THE COLLEGE NEWSPAPER:
STUDENT EDITOR AND ADVISER RELATIONSHIPS

by

JOSEPH DENNIS

(Under the Direction of Leara Rhodes)

ABSTRACT

Although not typically coming from student affairs backgrounds, college media advisers are employing student development theory in their practice of advising college newspaper editors. Utilizing a phenomenological approach — interviews with 24 advisers and student editors from a variety of college newspapers — this study finds that advisers are employing facets of student development theory in their advising, specifically helping students through the first four vectors of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) "Seven Vectors of Student Development." Furthermore, advisers of Pacemaker Award newspapers are nearly unanimous in their application of facets of student development theory, specifically offering consistent publication critiques, abstaining from prior review, helping students through conflict, and encouraging students to manage their own biases.

INDEX WORDS: college newspaper, college media adviser, student development, student affairs

THE COLLEGE NEWSPAPER:
STUDENT EDITOR AND ADVISER RELATIONSHIPS

by

JOSEPH DENNIS

Master of Arts, The University of Georgia, 2007

Bachelor of Arts, North Central College, 1998

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2016

THE COLLEGE NEWSPAPER:
STUDENT EDITOR AND ADVISER RELATIONSHIPS

by

JOSEPH DENNIS

Major Professor:	Leara Rhodes
Committee:	Diane Cooper
	John Soloski
	Barry Hollander
	John Greenman

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2016

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. My mother and late father instilled in me the importance of education since I was a child, working multiple jobs to send me to the best schools in Chicago, supporting me when I wanted to attend an expensive, private college for my undergraduate education, and being understanding when I kept my immediate family 800 miles away from home so I could complete my doctorate degree. Dad, I finally finished! I'm so sorry I could not complete this degree while you were still here. I hope you're proud.

To my sons, Jaydon, Jackson, and Matthew, thank you for giving up your dad for several nights and weekends over the past few years. I want you to know that anything is possible – even attaining the highest academic degree in your field while working full time, volunteering part time, and raising three children. You just need to have commitment and support, which was tirelessly demonstrated by my wife Carla. You have been a rock for me since I met you at North Central College freshman orientation in 1994. You have been patient, inspiring, and encouraging throughout this dissertation process. Thank you for not letting me quit, and giving me the space and time to work on this over the past few years. You are not the only "Dr." in the family now!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the obvious support of my immediate family, this dissertation would never have happened without my major professor, Dr. Leara Rhodes. I always enjoyed working with you at the Grady College, and respected your expertise and admired your work in the field of diversity. I never expected you would "rescue" me from being another "ABD" student. After two years in limbo, you had me assemble a committee and take my comprehensive exams within one semester. You were extremely supportive after my first attempt at a prospectus was subpar, and very patient after a family tragedy sidelined me for another year. When it was time for me to get back to work on this project, you gave me the "kick in the ass" needed and stayed on top of me as I rewrote my proposal, conducted my research, and finally, wrote this dissertation. I am indebted to you as my mentor and adviser.

In addition to Dr. Rhodes, this dissertation would not have been completed without the other members of my committee: Dr. John Soloski, Dr. Barry Hollander, Professor John Greenman, and Dr. Diane Cooper. I have the highest respect for each of you as faculty members. Admittedly, there were moments when I wished I had chosen "easier" faculty members for my committee. But the rigor each of you demanded was invaluable for my academic and intellectual growth. I would especially like to thank Professor Greenman for seeing this project through even in his retirement, and Dr. Cooper who came onto the committee later in the process and helped reeducate me on student development theory. The Dennis family truly owes Dr. Cooper, who served as the

major professor for my wife Carla's dissertation ten years ago. Also important to this dissertation was Dr. Dick Mullendore, who served on my original committee before retiring and suggested to me that there could be a link between student development theory and the college newspaper.

Finally, there are several members of the Grady College I need to acknowledge. This dissertation was done while I was working full time at Grady. The support of Dean Charles Davis was invaluable, as was the support of my supervisors over the years, including Cecil Bentley, Dr. Alison Alexander, and Dr. Sherrie Whaley. My colleagues, notably Diane Murray and Karen Andrews, have provided encouragement, necessary ribbing, and support as my dissertation process seemingly never ended over the past five years. Also, Dr. Kent Middleton helped me start this process, graduate dean Dr. Jeff Springston always gave the needed change approvals, and Ms. Debbie Sickles provided the constant reminders of deadlines … and the always asked the question, "When are you going to finish this thing?"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Chapter 1: Introduction

Ever since my freshman orientation leader encouraged me to cover volleyball for the North Central College *NCC Chronicle* back in 1994, I have been involved in student media. As I rose through the editorial ranks at my alma mater, I established a strong relationship with my newspaper adviser. Professor Nancy Kirby – or "Nancy" as she wanted to be called – was very "hands off" in her approach to advising. Coming from a lifetime of Catholic education, where deviation from the normal was punished, this freedom surprised – and scared – me. Of course we would get our weekly critique from Nancy, a newspaper that surely emptied the ink of a fresh red pen each issue, nevertheless her feedback was minimal. She had an "open door" policy, but outside of my journalism classes, I rarely talked to my adviser.

The freedom seemed to work. The *NCC Chronicle* always won several awards from the Illinois College Press Association, and I earned a few myself. With minimal oversight or interaction from our adviser, we achieved success at a statewide level. However, as students we were not aware there were much bigger accolades out there. I'm not sure my adviser even knew.

After six years as a professional journalist, ending with a stint as news editor of a community newspaper in Monroe, Georgia, I returned to academia at the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at The University of Georgia. As director of the Georgia Scholastic Press Association (GSPA), I became heavily engaged in the relationships between high school journalism advisers and their students. I quickly

learned that the lack of censorship that fueled my collegiate newspaper experience was also a driving force behind the award-winning high school newspapers in the state and nation. For my master's thesis, I studied the relationship between administrative prior review and award-winning newspapers. Seeking a theoretical background for my study, I was introduced to John Dewey's (1916) democratic education pedagogy and Jean Piaget's (1929) cognitive development theory. Combining the theories of Dewey and Piaget, the traditional high school years are an important time in a child's development as they learn to think for themselves and understand their role in a democratic society. For optimal development, children should be allowed to experiment and make mistakes. I proposed that the high school newspaper was an optimal tool to aid in a child's development, but administrative censorship essentially put up a barrier to such development because it did not allow students to experiment and make mistakes. My final paper, *Prior Review in the High School Newspaper*, was presented at the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) 2008 convention, and a summary article was published in *Dow Jones Adviser Update*, which was sent to more than 1,500 high school journalism teachers across the country.

Although my job at the University of Georgia was to work with high school journalists and advisers, I never abandoned my interest in the college newspaper. I befriended the adviser of the University of Georgia's independent student newspaper, *The Red & Black.* I also had strong relationships with several of the editors-in-chief of the publication, as they either worked for me with GSPA or I taught them in my classes. I found myself fascinated – maybe even a little jealous – with the relationship between *The Red & Black's* adviser and his students. While most professors at Grady went by formal

titles, the adviser was always on a first-name basis with his students. While most students would never think of sharing details of their personal lives with professors, the adviser was essentially a life support coach. While few professors give out their cell phone numbers to students, the adviser was always "on-call" for his students, and even frequently texted his editors throughout the day.

The Red & Black was a good college newspaper, winning regional awards annually and national awards occasionally, including the prestigious Pacemaker Award from Associated Collegiate Press (ACP). The relationship between the adviser and editor seemed to work. For example, on Saturday, April 25, 2009. I was at a campus ceremony with the editor-in-chief as my guest, when she suddenly left the event. I quickly caught up with her to make sure everything was okay, and she told me that her adviser had texted her that there was a shooting near campus involving a university professor. I drove her to the newsroom. Since it was the weekend before finals week, there were few newspaper staffers around, so the editor-in-chief worked with the help of her adviser to produce continuously updated content about the shooting on the newspaper's website. As the day continued and the story became more complex, more student staffers abandoned their weekend plans and helped get all aspects of the story. It was a banner day for *The Red & Black*, which beat every professional publication to the story and became the most reliable source for news on the topic (the paper would win a Pacemaker Award that year).

It was an amazing phenomenon to observe. At the height of academic stress (before finals) and on a beautiful Saturday afternoon in the spring, students deserted their day off to cover the news. And their adviser was with them every step of the way – on his

day off, too. I knew that his commitment to his students, and the newsroom culture that he fostered, undoubtedly played a role in the outstanding coverage of the tragedy.

A few years later in 2012, a completely different editorial staff staged a much-publicized walkout from the newspaper. The event, which garnered national coverage in publications like *The Huffington Post* and *The New York Times*, was not a protest against their adviser, but rather the newspaper's board of directors who instituted several professional personnel changes effectively reducing student editorial control (Perez-Pena, 2012). As an observer of the event and knowing the adviser and many of the editors, I was again fascinated by the relationship between the adviser and his students. He faced a dilemma, wanting to support his students but also needing to keep his job. Again, I know it was the newsroom culture that he fostered that gave the students confidence to walk out. Eventually, the publisher resigned, the newspaper's board of directors gained student representation, and all editors had their jobs reinstated. The students received everything they wanted, and they went back to work with their adviser.

By 2012, I became a college media adviser myself, advising *UGAzine*, the student lifestyles magazine of UGA. Initially published twice a year, it was a much simpler task than advising a student newspaper (which I do now in my current role as assistant professor of mass communications at Piedmont College). However, I still found myself replicating many of the traits of *The Red & Black* adviser. At the same time, I also started helping with the college's Management Seminar for College News Editors (MSCNE). The annual, weeklong summer conference hosts 64 student editors from college newspapers across the nation. Even though it was not part of my job and I received no extra compensation, I found myself heavily engaged with the seminar and its students. I

helped manage small-group discussions with student editors, teach a course on web development, and judge student work produced during the seminar. Over the week, through individual conversations or comments made in sessions, I was surprised to learn of the varied opinions students had about their advisers. While few would overtly criticize their adviser, it was evident that not everyone was having the same positive experience I knew the editors at *The Red & Black* were having.

I wondered, what were the differences between the advisers who elicited positive feedback and those who elicited negative feedback? What traits are students most appreciative of in advisers? Do these advisers know they are being well received? I had my topic for my dissertation. Now I just needed a theory.

My cognate for my doctoral education was student affairs administration. It seemed like a natural fit, given my interest in college students. I learned multiple student development theories, which conveniently were rooted in Dewey and Piaget. Student development theory seemingly fit perfectly with the college newspaper, as the core principles of autonomy, critical thinking, and learning to accept criticism all apply. In fact, a 1970 American Council on Education report said the college newspaper has "undeniable" value in student development (Mencher, 1970).

Surprisingly, my research on the "college newspaper" and "student development" yielded no relevant results. This dissertation will change that.

The college newspaper

For more than 225 years, college newspapers have been a vibrant aspect of higher education. Although the newspaper industry as a whole has been in decline over the past decade, most colleges and universities still publish student-produced newspapers. The

publication – whether produced in print or online – is often a source of information and debate about issues on campus, the community and the world. With its long history in American colleges and universities, college newspaper alumni include not only respected journalists, but also prominent political leaders. Some examples include Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan (editor at *The Daily Princetonian*, Princeton University), United States Senator Lamar Alexander (editor at *The Vanderbilt Hustler*, Vanderbilt University), and United States Ambassador to Japan Caroline Kennedy (*The Harvard Crimson*, Harvard University).

As the college newspaper expanded through the 20th Century, the position of the college newspaper adviser became commonplace. Simultaneously, the field of student affairs developed. With many college newspapers operating on student support funds (and complimented by advertising), the newspaper was most likely housed in the newly developed student affairs division, with the adviser often working within student affairs.

Student affairs practitioners are guided by student development theory, which focuses on growing the college student from the end of their childhood through the beginning of adulthood (Winston, Creamer & Miller, 2001). And though college newspaper advisers often work within student affairs divisions, most come from a journalism background and are likely not knowledgeable about student affairs theories and unaware of their role in student development. Therefore, evaluating if and how college newspaper advisers use student development theory may contribute to an understanding of how student editors grow and learn.

Statement of the issue

The interest in this study is the working relationship between college newspaper advisers and student editors. Specifically, I aimed to understand if advisers are practicing student development theory in advising students. Also, I wanted to determine if there were any common practices among advisers at Pacemaker-winning newspapers compared to advisers at non-Pacemaker winning newspapers.

The college environment offers students an opportunity for tremendous cognitive, moral and personal development (Garrison, 2009). "No other phase in the human lifespan does the combination of 1) academic rigor, 2) intellectual exploration, 3) moral investigation, and 4) physical maturation provide such a remarkable time for development" (p. 87). Based on multiple developmental theories, student affairs theorists Arthur Chickering and Linda Reisser (1993) developed a theory specifically for college students: the seven vectors for student development. A vector is considered a stage in a student's life in which the student encounters different situations and form relationships that foster development. The seven vectors are 1) developing competence, 2) managing emotions, 3) moving through autonomy towards interdependence, 4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, 5) developing identity, 6) developing purpose, and 7) developing integrity (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). To assist students through development, those working with college students should center the learning experience on the student, and not the end product, engaging students in complex experiences, encouraging them to reflect on situations, and to explore their internal thoughts on specific issues and situations (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

The college newspaper offers an ideal forum for student development for students. As noted earlier, a special commission of the American Council on Education evaluated the relationship between college newspapers and administration, and concluded that there is "undeniable" value in the student newspaper for student development (Mencher, 1970). The concepts of critical thinking and detailed examination of issues are paramount for an award-winning newspaper (Brasler & Rolnicki, 2001).

As the professional charged with working directly with students to produce the newspaper, the student newspaper adviser serves as the main catalyst for student development in the newsroom. Among 84 respondents to an informal survey of college media advisers, none had training in student development theory, with most advisers coming from a professional journalism background (email communication, May 15, 2014). Despite not having such training, and although no formal link between student development theory and adviser practices has been previously established in the literature, ethical codes and practical guidelines established for advisers show a strong relationship to student development theory. For example, the College Media Association – the largest organization serving college media advisers with more than 700 members nationwide – notes in its adviser code for ethical behavior (2013): "The ultimate goal of the student media adviser is to mold, preserve and protect an ethical and educational environment in which excellent communication skills and sound journalistic practice will be learned and practiced by students. There should never be an instance where an adviser maximizes quality by minimizing learning." This statement emphasizes Baxter Magolda's (2008) key to assisting student development, specifically centering the advising experience on the student and not the end product.

