faculty member
51 - Document/Report
52 - Anonymous source
99 - Other source

**Workload Rhetorical Devices**

**01-16 -- Time**

01-hike time
02-spend more time
03-valuable time
04-broaden definition of time
05-too little time in classroom/restore classroom time
06-restore classroom time
07-professors back in the classroom
08-amount of time teaching
09-professors back in front of the frosh
10-boost teaching
11-teach one more course
12-shoulder the burden of teaching undergraduates
13-increase value of teaching
14-a better balance of faculty work
15-more attention from senior faculty
16-define work
17-every waking minute in classroom

**18-27 -- Quality**

18-improve quality
19-quality of education
20-reward system
21-decent education
22-TAs barely speak English
23-decrease quality
24-reward for quality instruction
25-incentives - reward classroom innovations
26-link pay to the quality of teaching
27-decrease quality
28-40 -- Measurement
28-standards to measure
29-full-time faculty
30-count as teaching
31-measurable teaching time/activity
32-monitored and enforced
33-carrying out and measuring
34-tough standards
35-increasing the value of teaching
36-standards
37-Regents measure progress
38-counting lab time -- counting medical rounds
39-numerical credit
40-traditional measure

41-45 -- Autonomy/Accountability
41-have a say
42-weakening of the law
43-University depts. decide policy and be accountable
44-grants flexibility
45-departments determine who teaches
46-retain flexibility
47-departments leeway to decide policy and be accountable
48-U implements plans/responsible for result

49-75 -- Political/Conflict "Rhetoric of war"
49-public concern
50-legislative concern
51-good money
52-punitive measure
53-soften language
54-blessing of the Regents
55-satisfy lawmakers
56-mandated by legislature
57-lawmakers and governor demanded
58-launched a statewide effort
59-closed-door conference committee
60-tearing apart collective bargaining
61-push professors
62-forcing professors
63-refused to bargain
64-force Universities
65-slackers
66-misdirected
67-ivory tower
68-enraged faculty
69-forced by state law
70-violates
71-collective bargaining impasse
72-confronted
73-going smoothly
74-school impose standards
75-challenging
76-bans
77-conflict
78-lawmakers ordered
79-tuition soars
80-class size explode
81-demanded across-the-board increases
82-troublesome...policy
83-faculty unions furious
84-dangerous precedent
85-only fair way

Capital Debt Rhetorical Devices

01-19 -- Accountability
01-burden of repayment
02-shoulder financial responsibility
03-responsible for debt service
04-borrowing authority
05-be more prudent
06-put the brakes on the boom
07-require the U to pay
08-presidents to decide if they can afford
09-education becomes more affordable
10-local responsibility
11-serve students and taxpayers
12-become market-driven
13-pay debt individually
14-presidents think twice about...
15-each school responsibility pay off debt service
16-give campus more responsibility
17-give campuses a greater voice
18-make schools more accountable

191
19-decision-making power in trustees
20-burden on back of institution

21-45 -- Money
21-incentive to conserve
22-link payment to use
23-free to spend
24-pay down debt
25-bank
26-staggering debt
27-awash in borrowed funds
28-debt service gobbled
29-drained funds
30-pay down debt
31-eaten by debt service
32-invest funds
33-leverage dollars
34-suck money away from formula
35-arcane formula...tax forms look like child's play
36-cutbacks
37-no cost to Universities
38-crippled by construction debt
39-massive debt
40-shirt funds
41-shrink the construction debt
42-caps spending
43-skimpy appropriations
44-spiraling cost of tuition
45-Christmas every two years

46-62 -- Buildings
46-free buildings
47-bricks and mortar
48-overbuilding, overbuilt
49-pork projects
50-unchecked building boom
51-empty monuments
52-needless and costly building
53-half empty
54-unused space
55-25-year building spree
56-empty buildings/classrooms
57-construction will plummet
58-spark a stampede
59-new wish list
60-curtail campus construction
61-tremendous investment
62-laundry list of buildings