Although the college newspaper offers an ideal forum for student development, there are potential roadblocks to this relationship. Student newspaper advisers often find themselves in tenuous positions, balancing their professional responsibilities to the institution with their ethical responsibilities to student development. Negotiating this conflict can be difficult. In 2011, four college newspaper advisers found themselves either fired or suspended for allowing students to publish articles or commentary critical of the college's administration (Schraum, 2012; Zweifler, 2011; Brumback, 2011; Hardin, 2011). If advisers are consistently negotiating this conflict between pleasing the administration and serving the students, the desire to foster student development may be stunted. Research has also shown that despite an adviser's best efforts, external pressures on students may also be hurting their development. A study of college newspaper advisers and editors showed that student editors are highly susceptible to "burn out" (Filack & Reinardy, 2011). Specifically, 38.4% of student editors were experiencing high levels of exhaustion. These results indicate that the college newspaper may not be appropriately assisting in student development. If students are feeling "depersonalization" and low levels of personal accomplishment, as burnout is defined in this study, then their development might be stunted.

This study examines the relationship between college newspaper advisers and their student editors. Although most advisers likely lack student development training, student development theory may be unknowingly used by advisers in their interactions with their students and the culture they help establish in the newsroom.

By examining the relationship between student development and theory and college newspaper advising, I hope to fill a gap in the literature and provide a theoretical

foundation for adviser practices. With a theoretical foundation in place, college media proponents can better develop a training protocol for new advisers – most of whom have no background in student affairs – that will properly focus on student development. Such a foundation could also be used to promote autonomous college newsroom learning environments to institutions that promote student development.

Furthermore, this study examines if there are advising practices that are more common in Pacemaker-winning newspapers than in non-Pacemaker winning newspapers. Since 1927, Associated College Press has sponsored the college newspaper Pacemaker Award, considered the highest honor for college media. In its guidebook for advisers, the organization emphasizes that advisers should allow student autonomy in the production of the newspaper and encourage students to students to pursue stories that require critical investigation (Brasler & Rolnicki, 2001). These suggestions parallel the basic tenets of student development theory, encouraging advisers to engage students in critical thinking while allowing students to produce their own work. By selecting students and advisers from both Pacemaker winning newspapers and non-Pacemaker winning newspapers, I sought to find if there were differences in advising practices – related to student development theory – within some of the nation's top college newspapers and other college newspaper.

By examining the practices of some advisers at Pacemaker-winning newspapers and comparing them to the practices of some advisers at non-Pacemaker winning newspapers, I hope to further strengthen the argument that student development theory, even if unknowingly practiced by advisers, provides a theoretical foundation for college newspaper advising. If advisers from the nation's most prestigious college newspaper

advisers are implementing practices that involve student development theoretical concepts, then the development of a model for advising rooted in student development theory would not only be beneficial to students, but also be beneficial to the institution, with the potential for national recognition. Rather than develop a new theoretical model or testing an existing theory, this study hopes to shine a spotlight on a theory that perfectly fits – and many times is even unknowingly practiced in – college newspaper advising.

My hope is that such a discovery could be a boon to college newspapers, an entity which is increasingly being met with censorship and mistrust from college administrators (Wheeler, 2015). If autonomy, critical investigation, and new experiences are keys to student development, and the college newspaper provides these keys, college administrators may begin to see the value in student media.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Student newspapers have been a part of college campuses for almost as long as the founding of the United States. The self-proclaimed oldest college newspaper in the country, *The Dartmouth*, was founded in 1799, thirty years after the establishment of Dartmouth College. *The Yale Daily News*, the student publication of Yale University, calls itself the oldest daily college newspaper in the country, printing its first issue in 1878. Some of the oldest public institution newspapers include the Rutgers University *The Daily Targum* (1869), and the University of Georgia's *The Red & Black* and the University of North Carolina's *The Tar Heel*, both established in 1893.

The first professional organization representing college newspapers, Associated College Press, was established in 1921. Through the 20th Century as college attendance spiked and student development was established as a field, the role of the College Media Adviser became more grounded, with the establishment of the National Council of Publications Advisers in 1954. Now called the College Media Association, the organization currently has 906 members, representing roughly half of the estimated 1,800 college newspapers in the United States (Conlin, 2014).

Student Development Theory

The time spent in college is a crucial time in personal development (Kegan, 1982; Baxter Magolda, 2001; Kohlberg, 1963; King & Kitchener, 1994; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Legally classified as adults, traditional students leave the nest of their family and begin to encounter and experiment with their new independence. Recognizing this critical

turning point in an individual's life, psychologists and social scientists began studying student development early in the twentieth century. Evans (1998) noted that early student development theory focused on matching student skills with suitable occupations, but a major shift occurred in the 1960s, when social scientists began studying how students grow and mature through their college years.

The roots in modern-day student development theory can be traced back to the child development theories of Jean Piaget (1929) and the democratic education pedagogies of John Dewey (1926). Piaget divided child development into four stages: sensorimotor (birth to 2 years), preoperational thinking (2 to 7 years), concrete operations (7 to 11 years), and formal operations (11 years and older). In the sensorimotor stage, children are experiencing the world through movement and senses, and meanings are very concrete. For instance, an infant recognizes "mommy" and knows if she cries, "mommy" will come to her aid. In the preoperational thinking stage, children begin to make meanings through playing and pretending, generating symbols for various objects. For instance, children may play "house" in which the child's bedroom is the house, a dresser is the stove and the bed is the kitchen table. In the concrete operations stage, children begin to think logically and understand what they can and cannot physically accomplish. In the formal operations stage, children develop abstract thinking and begin to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills. She is able to formulate a perspective and consider other insights to reach a conclusion. At this stage, accommodation – altering one's existing ideas based on new information – is critical. For optimal human development, Piaget promotes learning environments that allow changes in cognitive structures, allowing for accommodation to occur.

Piaget was critical of the education system of the early twentieth century. Methods such as rote learning restricted a student "from discovering truth for himself" (p. 107). He also criticized the authoritative role teachers were expected to follow, writing that it inhibited student development. "If the only social exchanges that make up the life of the class are those that bind each student individually to a master holding all power, he will not know how to be intellectually active" (p. 107). Such authoritative rule based on unilateral respect only isolates the student from the school, authority and his thoughts, instead of promoting individual and community thought. Piaget believed that students who acquire knowledge through their own investigation – rather than having lessons imposed on them – are more likely to be able to retain that knowledge and learn to build their own ideas. He argued that students should not only have a role in their education, but also a say in school regulations and discipline. Such a two-fold approach to education will further develop a mutual respect between the student and the teacher. Just as through rote memorization a student can remember lessons but not understand them, a student may obey the teacher's rules but will not understand the significance of the rules. Therefore, students should be given an opportunity to help develop necessary rules in their education (Piaget, 1973).

When a child reaches college, the student is still in the formal operations stage. Since college-aged children have the ability to think abstractly, the most efficient learning environment for development would be one that allows a myriad of ideas, allowing the student the autonomy to consider differing perspectives to formulate her own opinion. This requires presenting problems to students and allowing them to develop solutions on their own, comparing their findings with fellow students (Dembo, 1977).

Garrison (2009) noted that with its myriad opportunities and liberal arts education, college provides a "time of insurmountable discovery and examination. No other phase in the human lifespan does the combination of (1) academic rigor, (2) intellectual exploration, (3) moral investigation, and (4) physical maturation provide such a remarkable time of personal development" (p. 87). Because of the unbridled opportunity for development, Garrison warned that those who work with students should be aware of the "fragility of the student's cognitive development" (p. 99).

While Piaget focused on the entire development of the child, Dewey's focus was much narrower – examining the educational practices of schools and teachers. He posited that schools serve not only to educate students in the core subjects, but also to prepare them to be active and participatory citizens in American democracy. Democratic pedagogy relies heavily on encouraging students to think critically about relevant issues and empowering them to contribute to their own education. A democratic education should "construct a course of studies which makes thought a guide of free practice for all" (p. 305). Not only does a democratic education encourage diversity of people and thought, but also it embraces diversity as a critical element of education. Dewey noted that a democracy is not just a form of government – it is a community of many people and ideals. In order to prepare students to enter that democracy, diversity in schools should be embraced and students are encouraged to work together. Intellectual freedom utilizing the diverse interests and beliefs of students is promoted. Dewey wrote that education is conceived in one of two ways: retrospectively or prospectively. A retrospective education works to accommodate the future (students) to the past norms and ideals, while a prospective education utilizes the past as a resource in developing the

future. Agreeing with Dewey, student development theorists believe the goal of education should not be to instill historical ideals in students, but rather to encourage students to build on those ideals through their own thoughts. Like Piaget, Dewey was highly critical of the early 20th century education system.

Although written nearly a century ago, Dewey's principles are still relevant in higher education today. Hamrick (2002) noted that a "commitment to citizenship as an intended outcome of higher education continues into the present" (p. 185). In its *Statement of Ethical Principles and Standards*, ACPA (2006) lists as its fourth standard a responsibility to society. "As ACPA members, students affairs professionals will assist students in becoming productive, ethical, and responsible citizens" (p. 5). This commitment to developing citizens requires that student affairs professionals accept dissenting thought — "dissenting students are in fact making an ultimate commitment of citizenship to their home campus" (Hamrick, p. 188). In order to develop democratic citizens, Hamrick, et al., recommends that student affairs practitioners refrain from suppressing student dissent on campus. To the contrary, the authors recommend that institutions "ensure the free exchange of ideas within the framework of our national tradition of dissent" (p. 205). The learning experience occurs not only by the student expressing their viewpoint, but also by honoring an obligation to let other voices speak. This freedom is represented in the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education *Statement of Shared Ethical Principals* (2006), which calls on members to foster an environment where people feel empowered to make decisions and respects the rights of individuals to express their opinions.

Dewey's work and Piaget's work grounded student development theory in critical thinking. From their roots, college student development theory evolved to focus on three areas on an individual's development: cognitive and behavioral development, moral and ethical development, and psychosocial development.

Cognitive and Behavioral Development.

Educational psychologist William Perry (1970) proposed a nine-part developmental scheme students encounter through their college years. Students enter college under the first scheme, basic duality, seeing the world in black and white — right versus wrong, good versus bad, etc. — and believing that will power and work should result in reward. Students are typically coming from environments largely based on punishment and rewards – do your homework or get a zero, come home by curfew or get grounded – and for the first time are encountering an environment in which they will be largely independent. Once students are in college, they begin to progress through the next three stages, which involve achieving multiplicity: multiplicity pre-legitimate, multiplicity subordinate and multiplicity correlate. As students progress through stages two through four, they begin to recognize multiple points of view and begin to recognize that authority does not have all the answers. In classrooms, students are encouraged to examine multiple arguments and develop their own viewpoint based on the examined evidence, not just on what they were taught by authority. Outside of class, students are offered a myriad of extracurricular activities that encourage them to explore and discover their own interests and lifestyles. They are exposed to diversity.

In the fifth stage — relativism correlate, competing, or diffuse — students recognize that knowledge is always changing and can be shared but cannot be measured.

Here students begin to understand how "truth" can evolve based on new evidence. Commitment foreseen is the sixth stage and occurs when students recognize that individuals construct knowledge according to their own backgrounds and experiences. Students recognize that knowledge is not only based on empirical evidence, but also on a person's own prejudices and experiences. They recognize that others have different experiences than their own, which is why they may have a different knowledge base than others.

The final three stages involve commitment: initial commitment, orientations in implications of commitment and developing commitment. Through these stages, students recognize that learning, combined with past experience, develops knowledge. They recognize the need to act upon their newly developed knowledge, and learn to pursue new perspectives while discarding those no longer useful. Students who attain the stage of committed relativist understand their own values, but are open to change. Committed relativists understand the responsibilities and importance of citizenship and balance it against other responsibilities (Hamrick, 2002). For college administrators and faculty, Perry states the key to helping students move through the stages is to provide a balance of challenge and support, occasionally posing problems one or two levels above the students' current position.

Psychologist Robert Kegan (1982, 1994) proposed orders of consciousness individuals encounter as they make meanings about themselves on the journey through cognitive development. Although his theory did not specifically focus on college student development, his third and fourth order of consciousness typically occurs during the age of the traditional college student. Young children move through the first order, making

simplistic, absolute meanings of physical objects and people – mommy is mommy. From late childhood through the end of adolescence, children move through the second order, recognizing that other people have distinct characteristics and meanings of objects are not absolute – mom is not just a mom, but she is also a wife, a doctor, a foodie, and a Cubs fan.

The third order of consciousness — cross-categorical thinking — occurs as students enter college, and involves the ability to think abstractly about issues and recognize community interests, as opposed to solely concentrating on self interests. As they get involved in activities and further develop critical thinking skills, they begin to examine their role in the community and how they can impact positive developments. The movement to the fourth stage, which Kegan considered the key transformation to adulthood, ideally occurs through the college years. Labeled cross-categorical constructing, the fourth order of consciousness requires individuals to develop the capacity to recognize other value sets and develop deeper convictions. Similar to Perry's commitment stage, individuals can decipher multiple points of view, reflect on them, and construct them into their own theory. Kegan's fourth order forms the basis for the goal of many student affairs divisions: "to foster the student's development as a self-directed learner, an individual who acts on the world for the betterment of society, and an engaged citizen with a strong sense of values and a clear identity that is internally defined" ("Kegan's Orders," 1999). To achieve the fourth order, Kegan states that individuals must exercise critical thinking, be self-directed learners, view themselves as co-creators of culture rather than being shaped by culture, read actively rather than receptively, write to bring others into self-reflection, and take charge of concepts and theories. Kegan

coined this meaning-making goal as “self-authorship” (p. 185). Achieving self-authorship is critical for individuals as they enter adulthood. To promote self-authorship and accomplishment of the fourth order, students must be challenged in an environment where support is offered. Those working with students should continuously challenge them, but allow them to make mistakes and make up for those mistakes.

College student development theorist Marcia Baxter Magolda (2001, 08, 09) greatly expanded upon Kegan’s notion of self-authorship, positing that self-authorship occurs in the college years and beyond through three steps. Similar to Perry’s first scheme of basic duality, Baxter Magolda’s first stage toward self-authorship is following external formulas. In this stage students are merely recording knowledge in the classroom, taking classes parents and advisers suggest, and participating in activities that are popular among their peers. As students get acquainted with college, the external forces begin to move into the background of meaning making and students begin to enter the second stage: crossroads, which occurs in two parts. “Recognizing the shortcomings of external formulas, whether about career directions, relationships, faith systems, racial or ethnic identity, or sexual orientation, (individuals) enter a crossroads where their internal voices begin to emerge” (Baxter Magolda, 2009, p. 629). At crossroads, students begin to listen to their internal voices, identifying what generates personal happiness and what is personally important. An individual also begins to recognize the difference between his personal feelings and the expectations placed upon them. The second phase of crossroads occurs as a student begins to cultivate her own voice. In this phase students begin to put together the pieces of who they are, putting aside beliefs that no longer work

to develop personal values and establish priorities. External voices are not dismissed, but rather reconstructed to shape one's internal voice.

Like with Kegan, achieving self-authorship is the ultimate goal for Baxter Magolda, and it is achieved through three phases: trusting the internal voice, building an internal foundation, and securing internal commitments. In trusting the internal voice, a student learns to distinguish the difference between reality and one's reaction to reality. There are elements of reality that cannot be controlled – for instance the death of a loved one. However, what can be controlled is a person's reaction to the loved one's death, such as seeking grief counseling. In the second phase of self-authorship – building an internal foundation – an individual learns how to use his internal voice to guide his reactions to reality. Here a person begins to align his life with his internal voice, setting priorities. For instance, a student may discover that his Baptist upbringing no longer aligns with his personal beliefs developed through his college experience, and make the determination to no longer identify as a Baptist and attend church. In the final phase of self-authorship – securing internal commitments – an individual begins to merge knowledge and his sense of self to develop his core. The person becomes confident in self and is open to exploring new areas of self. The individual is open to further personal growth. For instance, the aforementioned student who decided to no longer be Baptist may explore some previously considered radical religious concepts, such as agnosticism or atheism.

Because developing self-authorship is critical for individuals as they enter adulthood, Baxter Magolda emphasized the importance of those who work with college students to understand this developmental phase (2008). "Because self-authorship can

develop before or during college, and because self-authorship is a capacity that allows young adults to better meet the challenges of adult life, enabling this capacity should be a key focus of a college education" (2008, p. 282). This can be accomplished by engaging students in complex experiences, encouraging them to reflect on situations, and to explore their internal thoughts on specific issues and situations. Essentially, those working with college students – whether in the classroom or through extracurricular activities – should center the learning experience on the student, and not the end product. "Giving learners responsibility for refining their internal voices using their own set of personal realities and supporting that process is our central challenge" (p. 264).

Moral and Ethical Development

Along with developing critical thinking skills during the traditional college years, students also begin to challenge and adjust their own morals and ethics (Kohlberg, 1963; Gilligan, 1982; King and Kitchener, 1993). Rooted in Piaget's developmental theory, Lawrence Kohlberg (1963) was concerned with how individuals develop moral reasoning. He broke down moral development into three levels and six developmental stages. Level 1 is the pre-conventional/egocentric level and is present in childhood, although adults can be stuck at this level. The first stage of the pre-conventional level is punishment and obedience orientation – an individual acts out of fear of punishment, or "disobeys" and is punished. The second stage is instrument and relativity orientation – an individual acts based on his self-interest. In this stage an individual recognizes that his actions affect others, however they are still looking out for his own interest. For instance, a child may offer to do an extra chore knowing he will get extra money in his allowance.

Level 2 is conventional/social and is present in adolescents and early adulthood. At this level an individual recognizes the social norms and conventions, and is willing to adhere to them to maintain the status quo, even if there is no punishment or self-gain for acting within the convention. Here a person goes through stage three of development: interpersonal concordance orientation – recognizing what results in social approval and gets one respected in society. An individual seeks social approval by acting in accordance with social norms. In stage four – law and order orientation – a person follows the norms not for social acceptance, but in recognition of the importance of social order. Reaching stage four is a moral achievement, as a person is behaving not in their own self-interest, but in the interest in society. However, an outside force is still driving that person.

A person able to act beyond law and order is moving through level 3: post-conventional/principled. At this level, an individual is able to develop his moral principles based on his own knowledge, not merely the rule of law. Stage five – social contract orientation – occurs when a person recognizes the social principles behind laws, and is not afraid to challenge lawmakers when the laws are out of harmony with deeper social values and principles. For example, abolitionists were stage five thinkers, recognizing that although slavery was legally allowed, it was morally wrong. The sixth and ultimate stage of moral development is universal ethical principles orientation. This stage is achieved by an extreme few number of individuals, and occurs when a person is able to rise above society in a commitment to justice, disregarding unjust laws without fear of punishment, social acceptance, or disrupting social order. Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi are examples of people who reached stage six reasoning (Goree, 2000). At the college level, individuals are typically between stages four and five, recognizing the

interest of acting in accordance with society and developing their own moral principles rather than acting on the rule of law (Commons, 1992). This can be evidenced by the historical frequency of protests on college campuses.

Expanding on Kohlberg's theory is Carol Gilligan (1982), a student of Kohlberg. She focused on the moral and ethical development of women. Gilligan argued that women follow a different moral trajectory than men, who were the core focus of Kohlberg's studies. Although often interpreted as a conflict with Kohlberg – a model of "care" versus a model of "justice," Gilligan's theories should be seen as a compliment of Kohlberg (Jorgensen, 2006), as "justice" and "caring" can act interchangeably in a person's moral decision-making (Walker, 1987). Focusing specifically on women, Gilligan posited three steps of moral development, all related to caring. Gilligan argued that women's perception of self is connected to others.

The first step is "caring solely for self," even at the expense of others. Similar to Kohlberg's egocentric stage, a person in this initial stage is only concerned about having her needs met – a girl cries in the middle of the store because she did not get the toy she wanted, with no regard for the embarrassment her mother is feeling at having a screaming child in public. In the second step, a woman is "caring solely for others," even at the expense of herself. In this stage, a woman relies on others for her self-identity. She is a reflection of what others think of her. Because of this, her self-sacrifice occurs because of feelings of unworthiness. For example, in an effort to keep her boyfriend, she may have sex with him even though she is not ready. She wants to please him so he will continue to praise and think highly of her. The third step is developing a balanced understanding of needs. In this final step of development, a woman makes decisions based on priorities.

The focus is still on caring, but she had developed a stronger sense of self and balances caring for herself and others. For instance, an adult woman may decide to continue working after having a child, recognizing that her career is important to her, as is her child.

Patricia King and Karen Strohm Kitchener (1994) proposed a seven-level model of development that individuals endure while moving to reflective thinking. At levels one through three, individuals are at the pre-reflective thinking stage. They justify their opinions in a simple manner because they fail to perceive uncertainty. Like Kohlberg's pre-conventional stage, these students see the world as black and white, and often rely on the knowledge of authority. At levels four and five individuals are at the quasi-reflective thinking stage. Here, students begin to recognize that there are certain levels of uncertainty and begin to recognize the importance of evidence, however they are more likely to rely on intuition or personal beliefs to reach conclusions.

At levels six and seven individuals enter the final stage, reflective thinking. At this stage, students fully develop and recognize that their understanding of the world must be actively constructed and knowledge must be understood in the context it was generated. Individuals recognize that absolute truth is unattainable, but explanations based on sound data and evidence is more likely to be valid. Reflective thinking involves considering differing viewpoints, critiquing viewpoints and accepting criticism, and becoming confident to take a stance on an issue. In order to help students achieve reflective thinking, educators should "create and sustain learning environments conducive to the thoughtful consideration of controversial topics, that they help students, learn to evaluate others' evidence-based interpretations, and that they provide supportive

opportunities for students to practice making and explaining their own judgments about important and complicated problems" (Komives & Woodward, 1996, p. 232). King's and Kitchener's reflective judgment model also ties in to Dewey's concern of citizen development. Individuals at the pre-reflective stage are unable to make informed decisions. But as students develop into reflective thinkers, they "approach citizenship in a thoughtful and considered manner" (Hamrick, 2002, p. 197). They consider all viewpoints before taking a stand on an issue.

Psychosocial Development

A third area of development in college is the student's ability to interact with others and develop their own sense of self (Erikson, 1968; Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Rooted in the work of Freud, developmental psychologist Erik Erickson (1968) focused on the relationship between the individual and society, emphasizing the importance of social institutions to the individual. He presented human growth as a battle between internal and external conflicts, and each conflict resolved results in further personal development. "Each crisis overcome develops a stronger inner unity, judgment and reinforcement of standards" (p. 92). Creating the term "identity crisis," (Gross, 1987) Erickson defines crisis not to "connote a threat of catastrophe, but a turning point, a crucial period of increased vulnerability and heightened potential" (p. 96). There are eight conflicts individuals face through their development, and a favorable outcome through a stage gains the individual a "virtue." While each stage must be overcome before continuing to the next stage, an individual is continuously faced with previous stages of development and is presented with the opportunity to overcome past weaknesses.

The first conflict is “basic trust versus mistrust.” This is the most basic conflict that occurs in infancy. As a baby learns to trust her mother, she develops the virtue of hope. The second conflict is “autonomy versus shame and doubt.” Faced between the ages of 1-3 years, a child is becoming more autonomous and it is the job of a parent to encourage that autonomy. However, if a parent is too restrictive to the child, shame and doubt can emerge as a dominant trait. If a child is encouraged to develop, she will gain the virtue of will. The third stage is “initiative versus guilt,” and is encountered during the preschools years, ages 4-5. Here a child becomes more independent, often pursuing activities that spark her curiosity, rather than relying on what his parents or teachers want her to do. It is the job of the parents and teachers to promote the child’s curiosity, rather than restrict him. Of course, it is still the caretaker’s role to create safe limits. For instance, if a child wants to touch the rose growing in his parent’s garden, it would be good for the parent to allow him to do that. However, the parent should set a restriction making sure the child does not grab the thorny stem. Successful fulfillment of this stage results in the virtue of purpose. The fourth stage is “industry versus inferiority” and is encountered during the child’s elementary school years, ages 6-11. At this stage, children begin to produce things, such as art projects, answers to math problems, and learning to write sentences. It’s critical for parents and teachers to praise the work of children. Consistent and harsh critiques can result in a feeling of inferiority. However, consistent positive reinforcement results in the virtue of competence.

As a child enters his teenage years, he faces the fifth conflict, “identity versus identity diffusion.” With their physical appearance changing, the beginning of self-developed emotional relationships, and the reality that they will soon be in total control

of their own lives, teenagers face a true "identity crisis" as they make the transition from childhood to adulthood (Gross, 1987). A teenager is especially concerned about how they appear to others, particularly those within her peer groups. She faces confusion over her role in all relationships, and experiments with various activities to see how she fits into society. Identity diffusion occurs when a teenager has not committed to any possibilities, resulting in apathy and indifference (Lewis, 2006). Successfully resolving this conflict takes time and often extends into the college years, but the end result is fidelity — "the ability to sustain loyalties freely pledged in spite of the inevitable contradictions and confusions of value systems" (Gross, 1987, p. 49). A person is able to remain committed to a set of values, relationships, and beliefs. Those who successfully resolve this conflict have developed their identity – "an understanding of who they are" (Lewis, 2006, p. 31). Although the identity crisis stage is typically associated with one's teenage years through early adulthood, it can be prolonged (Gross, 1987).

The sixth conflict – intimacy versus isolation – occurs in early adulthood, typically in a person's 20s. This involves a person's external relationships with other people, including lovers and friends. The individual develops to make the sacrifices and compromises required in intimate relationships. The virtue achieved is love. The seventh conflict is generativity versus stagnation and occurs during the second stage of adulthood, typically through retirement. In this stage a person is concerned with contributing to society, through work, raising children with strong morals, and community service. The virtue achieved in this conflict is care. The final conflict typically occurs in those 65 and older, and is ego integrity versus despair. In this conflict, a person reflects back on his life

— looking back at his accomplishments or lack of accomplishments — and either develops the virtue of wisdom or a sense of despair.

Based on the aforementioned developmental theories, student affairs theorists Arthur Chickering (1969) and a later update with Linda Reisser (1993) developed a theory specifically for college students: the seven vectors for student development. A vector is considered a stage in a person's life in which they encounter different situations and form relationships that foster development. The vectors include developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy towards interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, developing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. Although not sequential, each vector builds upon another to the formation of personal identity and individuality.

The first vector — developing competence — requires the individual to gain increasing confidence in his ability. This includes competence in intellectual, physical and manual capabilities, and interpersonal skills. In developing intellectual competence, students are mastering content and building skills to comprehend various situations. In doing so, students are learning new ideas to help provide "more adequate" structures to make sense of their interactions.

The second vector – managing emotions – is achieved after the student learns to balance self-control and self-expression. Essentially, a student learns to be less selfish – "transcend the boundaries of the self" (p. 46) – and identify with larger groups.

The third vector – moving through autonomy toward interdependence – involves developing interdependence in three areas: emotional, instrumental and interpersonal. Emotional interdependence occurs when students break free from the need for constant

reassurance and approval, and students show a willingness to take principled risks despite a potential loss of comfort and status. Instrumental interdependence occurs when students demonstrate an ability to think critically, translating ideas into focused action. Interpersonal interdependence occurs when students recognize the larger context of specific issues and how their opinion fits in society.

The fourth vector — developing mature interpersonal relationships — is achieved as students develop a tolerance and appreciation for differences among others, and develop a capacity for intimacy. The critical goal for this stage is the ability of students to begin to ignore stereotypes of other people and recognize others as persons, forming their own opinions based on real conversations and interactions.

The fifth vector – establishing identity – occurs as students become comfortable with themselves. This includes body image, gender, sexual orientation and self-esteem. On a broader note, it also includes the student developing a sense of self within a social, historical and cultural context.

The sixth vector – developing purpose – is accomplished when students set clear intentional goals, explore their own personal interests and activities, make meaningful commitments with other people and continue to persist despite obstacles.

The seventh vector – developing integrity – occurs as students begin to fully humanize their core values while respecting the values and beliefs of others, even if they are different. Moving through this stage of development shows that students are able to respect, discuss, and understand opposing viewpoints while maintaining their beliefs.