63-91 -- Political/Conflict
63-radical fix
64-fair share
65-adamant opposition
66-unanimously opposed
67-promiscuous use
68-prohibit bonds...
69-reform
70-piggy-backed
71-countered
72-retort
73-monumental waste for taxpayers
74-horrrendous
75-high-pressure tactics
76-fighting to keep ...
77-pork barrel projects
78-no mood to compromise
79-Regents... at war
80-put pressure on the schools
81-force schools to pay
82-Ivory Tower
83-budget fight
84-U leaders cry foul
85-battle
86-balked
87-sad commentary
88-misleading data/information
89-constructive ... not obstructionists
90-hit a snag
91-caught flat footed
92-quietly bargaining
93-promiscuous vote
94-laundry list
95-tremendous pressure
96-force the state
97-gambit
Managing for the Future Rhetorical Devices

01-17 -- Efficiency
  01-improve efficiency
  02-blueprint for improving
  03-how to manage better
  04-scrutinizing
  05-operate more efficiently/effectively
  06-sweeping changes
  07-provides better service
  08-more efficient
  09-streamline and cut costs
  10-management plan
  11-ineffective professors
  12-make schools more financially accountable
  13-profs are so lazy
  14-productivity evaluated
  15-merge -- merged campuses
  16-consolidating
  17-eliminate/less duplication

18-39 -- Money
  18-make do with current resources
  19-use money wisely
  20-do more with less
  21-focus limited resources
  22-money is tight
  23-dwindling state resources
  24-staggering budget cuts
  25-skinny down
  26-weak economic growth
  27-failure to invest
  28-finance is decreasing
  29-economic growth is stagnant
  30-suffered budget cuts
  31-doing more with less
  32-cost effective
  33-save money
  34-merger could be expensive
  35-support future economic development
  36-attract new business
  37-needs more money
38- pressing budget problems
39-backdrop of financial emergency

40-84 -- Political/Conflict "Words of War"
40-drawing opposition
41-drew early fire
42-opposes
43-victim of budget ax
44-creating a ruckus
45-choke hold on higher Ed
46-slap in the face
47-threat of a deficit
48-restructure -- refocus
49-mixed reactions
50-draw criticism
51-balking
52-polite outrage
53-forcefully oppose
54-groundswell of protest
55-provoked
56-divergent views
57-more than their share
58-hot potato
59-dissenting report
60-spawn a political donnybrook
61-protect our own butts
62-destructive
63-burden
64-launched a plan
65-force schools
66-condemned
67-misinterpreting
68-misapprehension
69-threatened
70-consensus building
71-smooth nervous colleges and universities
72-controversial...authority
73-clout
74-power -- increase the powers
75-in charge
76-give up a little freedom
77-power of life and death
78-authority to Regents
79-decision-making power
80-radical new powers
81-revolutionary change
82-launch a revolution
83-authority to eliminate
84-beefing up power
85-business as usual
86-frozen out
87-force change
88-offending programs
89-unveiled a management plan
90-"hot" topic
91-unfair advantage
Appendix B

News Story Coding Sheets

Newspaper:

Date:

Topic:

Headline:

Word Count:

Sources: Device Borrowing:

Rhetorical Devices:

Thematic Devices:

Researcher Notes:
Appendix C

Journalist Interview Questions

1. Where do your story ideas come from?

2. Why were you interested in the workload issue?

3. How did you decide what to cover? editor influence; PR influence?

4. How did you find appropriate sources for stories?

5. Who or what types of people did you rely on for information?

WORKLOAD STORIES

We could say the theme of the workload stories was that faculty don’t teach or that professors need to spend more time in the classroom.

1. How do you think that theme came about?

2. Do you believe that faculty don’t teach enough?

3. Did you talk with your editors about this?

4. Did you ever interview any faculty? Why or why not?
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