The College Newspaper and Student Development

As a venue that can fulfill all seven vectors, the college newspaper offers an ideal forum for personal development for its participants. The concepts of critical thinking and detailed examination of issues is paramount for a successful newspaper. The basic tenets of reporting require students to investigate an issue by conducting research, interviewing experts from multiple points of view, and writing concise articles based on their findings. After a series of conflicts between college newspapers and administrations in the University of California system in the 1970s, a special commission was assigned to determine the value and impact of college newspapers among students. The final report noted the undeniable value of the student newspaper in developing individuals: "The newspaper … nurtures independence, maturity, and responsibility. It teaches young men and women to investigate before they accept ready-made solutions" (Mencher, 1970, p. 21). Furthermore, the report encouraged college administrators to allow the student newspaper freedom to report on controversial issues, including those involving college administration: "to inhibit the questioning and probing of student journalists by the burden of official imprimatur is both unrealistic and counterproductive to the constantly proclaimed academic thrust for unfettered intellectual change" (p. 29). This position was supported by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, which stated that "a college or university is supposed to be dedicated to the concepts of freedom, and this surely should include the press" (Duscha & Fischer, 1973, p. 38).

The college newspaper serves as an ideal tool for cognitive and behavioral development, offering opportunities for movement through William Perry's (1970) scheme of intellectual and ethical development. The nature of writing articles requires

students to gain several viewpoints about a specific issue, forcing them to recognize multiplicity. They move into relativism as they recognize that in most cases there is no absolute truth, just a set of varying opinions and it is up to the individual to evaluate the opinions and make their own determinations based on the best set of evidence. This is not only true for the writer, but also for students who read the college newspaper and are exposed to the varying viewpoints expressed in articles.

Kegan proposed orders of consciousness individuals encounter as they make meanings about themselves as they journey through cognitive development. Order one occurs in children as they make simple meanings. In the second order children are able to recognize different characteristics of individuals. In the third order, cross-categorical thinking, students begin to think abstractly about issues and recognize community interests. It is in the fourth order – cross-categorical constructing – where the college newspaper can have a major impact. Students are able to internalize multiple points of view, reflect on them, and construct them into one's own story. To help students achieve order four, Kegan encourages group work from students across different developmental points. Students are expected to be co-creators of culture, read actively, and write to bring others into self-reflection. The college newspaper offers the opportunity for editors and readers alike to consider multiple points of view. Specifically, the opinions section, which invites reader feedback through guest columns and letters to the editor, serves as an ideal forum for meaning making. College newspaper websites that allow for commenting on stories serves the same purpose.

The newspaper can be a tool to reach Baxter Magolda's ultimate goal of self-authorship. Questioning, collaboration and mutual construction of ideas are key elements

toward self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2001). By its nature of being a journalistic tool, the college newspaper fits all these criteria. Students must question sources and ideas to develop stories. They collaborate with others, whether through an interview with outside sources or with designers, photographers and editors to publish the final project. And through this collaboration, stories are mutually constructed. The development occurs not just in the final product, but also within the student. In interviewing multiple sources and researching multiple issues they are developing their own ideas on the issues they cover.

The college newspaper can also be a tool for moral and ethical development, specifically the transition between Kohlberg's (1963) social and principled stages. In stage four – law and order orientation – students are learning the importance of laws to maintain order. They learn this by interviewing officials about new policies and covering crime; discovering the negative effects when rules are not followed. Ideally, students will also enter stage five: social contract orientation. Through critical investigation, including extensive research and multiple interviews with officials and those opposed to a specific rule, students begin to see the social principle behind the law. They may object to a specific law, finding the law lacks moral validity. In these cases, students have the option of publicly expressing their opinion through a column or editorial.

Gilligan's "Model of Care" posited three steps of moral development. In the first step people care "solely for self" (1984). The motivation for writing for a college newspaper might be exemplified by a student in step two, "caring solely for others." She might be writing for the paper to see his byline in print, and to gain public acceptance. However, as a student continues to write for the paper, that sense of satisfaction in being publicly read may dissipate, as the initial thrill of having a byline fades. They then go

through step three of the model, having a balanced understanding of one's needs. A student may decide to focus on a specific area of writing, begin to say "no" to various assignments, or even quit the newspaper because it does not fit in among her priorities.

Kitchener and King (1994) proposed a seven-level model of development: pre-reflective thinking (levels one through three), quasi-reflective thinking (levels four and five), and reflective thinking (levels six and seven). The college newspaper allows students to achieve reflective thinking, the final stage critical in development according to Kitchener and King (1994). In this stage, students construct knowledge from an evaluation of a variety of sources, must be confident enough in their opinions to take a personal stance on an issue, and must be able to accept critiques of their knowledge interpretations. Again, the college newspaper fulfills this need as it serves as a spark for discussion on the college campus. In addition, students who comment on controversies in news articles are learning to take a stance and accept the feedback generated by peers once their opinions are published.

The college newspaper also offers a venue for a student's psychosocial development. College students are typically facing Erickson's (1968) "identity versus identity diffusion" conflict. Through work with the college newspaper, students have an opportunity to establish their identity. The process of writing a non-biased article forces students to examine their own biases and attempt to write an objective story. This critical examination may change their viewpoints, or reinforce them. Through every story written – especially those around specific issues – students are creating new identities as "experts" on a certain issue.

Since Chickering and Reisser (1993) seven vectors theory is the most recent, comprehensive, and widely cited (ACPA, 2004; Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton & Renn, 2009; Jones & Abes, 2013; NASPA, 1990; Schuh, Jones & Harper, 2010) psychosocial theory for college-aged student development, this paper will use the theory as the foundation for its research. The college newspaper offers a forum for students to accomplish tasks that build strengths and coping mechanisms to help students develop according to Chickering and Reisser's seven vectors.

The first vector — developing competence — requires the individual to gain increasing confidence in his or her ability. The newspaper offers an ideal opportunity to foster intellectual competence, as student participants are called to get "both sides of the story" and craft stories to allow readers to draw their own conclusions. Such conclusions are based in expert opinion and sound research, rather than hearsay. The newspaper helps its participants develop the manual capabilities – from taking photographs to learning graphic design programs – to develop physical competence in the field. Perhaps most prominently, student editors are developing their interpersonal skills in their role on the newspaper staff. Developing interpersonal competence requires students to learn how to put aside personal agendas for the success of the group. Responsible for the final publication, editors are often faced with such dilemmas to benefit the entire staff.

The second vector – managing emotions – is achieved after the student learns to balance self-control and self-expression. This happens in the newspaper as editors are called to put their personal interests and feelings aside for the betterment of the publication. For instance, if the editor is a staunch liberal, but the leading conservative student organization launches a campaign against the "liberal student newspaper," it is

the editor's responsibility to manage her emotions, and react in a way that will support the newspaper organization and its staff.

The third vector – moving through autonomy toward interdependence – involves developing interdependence in three areas: emotional, instrumental and interpersonal. In the newspaper, moving through autonomy through interdependence occurs when editors challenge authority, or even peers, for a principled stand and continue the coverage until action occurs. In September 2013, the editors of *The Crimson White* at the University of Alabama took such a stand, bringing attention to racism within the university's Greek system. The editors went against institutional culture, even isolating a large and influential portion of the student body to call attention to a pressing issue. Stories were followed with multiple columns calling for an end to segregation within the university's sororities. The story took on national prominence, reaching the pages of *The New York Times* and CNN, and spreading to other college campuses reinvigorating a conversation about race and the Pan-Hellenic culture.

The fourth vector — developing mature interpersonal relationships — is achieved as students develop a tolerance and appreciation for differences among others, and develop a capacity for intimacy. Student staff at *The Daily Tar Heel*, the newspaper of the University of North Carolina, demonstrated such maturity in its April 22, 2013 coverage of the Boston Marathon bombing. The editors ran a story about how the bombing is affecting Muslim student at the UNC campus, focusing on concerns regarding backlash against Muslim students. The decision to run such a story, rather than play on stereotypical fears of Muslims, showcased personal growth among the student editors.

The fifth vector – establishing identity – occurs as students become comfortable with themselves. *The Red & Black*, the student newspaper of the University of Georgia, ran a column through fall 2013 titled "College as an Introvert." In this weekly series a self-described introvert recounts her experiences in her new life as a college student, from the college life mundane such as navigating the dining halls and recreational center, to more interpersonal tasks such as flirting with the opposite gender and dealing with roommate concerns. The author showed remarkable growth through the fifth vector over the weeks of the column, initially trying to fit in to finally deciding to be herself.

The sixth vector – developing purpose – is accomplished when students set clear intentional goals, explore their own personal interests and activities, make meaningful commitments with other people and continue to persist despite obstacles. A column in the spring 2013 issue of *The Collegian*, the student newspaper of Kansas State University, featured a student journalist recognizing and preaching the importance of sound, traditional journalism in the wake of multiple social media news scandals in the wake of the Boston Marathon bombings. The author shows true development of purpose, explaining the role of an editor in his column: "Being an editor includes making editorial decisions because readers need to know what matters to their community."

The seventh vector – developing integrity – occurs as students begin to fully humanize their core values while respecting the values and beliefs of others, even if they are different. Moving through this stage of development shows that students are able to respect, discuss, and understand opposing viewpoints while maintaining their beliefs. *The Daily Bruin*, the student newspaper of the University of California Los Angeles, has demonstrated integrity throughout 2013 with its ongoing coverage of the appointment of

new university President Janet Napolitano. While criticizing the lack of transparency throughout the presidential search process, *The Daily Bruin* editors provided multiple insightful columns and articles about the positives and negatives of her appointment. The editors managed to keep a respectful tone, recognizing the reality of the appointment but using the moment to preach transparency.

The College Newspaper Adviser

The college years offer a critical time in a person's development, but they are not expected to develop on their own, without any assistance. Most institutions have a student affairs division devoted to fostering a student's development through their involvement in extracurricular activities, living in dorms, and serving in leadership roles on campus (Rhatigan, 2000). Student affairs has developed into its own field, with advanced degrees, with part of the focus on college student development, offered for aspiring professionals (Rhatigan, 2000). Professional organizations such as Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) offer student affairs practitioners and institutions guidance in their practices.

The college newspaper adviser is charged with leading the students who produce the campus newspaper. However, unlike many other extracurricular advisers on campus, the newspaper adviser is rarely trained in student development theory (email communication, 2014). And even though they may be housed in a student affairs division, college newspaper advisers rarely are involved in professional organizations such as NASPA and ACPA. However, newspaper advisers do have a support organization: College Media Advisers (CMA). The organization is very clear in its stance

on free speech and student autonomy: “student media must be free from all forms of external interference designed to regulate its content” (CMA, *Code of Ethics*, 2013). Furthermore, advisers are instructed to remain aware of the “obligation to defend and teach without censoring, editing, directing or producing.” Since 1998, the board of directors of College Media Advisers has censured nine schools for violating the organization’s code of ethics (CMA, 2015).

Despite support from professional codes of ethics, student newspaper advisers often find themselves in a tenuous position, balancing their employment responsibilities to the institution with their professional responsibilities to their students. Several recent cases demonstrate this difficulty:

- In January 2012, the adviser of *East Carolinian*, the student newspaper of East Carolina University, was fired after students published a controversial front-page photo of a streaker (Schraum, 2012).
- In June 2011, the adviser of *The Courier*, the student newspaper of the College of DuPage, was reassigned after the publication printed several stories critical of the college administration (Zweifler, 2011).
- In April 2011, the adviser of *The Chart*, the student newspaper of Missouri Southern State University, was fired after being named the state’s “Adviser of the Year” for encouraging students to pursue stories critical of the administration (Brumback, 2011).
- In January 2011, the adviser of *Student Vanguard*, the student newspaper of the Community College of Philadelphia, resigned after administrators shut the newspaper down for critical commentary of the administration (Hardin, 2011).

However, research suggests that, at least the perception of censorship is much stronger than the aforementioned actions. In a survey of 47 student editors and 32 advisers, Bickham and Shin (2008) found that only 19% of advisers believed censorship to be a problem in the college newspaper, however, 42% of student editors believed it to be a problem. Furthermore, the authors found a positive relationship between editors who perceived that they had have less control over content and their willingness to self-censor content critical of the faculty and/or institution. Editors were more willing to self-censor content if they perceived that their adviser or other administrator was more in control of the final content. The authors propose that student newspapers establish a clear precedent of student control of content, written into official institution documents.

If more than 40% of student editors perceive they do not have full autonomy of published content, it makes moving through the third vector – moving through autonomy through interdependence – difficult to attain. Furthermore, even at 19%, the number of advisers who perceive they have final autonomy is contradictory with adviser code of ethics and student affairs practice guidelines. It also inhibits the ability of the newspaper to perform at high-quality standards. Associated College Press (ACP) sponsors the college newspaper "Pacemaker" Awards each year. Considered the highest honor for college media, the Pacemaker is the only consistent national awards program for college newspapers, with the first award given in 1927. In its evaluation guidebook for advisers, the organization lists four qualities for effective advisers (Brasler, 2001):

1. Effective advisers give students an educational experience they could not have if they were publishing the paper on their own.
2. Effective advisers serve as a catalyst for ideas.

3. Effective advisers serve as advocates for excellence.

4. Effective advisers advise.

Most important, the guidebook notes that advisers "do not plan the paper, have final say on how stories will appear or make final decisions on editorial policy. They know when to step back and keep quiet" (p. 8). Not surprising, college newspapers that often receive the Pacemaker are ones that pursue controversial issues at the campus – the type of issues that likely put the adviser in a difficult situation with superiors. Among Pacemaker winners in 2012 were *The Daily Collegian* of Pennsylvania State University, which featured heavy coverage of the school's football program scandals; *The Minnesota Daily* of the University of Minnesota, which featured critical coverage of the university's discipline policies; and *The Excalibur* of York University in Toronto, which featured comprehensive coverage of the school's lagging admissions rates.

In these instances, it's clear that college newspaper editors are operating with autonomy. However, at what price? The most recent study of the college newspaper shows that student editors experience higher rates of burnout than their college adviser (Filack & Reinardy, 2011). Utilizing the Marsh Burnout Inventory Scale, Filack and Reinardy (2011) surveyed 217 advisers and 185 editors, finding that in comparison to advisers, students had significantly higher "levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization while simultaneously reporting lower levels of personal accomplishment" (p. 252). Specifically, 38.4% of student editors were experiencing high levels of exhaustion. These results are troubling for student development. If students are feeling "depersonalization" and low levels of personal accomplishment, the fifth and

sixth vectors, establishing identity and developing purpose, are not happening at the newspaper.

No known published research has been conducted evaluating the number of student-produced college newspapers in the United States and the reporting structures within those publications. My informal survey (email communication, May 15, 2014) of 89 CMA members who self-identified as newspaper advisers shows that roughly 56% of college newspapers are housed within the school's student affairs division and 54% of advisers report to a person within the department of student affairs. This demonstrates the link between student affairs and college newspapers.

Chapter 3: Methodology

I began my research with an informal survey of advisers through the CMA listserv (email communication, May 15, 2004) to gain an understanding of existing relationships between student affairs and the college newspaper. Eighty-nine advisers responded to my brief survey, and more than half indicated they were housed within their school's student affairs division (Table A).

Table A: Department in which college newspaper is housed

Department	**Total (percentage)**
Student affairs	51 (57.3%)
Journalism/Mass Communications Department	23 (25.8%)
English Department	3 (3.4%)
Independent of Institution	12 (13.5%)

College Media Adviser ethical guidelines are largely aligned with student development theory, emphasizing student autonomy and development (CMA, 2013). Furthermore, Associated College Press administers the Pacemaker — the top national award for college newspapers — and cites standards in its adviser guidebook criteria supportive of student development theory (Brasler, 2001). Although the student newspaper offers an ideal forum for student development to occur, the accounts of student censorship and adviser firings (Schraum, 2012; Zweifler, 2011; Brumback, 2011; Hardin, 2011) indicates such development is not fostered at some institutions. While some advisers are at risk of losing their jobs for practices that align with student development, others are winning Pacemaker Awards. Despite the link between adviser leadership and student development theory being evident, my informal survey found that

most advisers have no formal training in student development theory, with the majority coming from a professional media job (email communication, 2014).

No known published research has formally linked student development theory with advising college newspapers.

Statement of the Phenomenon

This phenomenon in this study is the relationship between college newspaper advisers and their student editors. Although most advisers likely lack student development training, student development theory may be unknowingly used by advisers in their interactions with their students and the culture they help establish in the newsroom. By examining college newspaper advising practices and comparing it to student development theory, I hope to fill a gap in the literature and provide a theoretical foundation for adviser practices. I hope to accomplish this by answering the following research question:

RQ1: Are there links between common advising practices of college newspaper advisers and student development theory?

Furthermore, this study examines if there are advising practices that are more common in Pacemaker-winning newspapers than in non-Pacemaker winning newspapers. The college newspaper Pacemaker Award, considered the highest honor for college media, requires that students critically and autonomously examine issues of impact to their school. This requirement parallels the basic tenets of student development theory, encouraging advisers to engage students in critical thinking while allowing students to produce their own work. By selecting students and advisers from both Pacemaker winning newspapers and non-Pacemaker winning newspapers, I sought to find if there

were differences in advising practices – related to student development theory – within some of the nation's top college newspapers and other college newspapers.

By examining the practices of some advisers at Pacemaker-winning newspapers and comparing them to the practices of some advisers at non-Pacemaker winning newspapers, I hope to further strengthen the argument that student development theory, even if unknowingly practiced by advisers, provides a theoretical foundation for college newspaper advising. If advisers from the nation's most prestigious college newspaper advisers are implementing practices that involve student development theoretical concepts, then the development of a model for advising rooted in student development theory would not only be beneficial to students, but also be beneficial to the institution, with the potential for national recognition. Rather than develop a new theoretical model or testing an existing theory, this study hopes to shine a spotlight on a theory that perfectly fits – and many times is even unknowingly practiced in – college newspaper advising. I hope to accomplish this by answering the following research question:

RQ2: Are there common adviser practices in Pacemaker-winning newspapers, and do those practices relate to student development theory?

My hope is that such a discovery could be a boon to college newspapers, an entity which is increasingly being met with censorship and mistrust from college administrators (Wheeler, 2015). If autonomy, critical investigation, and new experiences are keys to student development, and the college newspaper provides these keys, college administrators may begin to see the value in student media.

Rationale for Qualitative Research

A qualitative research design was used for this study because I wanted to gain a depth of understanding regarding adviser practices and student-adviser relationships. Qualitative research is a personal and involved activity that allows researchers to understand individual expressions, experiences, and encounters (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The qualitative research process is inductive, allowing the researcher to make interpretations of the meaning of the data (Creswell, 2014). This study attempted to analyze the culture of the college newsroom by examining the relationships between college newspaper advisers and student editors. Clifford Geertz (1973) likened culture to "webs of significance" spun by humans, and analyzing the culture as done through interpretation, producing "thick descriptions" of a person's performance in search of meaning. In this study, I used a qualitative approach because it allowed me to gain a more in-depth understanding of the working relationships between student editors and advisers, as respondents were able to share detailed information regarding their specific culture.

Phenomenological Approach

I used a phenomenological approach to gain an understanding of college newspaper advisers and student editors. Philosopher Edmund Husserl (1931) developed the concept of phenomenology to define the essence of the objects of a person or group's perceptions. Husserl argued that individuals are always making meanings of objects through overt or more obscure interactions. Philosopher Alfred Schutz (1967) proposed that researchers focus on the inhabitants of the culture, not the artifacts that are produced. Research using the phenomenological approach involves the researcher describing "the lived experiences of individuals about a phenomenon as described by participants"

(Creswell, 2014, p. 14). Applied to this study, the college newspaper is the artifact and the principal inhabitants being studied are the student editor and adviser. In phenomenological research, the researcher uses "the analysis of significant statements, the generation of meaning units, and development of an essence description" to produce data (Creswell, 2014, 196).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were addressed for this study because at the time of the research, I was adviser of a student-produced, college magazine. Potential study participants with whom I already had a relationship were not invited to participate in the study. My adviser capacity created a hierarchical structure with students. To ensure that participants felt safe with the study, I emphasized to each participant that he or she may leave the discussion at any time, and did not have to answer questions if there was concern. All respondents were assured confidentiality, with all personally identifying information being omitted from the final study. Furthermore, participants were made aware that the study was approved by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board.

Procedure

To conduct this study, I utilized three research procedures: an informal survey of college newspaper advisers, interviews with advisers and college newspaper editors, and a detailed journal updated throughout the research process.

Sample Selection

This study focuses on the experiences of, and relationships between, student editors and advisers of college newspapers. Participants for the study were chosen using a

maximum variation sampling strategy, in which the researcher attempts to find participants representing a wide range of characteristics within the phenomenon being studied (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). All student participants in this study served in the highest editorial capacity at their publication, and attended a national leadership conference during the summer of 2015. I purposefully selected study participants to obtain a diverse sample according to the following criteria: the geographic location of the institution the student attends, the size of the institution, and the public/private nature of the institution. Also, the researcher selected participants whose publications have won Pacemaker Awards, and participants who have not won Pacemaker Awards. After student interviews were conducted, I contacted the students' advisers to conduct phone interviews.

Informal Survey

Because no published research could be found demonstrating a link between college newspaper advisers and student development theory, an informal survey (email communication, May 15, 2014) was conducted using members of the CMA listserv to determine if the researcher's assumption was valid: that several newspaper advisers report to student affairs personnel and several newspapers are housed within student affairs divisions.

Eighty-nine CMA members who self-identified as newspaper advisers responded to the survey. The results affirmed the researcher's assumption that there is a link between student affairs and college newspapers. Among survey respondents, roughly 57% of college newspapers are housed within the school's student affairs division and 54% of advisers indicated that they report to a person within the department of student

affairs (Table A). Furthermore, the informal survey found that 100% of advisers in the survey came from a professional journalism background and not from a background in student affairs.

Respondent Interviews

Respondent interviews served as the qualitative method used in this study. Interviews "are a lens for viewing the interaction of an individual's internal states with the outer environment. The interview response is treated as a report of that interaction." (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 179). Conducting interviews of participants in a phenomenon is one of the primary practices of the phenomenological approach, as participants are able to provide descriptions of social phenomena that researchers would not be able to study on their own. It allows the researcher to be "the observer's observer" (Zelditch, 1962).

Respondent interviews strive to elicit open-end responses by accomplishing at least one of five goals: 1) to clarify meanings of common concepts and opinions; 2) to distinguish decisive elements of opinions; 3) to determine what influenced a person to act in a certain way; 4) to classify complex attitude patterns; or 5) to understand the interpretations that people attribute to their motivation to act (Lazarsfeld, 1944). Typically practiced as a stand-alone procedure in a qualitative study, respondents are asked to share their personal experiences and relay how they feel about a specific phenomenon (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Interviews were selected as the main method for this study because the researcher is seeking to gain insight into the individual experiences of each participant, including student editors and professional advisers, in his or her college newsroom environment.

Interviews of student editors were conducted in person during a major national conference that attracts editors from institutions across the country. Held in summer 2015, the researcher gained permission from the seminar director to solicit interviews during the week. Attendees to the annual conference include student editors of college newspapers from institutions ranging in size, geographic location, public/private status, and institutional reporting structure. Because the conference attracts several editors from publications that have consistently won Pacemaker Awards and is considered a conference focusing on newsroom leadership, it is an ideal venue to conduct interviews of student editors for this study.

Interviews were also chosen as my main method because it is a method with which I am very comfortable. I have more than a decade of experience in interviewing, both as a newspaper reporter and as a radio disc jockey. Although traditional news interviews are short, I have written many long-form feature stories that required more in-depth interviews, and sometimes even multiple interviews. I have won awards from the Georgia Press Association and Georgia Sportswriters Association for feature stories I wrote based on these interviews. As a radio disc jockey, I have interviewed numerous musical artists, both in person and over-the-phone, live on the air and pre-recorded.

I invited selected editors to participate in the interview prior to the conference in an email invitation (Appendix A). Of the fifteen students invited, fourteen agreed to participate in the study. Prior to the interview, student editors were asked to sign a consent form, assuring the confidentiality of the interview and giving permission to record (Appendix B). The interviews were conducted in person and one-on-one with the researcher. Interviews were conducted in multiple locations, including a campus

cafeteria, the lobby of the hotel where conference participants stayed, and in a coffee shop on campus. I used an interview guide (Appendix C) for asking questions, deviating from the guide to probe deeper as necessary. The guide focused on questions regarding the student's working relationship with her adviser, and were guided by student development theory, specifically Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial theory: seven vectors for student development. Questions focused on the adviser's leadership style, the adviser's involvement in the publication of the newspaper, and adviser practices in offering feedback and handling conflict. I attempted to treat each interview more like a conversation, encouraging the student editor to share stories related to my question and giving verbal and nonverbal cues that I was actively listening.

Overall, the student editors were very open in answering questions and providing significant details. When discussing controversial situations, some students asked about the confidentiality of the interview, and I reassured them that they would not be identified. Interviews ranged from fifteen minutes to more than an hour. The average interview lasted around thirty minutes. Although no student refused to answer a question, one student asked to cut the interview short so he could attend an informal outing other students were attending. I granted his request (that was the fifteen-minute interview).

After student editor interviews were conducted, I solicited participation from the thirteen advisers of students who were interviewed. Ten of the thirteen advisers agreed to participate in the study. I invited advisers to participate through an email invitation (Appendix D). Prior to the interview, advisers were asked to sign and return a consent form assuring their confidentiality and giving permission for the researcher to record the interview (Appendix E). Nine of the interviews were conducted over the phone and one

interview was conducted in person in September 2015. I called each adviser at a time and phone number convenient to them. Five of the phone interviews were done while the adviser was working. Three were conducted while the adviser was at home, and one while the adviser was driving. The in-person interview was conducted at a local coffee shop. I used an interview guide (Appendix F) to guide my questions, but I strayed from the guide to probe further when needed. While I avoided discussing my advisory role with students, I mentioned it during adviser interviews to help build camaraderie with my fellow adviser, and treat the interview more like a conversation between two advisers. Interviews lasted from twenty to seventy minutes.

All in-person interviews were recorded using a portable voice recorder. The phone interviews were recorded utilizing the subscriber-based recording and transcription service, NoNotes.

Journal

Because the study was conducted over a two-month period at various locations, I maintained a journal throughout the process. Lindlof and Taylor (2002) note that maintaining a journal has many practical benefits for an interviewer, assisting the researcher with managing data, highlighting prominent findings, and adjusting question strategies. Although all interviews in this study were recorded and later transcribed, I maintained a journal throughout the study to help pinpoint key responses in the interviews and identify patterns in responses.

Data Analysis

Phenomenological data analysis involves analyzing interview responses for significant statements, meaning units and essence description (Creswell, 2014). All

interviews were fully transcribed, most by the researcher and some by the subscription-based recording and transcription service, NoNotes. After transcription, the researcher reviewed all data, including information recorded in the researcher's journal, and recognized several patterns in the data. These patterns were developed into codes, typically an affirmation of or a negation of a specific phenomenon in college newspapers. Codes are "linkages between the data and categories posited by the researcher" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 216). While most coding occurred during the data analysis process, some codes emerged as the study progressed, with the researcher recognizing a pattern in respondent answers that could be coded a certain way, and notated the coding in his journal during interviews. All codes emerged during data analysis, a standard approach in social science qualitative research (Creswell, 2014).

After data are coded, the information must be interpreted. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest asking the question, "What were the lessons learned?" With the purpose of the study being to find common adviser practices and their relationship to student development theory, I looked for themes between interview responses and Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory.

Validity and Reliability

Reliability has to do with the consistency of observations. However, for qualitative studies, reliability "is not so much of a consideration" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 238). Specifically, reliability is virtually impossible to test in interviews, as "meanings of the social world are continually changing," as well are the researcher's own interpretations of those meanings (p. 239).

Validity – whether the instrument is accurately reporting the phenomena being studied – is a concern for qualitative research. The structure of this study involved triangulation, which compares two or more forms of evidence in the research process (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The student editors and advisers interviewed in this study were from the same publications. Many anecdotes given by student editors were reinforced by their adviser. Also, when appropriate, the researcher asked advisers about specific phenomena brought up by the student editor.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, a "newspaper" is defined as a college publication produced by students, regardless of its means of distribution. Some newspapers may be distributed in print, some may be distributed online, and some may be distributed through both means.

An "editor" is defined as the student who holds the top student position in the college newsroom, despite his or her actual title.

An "adviser" is defined as a non-student employed by the institution or publication to advise the newspaper. Some advisers are classified as faculty. Some are classified as staff.

A "Pacemaker newspaper" is defined as a college newspaper that has been nominated for a Pacemaker Award from 2013-2015. A "non-Pacemaker newspaper" is defined as a college newspaper that has not been nominated for a Pacemaker Award from 2013-2015.

A “large” institution newspaper is defined as the home institution having more than 10,000 students. A “small” institution newspaper is defined as the home institution having less than 10,000 students.

A “vector” is defined as one of the seven vectors of student development, developed by Chickering and Reisser.

Summary

The phenomenon in this study is the college newspaper and the working relationship between college newspaper advisers and student editors. Specifically, this study aimed to understand if advisers are practicing student development theory in advising students. A qualitative research design was used for this study because I wanted to gain a depth of understanding regarding adviser practices and student-adviser relationships. Specifically, this study used a phenomenological approach, which involved the researcher describing “the lived experiences of individuals about a phenomenon as described by participants” (Creswell, 2014, p. 14). Respondent interviews served as the qualitative method used in this study to allow participants to provide descriptions of social phenomena that the researcher would not be able to study on this own. Through phenomenological data analysis, the researcher hoped to find common themes answering the following research questions:

RQ1) Are there links between common advising practices of college newspaper advisers and student development theory?

RQ2) Are there common adviser practices in Pacemaker-winning newspapers, and do those practices relate to student development theory?

Chapter 4: Results

Background

Interviews of fourteen editors were conducted at a national college journalism workshop held in July 2015. The participating editors were purposefully selected by the researcher to represent: different parts of the country, public and private schools, large and small colleges, and publications that have won a Pacemaker in the past three years, and publications that have not won a Pacemaker in the past three years (Table B).

Table B: Participating Editors

	Location	**Type**	**Size**	**Pacemaker**
Editor 1*	West	Public	Small	No
Editor 2*	Southeast	Public	Large	Yes
Editor 3	West	Public	Large	No
Editor 4*	Midwest	Public	Small	No
Editor 5	Southwest	Public	Large	Yes
Editor 6*	Southeast	Public	Large	No
Editor 7*	Northeast	Private	Small	No
Editor 8*	Northeast	Private	Small	Yes
Editor 9*	Southwest	Private	Large	No
Editor 10	Midwest	Public	Small	No
Editor 11*	Midwest	Public	Large	No
Editor 12*	Southeast	Public	Large	Yes
Editor 13*	Midwest	Public	Large	Yes
Editor 14	South	Public	Large	Yes

**indicates adviser was interviewed as well*

Interviews of ten advisers were conducted mostly over the phone in September 2015. Adviser participants were purposefully selected based on the fact that their editor had already participated in the study. Participants included six advisers of Pacemaker

newspapers and four advisers of non-Pacemaker newspapers. All advisers interviewed indicated they have a professional journalism background.

There were a variety of home departments reported by the advisers, with four reporting to student affairs, three to an academic department, two completely independent of the institution, and one to academic affairs (Table C).

Table C: Adviser Reporting Structure

Public/ Private	**Title**	**Home**	**Direct Supervisor**	**Pacemaker**
Public	Editorial Adviser	Student Affairs	Director of Student Involvement	Yes
Public	Print Adviser	Journalism School	Director of Student Media	Yes
Public	Newsroom Adviser	Independent	General Manager	Yes
Public	Director of Student Publications	Academic Affairs	Vice Provost	Yes
Private	Assistant Director of Student Media	Student Affairs	Associate Director of Student Media	Yes
Private	Adviser to Student Media	Journalism School	Journalism Chair	Yes
Public	Associate Professor/Faculty Adviser	Student Affairs	Journalism Chair	No
Public	Editorial Adviser	Independent	General Manager	No
Public	Director of Student Media	Student Affairs	Dean of Students	No
Private	Associate Professor/Adviser	Communications School	Communications Chair	No

Questions were grounded in student development theory, specifically Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial theory: seven vectors for student development. Questions focused on the adviser's leadership style, the adviser's involvement in the publication of the newspaper, and adviser practices in offering feedback and handling conflict (Appendix A, B). I often asked participants to elaborate on their responses,

seeking personal stories to help explain their response. Interview length ranged from fifteen minutes to more than an hour.

Data from both the student editor and adviser interviews were analyzed by the researcher for common themes and phenomena related to advising practices and adviser-editor relationships. Following a qualitative format, the data are presented in descriptive, narrative form using "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) and the meanings the researcher attached to the data will be explained (Creswell, 2014). The questions asked of student editors and advisers were an attempt by the interviewer to determine an answer to the research questions:

RQ1) Are there links between common advising practices of college newspaper advisers and student development theory?

RQ2) Are there common adviser practices in Pacemaker-winning newspapers, and do those practices relate to student development theory?

Response Themes

Four common themes of adviser leadership emerged from the interviews: consistent newspaper critiques, the absence of prior review, challenging a student's bias, and offering both intellectual and emotional support during conflict. Additionally, students and advisers provided different traits when asked to identify the most important trait for advisers.

Regular Critiques

Table D: Regular written critique and Pacemaker status

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Regular written critique	6	3
No regular written critique	0	5

A written critique of the final publication is the most common form of consistent feedback given by advisers. This is done in a variety of ways: "marking up" the physical copy of the newspaper and placing it in the newsroom, placing post-it notes offering suggestions on the physical newspaper, and sending an annotated .pdf of the publication through email to student staff members. Consistent critiques happened in all six of the Pacemaker newspapers evaluated, and most non-Pacemaker newspapers did not have a regular critique (Table D).

For the most part, students appreciate the critiques, especially when advisers understand the students whom they are critiquing. A student editor from a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the Southwest said:

> I find (our adviser) is often harsher in the critiques on the better writers because he wants to keep challenging them. The less-developed writers – (our adviser) is aware of their skill level and takes that into account, offering suggestions and telling them what they did right.

At a large, private, Pacemaker newspaper in the Northeast, the adviser's critique is paired with a weekly critique meeting, open to editors and any other student who wants to attend. The student editor of that newspaper attributed improvement in the newspaper to this critique process:

> That is a huge thing that has helped our publication – having that critique session every single week. (Our adviser's) opinion really does matter to us.

The newspaper's adviser said she developed this formula over time, and it gives an opportunity for her not only to present her feedback, but also an opportunity for other interested parties across campus to give constructive criticism of the newspaper:

> We call it "Coffee and Critique." I provide the food and the students who come peer-to-peer critique each section. I try to stay out of it as much as possible, letting students come to their own conclusions. But if there's something they're missing, I try to very strategically mention it without being completely annoying.

Not all feedback is appreciated by student editors. A student from a small, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the Midwest said her staff is frequently frustrated with the feedback provided by their advisers. Rather than finding the criticism helpful, staff members took the criticism personally.

> There are all of these passive-aggressive post-it notes everywhere, and (the content) is not addressed directly with students. That just pisses people off.

Similarly, an editor at a small, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South said written critiques were a common practice by her adviser, until the staff continuously became upset at the negative nature of the criticism. At the advice of the editor, the adviser stopped giving written publication critiques.

> Our adviser took a red pen and marked the whole thing up and it looked like something had died. (Our adviser) was very harsh about the things we did wrong … It wasn't so much about, here's how to learn from this mistake, but rather a rant about how wrong it was and how much you should've done better … So we just discontinued those critiques because they were no longer useful for us.

Students react more favorably to critiques that balance positive comments with negative criticism. The editor of a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the South said her adviser's critiques are successful because they point out as many positives as negatives:

> Her critiques are great. She does a written critique and sends it out the next day as a .pdf. She also does a 'three and three,' which is where she says three things that she thinks we did great and three things she thinks we should work on. It's a great way for her to give 'shout-outs' to some of our staffers.

That newspaper's adviser notes that she is careful to make any criticism general – not naming specific individuals. But when she sees positive attributes, she specifically names the individual responsible.

> The three good things are really specific about praising and giving credit to an individual. I try to praise in public and critique in private. I don't want to call out one person and say, 'This person did a bad job on this story.' That's just not productive.

An adviser at a large, public, Western, non-Pacemaker newspaper also follows this pattern, being sure not to criticize a student in front of other students. She sends her critiques to the staff via email, but said if something looks really "out of place," she will contact the specific editor and writer directly:

> If someone's really struggling, I'll send them an email that says I've noticed a trend in this story, then we can meet and talk about it. That way, it's not so public and I'm not taking them down in front of all the other staff members.

In addition to balancing the positive with the negative, students react more favorably to critiques that are consistent. Some students expressed frustration with the inconsistency of their adviser's publication critique. A student at a small, non-Pacemaker, public institution in the Midwest said her adviser frequently gets behind on the critique schedule:

> She teaches classes too and gets busy and will skip a few issues, then finally picks it back up again. It's not very consistent. That makes it hard for us. She really does give really good, thorough critiques that are very helpful. It slows us down a bit when we don't get that feedback.

Students who do not receive a written critique from their adviser expressed a desire for one. An editor at a large Southern public institution, non-Pacemaker newspaper said:

> (Our adviser) might say something in passing … but I'd really like a markup, you know, with the red ink – just something physical so I can show it to my staff. I think they'd like that too just so we felt like (the adviser) was reading it.

A student at a small, non-Pacemaker, public newspaper in the Midwest said her adviser would occasionally write a few comments on the newspaper, but the tone, lack of insight, and inconsistency of the critiques only frustrated students:

> He would mark some things in the margins and leave us with the paper, but would never really explain his comments to us, or tell us what he thought of the overall product. Our staff was very frustrated with the way he interacted with everyone.

Interestingly, the three advisers interviewed who do not give a weekly critique said they felt some sort of guilt that they did not offer a regular critique. They all said that at one time they did offer regular written critiques, but they fell out of that habit because they felt students were either disinterested or were getting overly defensive over the criticism. An adviser at a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South said the critique process seemed counterproductive:

> I'm definitely an outlier on the critique continuum. When I did critiques, it was pretty depressing. They were telling me how much they wanted brutal honesty,

> but (after students saw the critique), I could see it in their face. They did not want brutal honesty. It became something I did less and less, and now I'm not doing a critique at all.

Another adviser of a large, public, Southern, non-Pacemaker newspaper said she also used to conduct weekly critiques, but stopped after she felt students were not reading her feedback:

> I think the written critiques are useful, but I don't think many students use them. They say they use them but they keep making the same mistakes over and over again. I think it's just one tool. Some people communicate better in written form and for some students, it's very useful. But for the majority of people, they just don't read (the critique) … I can get more information across by grabbing someone and saying, "Do not, do not use percentage signs." If I do that in person, they get the message. But if you do that in a critique, they would never read it.

An adviser of a small, private, Midwestern, non-Pacemaker newspaper said she feels like she is not doing her job by offering a regular critique. But she has found a regular critique to be difficult for her publication since it is an online-specific publication:

> This is awful and I'm glad this is confidential because doing a critique is nearly impossible for me to get done. When we were a print publication, it was no big deal. But with a new story rolling out every day … there's really no such thing as post-publication.

The adviser added that she is not sure how to handle critiques of online material without influencing content, in essence letting censorship creep into her advising:

> Where's the line between critique and editing? If I critique something, and they change the content online, it's problematic for the ethics of what we're trying to do.

Prior Review

Another common theme that emerged from the adviser interviews was the lack of — and strong feelings against — prior review.

Table E: Prior review and Pacemaker status

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Prior Review	0	0
No Prior Review	6	8

"Prior review" is the act of approving student media before publication (JEA, 2010). An adviser engaging in prior review would be a direct violation of the College Media Association's Code of Ethics (2013). Legally, advisers at public institutions are not allowed to stop content from being published because it is viewed as a First Amendment violation (SPLC, 2015). However, those same protections do not apply to private institutions. Also, an adviser at a public institution can still legally view content and offer suggestions during production. The adviser just cannot stop publication of the product.

Although publication critiques are widely practiced by advisers, the critique happens after the newspaper is published. All student editors interviewed stated that their adviser does not practice prior review, in any form (Table E). Advisers are largely absent during the production process. A common theme among editors was that their adviser takes a "hands off" approach to production. A student at a small, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the Midwest said:

> (Our adviser) doesn't have any place at all in the actual publication side of things. He's completely hands off.

Even at schools where the adviser is involved with other aspects of the publication – such as story budget meetings and advertising – the final product is left solely to students. An editor of a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the West said his adviser is at story planning meetings and may even suggest stories, but she has no involvement in production:

> When it comes to deciding what's in the paper, what stories are going to go in and where they are going to go, it's all up to us. She has no say in our final product.

For most editors, the idea of prior review is something they are confident their advisers would never attempt to practice. An editor at a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South laughed at the idea of prior review:

> I'm the last person who sees the paper. I think (our adviser) knows if she were to overstep her bounds like that, it wouldn't go very well for her.

The editor of a small, private, non-Pacemaker in the Northeast said as he sees small errors slip into the final product, he is reminded that he is the final safety net:

> My adviser has to remind me that she will not give her opinion unless I ask. I have full autonomy. She's so good about that.

That newspaper's adviser echoes the sentiment of all advisers, saying that prior review is out of the question, referring to the College Media Association's Code of Ethics:

> I have those words on my wall. I take it really seriously that I will never do prior review. I will never tell them what stories to cover. I will never open a (newsroom) file unless they specifically say the file is for me to read.

An adviser of a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the South said that he makes it a point to not even be in the newsroom during production:

> I make it a point not to be there. I don't want to know what the stories are. I don't want to know what the editorials are. I don't want to know what's on the front page. I saw [the newspaper] when the public saw it.

Even when advisers are around the newsroom during production, they still make it a point to not get involved with content decisions. An adviser of a small, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the Midwest said he is there for students on production nights, but he has no desire to enact prior review:

> If they have a question about something during production, I'll gladly jump in and help figure it out. But I don't read stories before they go to press. That's something I would really be uncomfortable with.

An ethical desire to allow student autonomy is the main reason why advisers said they did not practice prior review. However, another reason why prior review is not practiced could be to protect the university from lawsuits. In 2012, a libel suit was filed against Florida A&M University for a story in the institution's student newspaper, The Famuan, in which a murder suspect in a hazing case was improperly identified. The institution left itself open to a libel suit because of its "excessive involvement in The Famuan newsroom" (Landis, 2013). An adviser of a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South said his supervisors have made it clear to him that they do not want him engaging in prior review:

> I don't want to be that deeply into (the final product) and my students don't want me to me deeply into it. But also, my bosses don't want me to go there. The legal

advice the university administration gets now is, “Don’t touch that newspaper because you don’t want to be responsible for it.” I find that very liberating.

Challenging student bias

Although advisers are unanimously against prior review, that does not mean they do not challenge student-held beliefs, even if it is after publication of the newspaper.

Table F: Adviser will challenge student bias and Pacemaker status

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Challenges student bias	6	6
Does not challenge student bias	0	2

Objectivity is the mostly widely-known and most misunderstood traits of journalism (Kovach and Rosenthal, 2007). Although many people interpret “objectivity” to mean the journalist is free of bias, the term “objectivity” is really about the journalistic method. Despite his or her personal feelings, the journalist should get both sides of stories involving conflict. And if the journalist feels a personal bias is too strong, the journalist should be removed from the story. Part of an adviser’s job is help students produce objective article. According to the College Media Adviser’s Code of Ethical Behavior (2013), advisers should remind students of real and potential conflicts of interest in their pursuit of stories. Advisers are largely following this directive (Table F), including every adviser of a Pacemaker publication.

Challenging student bias can be a tricky task for an adviser, especially since prior review of editorial content is directly in violation with the College Media Adviser’s Code of Ethics (2013). Because of the requirement to be “hands off” during production, many challenges of bias occur after publication. A student at a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the south said her adviser is always encouraging students to “check their liberal”:

> She will definitely step in after the fact and say, "Guys, you know, this was a great piece that you worked on, but your liberal is showing.

Politics is not the only subject where bias can be present. In a college environment, students are usually involved in multiple aspects of campus life. An editor of a small, private, Pacemaker newspaper in the east said during the critique process, her adviser is quick to point out conflicts of interest:

> She's really good at pointing out things we wouldn't notice. For instance, we had an editor write a story about a department, but she was employed by that department, so there could be a conflict of interest.

The publication's adviser said that although she will point out potential conflicts of interest, she will always ultimately leave the decision in in her editor's hands:

> I'll walk with them through the how they could deal with the story, and what they should think about to balance the conflict … arming them with the knowledge they might not have. But ultimately letting them make the final decision.

In addition to conflicts of interest and political bias, advisers also work to make sure students are aware of subtler forms of bias. A student at a small, public, non-Pacemaker in the west said her adviser consistently helps students balance their cynicism of school administration:

> We did a story about a campus daycare that was getting free rent, and the institution decided it would start charging rent. This would force the daycare off campus, which angered a lot of faculty and staff who use the daycare. So we wrote a story … and it ended up being very biased. I didn't realize it at the time, but afterwards my adviser talked to me and noted how we never got the

> administration's point of view for the story. Maybe there is a good reason for them to start charging rent. But we didn't report the story objectively.

A student at large, private, Pacemaker publication in the southwest said his adviser is consistently encouraging staff members to recognize their own biases. For instance, when the institution proposed a significant tuition increase, the adviser encouraged student to think outside their own situation:

> If you're from a higher class family and you're going to this school, which is a really expensive college, you have to understand that the tuition increase is a really big deal to those students who are struggling financially. You have to understand where you're coming from before you can really write an objective story.

The student's adviser said he sees it as one of his main responsibilities to make sure students are seeing the bigger picture in stories and moving beyond their personal bias:

> It's the duty of the adviser to convince student to pursue something if something needs to be pursued – whether they're disinclined to because of their personal views or if they're worried about making someone angry.

Even in editorial writing, in which inserting personal opinion is expected, advisers have been critical of students for simply relying on their biased opinion. A student at a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the south said:

> (Our adviser) would be very critical of an editorial if it was just opinion, without facts backing it up and without considering the other side. He'll say that even though it's an editorial, you still have to do reporting. You can't just throw stuff

> out there. Examine the other side, find legitimate critiques and facts, and then form your opinion off those facts rather than just your opinion.

An adviser of a small, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the west said she also encourages her students to think beyond their own biases in editorial writing:

> I'll never say you should think this way or write about this. But I do challenge them to think beyond their own feelings. For instance, if there were statewide university budget cuts, I would encourage them to see what other institutions are cutting to inform their opinion about our budget cuts.

The two editors who indicated that their adviser does not challenge their bias, also noted that their advisers do not offer regular critiques of their newspaper. In essence, they are getting little or no feedback about their work, including any challenges to potential bias.

Support during conflict

Editors appreciate advisers who challenge them, but more importantly they praise advisers who support them in difficult times.

Table G: Positive adviser conflict support experience and Pacemaker status

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Positive conflict support	5	4
No positive conflict support	1	4

Inevitably, situations will arise in student media in which the student editor is faced with a conflict in which the student seeks support from an adviser. As the person ultimately in charge of the final publication, the editor is the first person to absorb criticism from the public. Also, as the leader of the organization, the editor is often faced with helping resolve internal conflicts within the publication. Although resolving conflict is not directly stated in the College Media Association's Code of Ethics (2013), the code

states that the adviser's primary responsibilities are to give advice and to teach students. All of the student editors interviewed shared a story about a time in which they sought advice from their adviser during a time of conflict. Nine students recounted a positive experience in which their adviser helped resolve a conflict, and eight students indicated that their adviser did not help them resolve a conflict, or even made the situation worse (Table G).

Many students cited an instance in which they faced criticism from someone outside the newsroom about a story that was published in the newspaper. A student at a small, public, non-Pacemaker institution in the west recalled a time when a college administrator contacting him upset about an editorial that criticized administrative decisions at the college:

> We've had problems with this person in the past. But everything we mentioned in this editorial was backed up by hundreds of emails that we obtained through a (freedom of information) request. I received an email from him demanding that we run corrections … My initial reaction was to tell this guy to 'fuck off.' My adviser was able to reel me in. I know she has the same animosity towards (the administrator), but she could also see the bigger picture. She told me to take it slow, and that I'm going to have to respond with a clear head as opposed to delivering a very passionate response right now.

A student at a small, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the west said her adviser demonstrated constant support in an ongoing feud the newspaper editors had with student government. The paper had been publishing critical articles of the student government, and the institution's student government retaliated by publicly criticizing the

ethics of the journalists and editors behind the stories. Making matters worse, the editor said one of her reporters indicated to a member of the student government that he didn't care about ethics:

> We had to do something about it, but I wasn't sure what to do. I didn't want people to think we weren't ethical in our reporting, because we were, but this naïve reporter said something he regretted. We went to our adviser and she was very supportive. She encouraged us to be transparent about the situation, put it out in the open that he made a mistake. And she advised us to put another person on the story.

The adviser of the publication recalls the situation, adding that this was the latest chapter in an ongoing feud between the newspaper and student government at the institution. She recalled a previous situation in which the student government was upset that the publication was frustrated with the lack of coverage for student elections. It had been a newspaper policy to not produce coverage of the candidates, instead requiring individual candidates to purchase ads:

> They just went ballistic on her – told her that she's doing a disservice to students. There was a lot of external pressure for her to change her newsroom policy, in which we would publish whatever the student government folks wanted us to publish. I told her to stick to her guns.

Ultimately, the editor did not budge on the editorial policy, but her adviser encouraged editors to set up a meeting with student government officials to explain the newspaper policy, and determine areas of mutual interest for future coverage. The adviser said the meeting eased tensions between the two entities.

The adviser being a calming figure is a common theme among students who found their advisers offering positive conflict support. An editor at a small, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South said that when a tragedy affected their student population and the newspaper staff was deciding how to cover it, her adviser was able to offer support:

> We were all very shocked and emotional. He was able to be a calm figure in the newsroom, and helped guide us in how we could disseminate the information we had. He was also there in a counselor role, if anyone was feeling overwhelmed.

Her adviser recalled the same event, calling the situation a great learning experience for not only the students, but for him as an adviser:

> There was definitely a counseling process going on. While students were covering the issue, they were also grieving. It was a day that people got out of their comfort zone … and [the coverage] turned into a positive for the entire [school] community.

A student at a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the southwest said her adviser was a calming influence in her pursuit of a story about a controversial issue on campus. Because the story would likely fuel already-existing tensions, she was questioning whether she should even cover the story. But her adviser offered support:

> I was afraid. There were already a lot of tensions on campus, and I was nervous I couldn't represent the story fairly. I talked to my adviser and he was very supporting and encouraging. A lot of it was telling me about his past experiences, and talking me through my current situation. It was very comforting, knowing I had him as a resource and that he had my back.

In addition to facing external conflict, editors must often deal with conflict within the student media organization. As the head of the newspaper staff, unresolved conflicts between staff members ultimately end up with the student editor. A student at a small, private, Pacemaker institution in the east recalled a conflict several editors were having with a fellow editor:

> A lot of our staff wasn't happy with his production, and many of us were often having to pick up the slack. A lot of people wanted him removed, but our adviser talked to me and encouraged me to address the conflict directly with him, addressing the problems we have with him. Instead of being angry and passive-aggressive, she advised us to address it directly with him in a rational way.

The student said that her adviser's advice was invaluable, as the editor in question changed his actions:

> He just didn't know what he was doing wrong. People don't know their faults until their pointed out, and he had a lot of potential, so I'm glad it worked out.

Offering an objective view of the newsroom is a trait many students said they appreciated in their adviser. An editor of a small, private, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the east said he was in a situation in which he struggled to work with a fellow editor with whom he was in competition with to become editor-in-chief:

> He resents that I was chosen as editor-in-chief, because he had been in the organization longer. It created a rub – sometimes he would smugly criticize me or he'd tattle on me to our adviser. But she is aware of these behaviors and lets me know when he does this, and encourages me to address the situation. She doesn't play favorites. She is dedicated to making sure we can get along professionally.

An editor of a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the south said she appreciates that her adviser allows room for emotion. She recalled a situation in which she had an argument with another editor that became so tense that the other editor walked out of the newsroom and quit:

> I went to my adviser's room, shut the door and I was frustrated, you know, like I was crying and I was mad. [My adviser] lets you get mad – she'll never stop you from being mad. If you need to come into her office and cry and swear and scream, she'll let you do that. She'll give you a hug and comfort you … when you've calmed down, she'll ask, "Where do we go from here?" She was able to help me craft a response to the girl.

The editor said her adviser's support during that situation was invaluable, and helped her grow as a leader:

> I never had to deal with something like that before. She was great at helping me work through the conflict. We get conflicts like any other student newspaper, and she's great at helping us work through those professionally.

The newspaper's adviser said that helping her students resolve conflict in a professional way is of her main duties as adviser:

> I will listen, talk to them about what the problem is, discuss what the challenges are and help them come to their own solution. I can offer them advice, but it's up to them to take the action.

Not all students believe their advisers were supportive in handling conflict. An editor at a small, public, non-Pacemaker school in the Midwest said there is a divide between her staff members and their adviser, who was in his first year. One of the root

causes occurred when her adviser publicly condemned her in a staff meeting for holding a job in the school's sports information office while serving as an editor of the newspaper:

> He called me out and said, 'Put a gun to your head and pick a job.' He told me I was being completely unethical and that if he knew I worked [in sports information], he wouldn't have hired me.

The editor said she was especially confused about this comment, since many staff members – as well as several previous editors – had other on campus jobs in public relations offices.

> It's just the way things work at our school. We're a small department, so you try to get experience in a lot of different areas.

The student added that one positive aspect about the public condemnation is that it united staff – albeit against the adviser.

> It was very embarrassing for me, being humiliated in front of the entire staff. But the whole staff ended up becoming pretty mad at him about it, because we all have a pretty strong relationship.

Most important adviser trait

Table I: Most important adviser trait (students)

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Autonomy	5	2
Support	1	6

The final question the researcher asked each editor and adviser was, "What is the most important trait in an adviser?" Participants were encouraged to not think specifically about their own adviser, but to think more broadly about what they believe is the most important quality in an adviser. Two common themes emerged: autonomy and being

supportive. Editors of Pacemaker newspapers were much more likely to name autonomy as the most important trait, while non-Pacemaker newspaper editors were more likely to say a "supportive" adviser is more important (Table I).

An editor at a large, public, western, Pacemaker newspaper said her adviser's professional experience, combined with his "hands-off" approach, has been most valuable to her:

> Our adviser has a lot of experiences in journalism, and that experience allows him to work through different issues and options as they come up, being flexible enough to analyze different problems in different ways and giving us a broad scope of responses. His flexibility allows us to examine all of our options and make our own decisions with his support.

An editor at a large, public, Southern, Pacemaker newspaper echoed this sentiment:

> I do not think a student newspaper benefits from an adviser that edits stories, assigns ideas to reporters or is heavily involved in the production of the paper. An adviser should be accessible and always willing to help, but should know when to take a step back and let the students lead on their own.

Another Southern editor, from a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper, said there is a fine line that advisers should be careful not to cross:

> You need to know where the line is between advising and being controlling. A lot of advisers will try to make content decisions and that's one thing our adviser was good about. [Our adviser] would argue with us, but ultimately let us come to our own conclusion at what was the best option. I think that's the most important thing.

Editors who said "being supportive" was the most important trait of a new adviser mentioned several different elements in their responses. An editor at a large, public, Midwest, non-Pacemaker newspaper referred to her high school adviser in looking for an ideal adviser:

> She was super-motivating. She never would let anyone believe they couldn't do it. If you thought you couldn't do it, she would help talk you down and get you to think about it in a different way – look at the different angles – and encourage you to keep trying … It's important to be motivating to your staff and to not beat them down to the point where they don't want to work for you.

An editor from a large, public, western, non-Pacemaker was more succinct in describing the most important trait for an adviser:

> Someone who allows you to grow, and inspires you do that.

An editor from a small, public, Southern, non-Pacemaker newspaper described support in a different way. She said an adviser needs to understand the demands placed on college students:

> They need to recognize that we as student journalists have to balance an array of things, and we don't always do a good job. I think having an adviser who can recognize that … is crucial. If you have an adviser who is expecting professional work out of you, and that you will always be available, then they're going to be disappointed.

Table J: Most important adviser trait (advisers)

	Pacemaker	Non-Pacemaker
Autonomy	0	1
Support	6	3

All but one adviser answered this question with a theme focused on being supportive of students (Table J). Sub-themes included listening to student concerns, being accessible to students, being upfront with students, and patience. An adviser of a small, public, Midwest, Pacemaker newspaper said, advisers need to remember they are dealing with people who are still developing:

> Kids between 18 and 22 years old speak a different language, and they communicate differently. The things that I am used to dealing with in a professional newsroom are different when dealing with younger people, who are just starting to find themselves and are developing personally and professionally. So you've really got to do a lot of listening to what they're saying.

An adviser of a large, public, Southern, Pacemaker newspaper added, that in addition to listening, advisers need to make themselves available to students:

> The number one thing I hope students would say about me is that he was there for us anytime we ever needed him for anything. The old approach of just sitting back and being an adviser in name – that time has passed us. You have to be available 24/7.

An adviser of a large, public, western, Pacemaker newspaper noted that in addition to being available, an adviser must hold firm with journalistic principles, and make sure students are abiding by them:

> We all have a desire to be liked, but that's not your role. You have to stay true to the ethics and professionalism of our profession. You have to tell them when things don't measure up.

The other theme mentioned was patience. An adviser at a large, public, Southern, Pacemaker newspaper said:

> Patience – the ability to try to influence rather than demand. It does take awhile for your lessons to sink in … and if they do you're not going to get credit for them. You have to be okay with that.

Summary

Four main themes involving adviser leadership emerged in interviews with fourteen student editors and ten advisers: consistent newspaper critiques, the absence of prior review, challenging a student's bias, and offering both intellectual and emotional support during conflict. All students indicated a desire for these traits in advisers, and most advisers indicated they practice these traits. One exception is with the practice of offering consistent publication critiques. Some advisers do not give critiques, despite a student desire for them. Students at Pacemaker-winning newspapers overwhelmingly indicated that their advisers practice these traits, while responses from students at non-Pacemaker newspapers were more varied. Additionally, students were split on what they thought was the most important trait for advisers: offering autonomy or offering support. Advisers largely agreed that being supportive is the most important trait.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusion

Discussion

This paper is the first known study to find a link between student development theory and the practice of college newspaper advising. Since many college newspapers are housed in student affairs divisions, and college newspaper involvement is largely seen as an extracurricular activity for college students, utilizing student development theory in advising college newspapers makes sense. Specifically, this study sought to find if elements of the psychosocial development theory developed for college students by Chickering (1969) and later updated with Reisser (1993) – the "seven vectors for student development" – is being unknowingly practiced in college newspaper advising.

RQ1: Are there links between common advising practices of college newspaper advisers and student development theory?

Four main themes involving adviser leadership emerged in interviews with fourteen student editors and ten advisers: consistent newspaper critiques, the absence of prior review, challenging a student's bias, and offering both intellectual and emotional support during conflict. These four traits relate to specific vectors within Chickering and Reisser's (1993) theory: developing competence (vector one), managing emotions (vector two), moving through autonomy toward emotional interdependence (part of vector three), and developing mature interpersonal relationships (vector four).

Publication critiques and developing competence

The publication critique is a technique widely practiced in student newspapers, and is especially practiced in the nation's most recognized, award-winning newspapers (Table D). Student feedback is clear: they desire consistent publication critiques that balance positive feedback with criticism. Publication critiques should be a consistent practice of college newspaper advisers, not only because of the desire of students, but also because of the potential it offers for student development.

The adviser practice of offering consistent publication critiques could help students through the first vector of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) "seven vectors of student development": developing competence. This vector requires the individual to gain increasing confidence in his or her ability, including intellectual, physical and manual capabilities, and interpersonal skills. In developing intellectual competence, students are mastering content and building skills to comprehend various situations. In doing so, students are learning new ideas to help provide "more adequate" structures to make sense of their interactions.

Consistent publication critiques that balance positive feedback with constructive criticism helps instill confidence in students. Positive feedback reinforces students' intellectual capabilities while constructive criticism offers them a path to improving their journalistic competence. Through the publication critique, students are feedback that helps them master content, and build their journalism skills. If the feedback is counter to what the student originally believed to be correct, students are absorbing new ideas that helps them develop "more adequate" structures. Advisers who compliment their publication critiques with face-to-face critique sessions, such as the "Coffee and

Critique" format, are also helping develop students' interpersonal skills as students are forced to deal with criticism in person from a wide variety of sources.

Although not overtly stated, advisers largely recognize developing competence in students as the core aspect of their job, and the critique was a key component of helping students. An adviser from a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the Southwest said he sees the critique as a way he can help students develop the skills needed for their professional careers, but it's up to the individual student to take that advice:

> My philosophy is that I'm here to help them know how we would do things in 'the real world.' I offer them my advice, based on my professional opinion, and they can take it or leave it.

Likewise, an adviser at a small, private, Pacemaker newspaper in the Northeast said she sees her role in the critiques to share her professional expertise to help enrich a student's knowledge, but again, the students have the responsibility to accept the feedback:

> I'm guiding them and giving them the knowledge that they might not have yet, but I let them make the final decision as to whether they will accept that feedback.

The lack of prior review and moving through autonomy toward emotional interdependence

"Prior review" is the act of approving student media before publication (JEA, 2010). Although students in public institutions are protected from prior review by the First Amendment, those same protections do not apply to students in private institutions. Also, advisers at public institutions are still legally allowed to view and comment on content before publication. However, advisers and editors interviewed were unanimous in their reporting of the absence of prior review at their publications (Table E). At these

college newsrooms, which represents both public and private institutions, prior review is nonexistent in any form. Many advisers even make it a point not to be near the newsroom during production.

The staunch opposition to prior review among advisers, leaving complete autonomy of the final product to their editors, could help students through a part of the third vector of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory: moving through autonomy toward interdependence. This vector involves requires the student to develop interdependence in three areas: emotional, instrumental and interpersonal. Emotional interdependence occurs when students break free from the need for constant reassurance and approval, and students show a willingness to take principled risks despite a potential loss of comfort and status. Instrumental interdependence occurs when students demonstrate an ability to think critically, translating ideas into focused action. Interpersonal interdependence occurs when students recognize the larger context of specific issues and how their opinion fits in society.

Specifically, the "hands off" approach advisers apply to the final product helps student editors develop emotional interdependence. The "safety net" of an authority figure reviewing content is removed, and the student is ultimately responsible for their work. Students are taking principled risks when they publish content for public consumption. When no prior review is practiced, students cannot hide under the comfortable protection of their advisers. Their words are in print or online, available for anyone in the world to read and critique. They are opening themselves up to public criticism and scrutiny. Editors are especially developing interdependence. They are ultimately responsible for all content in their publication, and all feedback – positive or

negative – will likely come to them. As the newsroom leader, it is then the editor's responsibility to determine how to disseminate such critiques.

Advisers largely recognize that part of their role is to help a student step out of their comfort zone and take principled risks, opening themselves to public scrutiny. Two advisers likened their role to being coaches. An adviser at a small, public, Pacemaker institution in the Midwest said:

> In this job you don't make the decisions. You offer advice. You coach. Sometimes you may ask questions or try to steer a student down a certain path, but you have to make sure you're letting the students make the calls, make the decisions.

Likewise, an adviser of a small, private, Pacemaker school in the Northeast likened her role as an adviser to that of a football coach and the publication is akin to a football game:

> I would describe my style as being the coach, and when talking to the students we discuss strategy. I give them the skills and tools they need, or I help them get them, but at the end of the day they are the ones that are out there on the field, playing the game.

The adviser added that although it may sometimes be difficult to watch students make mistakes, especially when you know exactly what they are doing wrong, you have to let them fall:

> Advisers are not in a hands-on role of preparing [the newspaper]. We are preparing the students to be hands-on, and then setting them free.

Challenging student bias and developing mature interpersonal relationships

Rather than insinuating that journalists should be unbiased, "objectivity" in journalism refers to the method of inquiry (Kovach and Rosenthal, 2007). Part of an adviser's job is to help students manage their bias in the pursuit of objective stories (CMA, 2013). Twelve of the fourteen editors interviewed in this study, including students from all of the Pacemaker newspapers, said their advisers challenge their biases (Table E). Because of an adviser's desire to not interfere with editorial content, the challenge to bias typically comes after publication. The two students that indicated their advisers to not challenge their bias were among those who noted that their adviser does not offer a regular critique (Table D), indicating they are not getting much of any feedback from their adviser.

Advisers who challenge a student's bias are potentially helping their development, specifically developing mature interpersonal relationships, the fourth vector of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory. Developing mature interpersonal relationships is achieved as students develop a tolerance and appreciation for differences among others. The critical goal for this stage is the ability of students to begin to ignore stereotypes of other people and recognize others as persons, forming their own opinions based on real conversations and interactions. By challenging a student's personal bias, the adviser is helping students look beyond their own viewpoints and understand other perspectives.

Although not overtly stated, advisers do feel they are helping students develop mature interpersonal relationships. An adviser at a large, private, Pacemaker newspaper

in the southwest says he is always pushing students to expand their view of the world from their own personal experience:

> It seems to be more common today than it was 20 years ago, but students are pretty happy. They think the university is a panacea, so there's not a lot that troubles them. So sometimes we have to take them aside and show them why something is important. We can't make them [pursue a story] and sometimes they don't. But we do are best to enlighten them about issues they may not be aware of. We encourage them to talk to people different from them, and understand their experience.

An adviser at a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the south said helping students see the bigger picture is one of his goals, directly relating his job to the mission of student affairs, the department with which his newspaper is housed:

> Student affairs is all about student success. Our goal is to develop students. I try to be someone who's going to push students to aspire to be more. I definitely see on of my biggest jobs is to get them to think bigger, to try and push students beyond their personal beliefs and experiences.

Editors largely appreciated the instances when their advisers challenged a potential bias, as long as it was clear that the final decision would be in the student's hands. A student at a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the southwest recounted a situation in which the publication was under fire for publishing the link to a Reddit post about a student death. Although the post was accurate, disparaging comments were posted in the comments section, and several people were highly critical of the newspaper for keeping the link posted.

> We were all really conflicted because the family found it defamatory. My adviser helped me see the other viewpoint, and he facilitated a conversation between the family [and me]. I really appreciated that. But ultimately, it was our call.

Conflict support and managing emotions

Student media are an entity in which its participants are prone to conflict: both external and internal. External conflict occurs from the readers – often including administrators – who are upset with content contained in the newspaper. Like all organizations, internal conflict occurs among its members. As the head of the organization, the student editor is the person who ultimately must deal with the conflict. Part of an adviser's job is to help students – especially the lead editor – mediate conflicts. Although all students indicated their adviser attempted to mediate conflicts, only nine of the fourteen indicated a positive experience with their adviser's support (Table G). Furthermore, all but one editor from Pacemaker newspapers said their advisers offered positive conflict support.

Advisers who offer support for their editors in the wake of criticism are potentially helping their development, specifically managing emotions, the second vector of Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory. Managing emotions – is achieved after the student learns to balance self-control and self-expression. Essentially, a student learns to be less selfish – "transcend the boundaries of the self" (p. 46) – and identify with larger groups. When advisers help editors resolve conflicts, they are helping students learn how to put their own personal feelings aside, and think about the betterment of the whole organization. Through practical experience, editors are

learning that in times of conflict, they must act like a leader for their staff to persist through the situation.

Editors who believe their adviser offered positive conflict support were able to balance their personal feelings with what was good for the publication. Many editors discussed how their advisers initially allowed them to emote, but ultimately led them to think about the best possible solution for the organization. In all cases, advisers encouraged their editors to personally and directly deal with the situation – once their emotions were in check.

Advisers recognize managing emotions as one of the key components of their job, and among those whose editors deemed as offering positive conflict support, two common themes were present: listening and autonomy. Advisers were more likely to be looked upon favorably by their editors if they allowed an opportunity for their students to emote, and if they empowered students to make their own decisions. An adviser at a large, public, non-Pacemaker newspaper in the South broke down her strategy for determining the needs of her students to emote into three categories: a vent, a rant, or a real problem:

> A vent is when they just want to relay a frustration. There's no other action needed after a vent. They just got to get it out. A rant is a little more serious. They are getting obsessed with the actions of a person, and I just have to help them understand where the other person might be coming from. A real problem is when you'll really need some conflict resolution. Then it's trying to figure out the root of the problem, and encouraging the student to handle it on her own.

The adviser said that helping students through internal conflict always involves helping them see the other side, and understanding that each student is working towards the same goal of producing an outstanding publication:

> This would happen a lot between the editors and the visual people – they're two different mindsets. So I would say to the writers, why don't you try drawing out (your design vision) for the visual editors? That's how good communication works.

Although students express a strong desire for their adviser to help them through periods of emotional conflict, they also want their advisers to allow students to make their own decisions. Advisers recognize this and are careful to tread the line between helping their editor and pursuing action. An adviser at a large, public, Pacemaker newspaper in the south said that dealing with conflict is part of an editor's job, and she is sure her editor's know that:

> I'm happy to give advice and help you figure out how to deal with different situations. But editors have to deal with people who are upset. That's part of what they do.

RQ2) Are there common adviser practices in Pacemaker-winning newspapers, and do those practices relate to student development theory?

Not surprising, the four themes related to student development theory were widely practiced in Pacemaker-winning newspapers. All students of Pacemaker-winning newspapers indicated that their adviser provides a regular publication critique (Table D), does not practice prior review (Table E) and challenges student bias (Table F). Five of six editors of Pacemaker-winning newspapers indicated that their adviser offers positive

support in times of conflict (Table G). Meanwhile, with the exception of the absence of prior review in all newspapers, students at non-Pacemaker winning newspapers gave mixed responses to the above-mentioned adviser practices. This study indicates that advisers at Pacemaker-winning newspapers do practice traits that advisers at non-Pacemaker newspapers may not practice, specifically offering a regular publication critique, consistently challenging students to balance their own emotions, and assist students in times of conflict. However, it is important to note that these practices are not correlated with winning a Pacemaker. They are simply adviser practices more common in Pacemaker newspapers than non-Pacemaker newspapers.

Implications

Despite all advisers in this study coming from a professional journalism background with no student affairs experience, they are mostly implementing student affairs theory in their practice. Those students who indicated their adviser is not implementing the mentioned practices expressed a desire for their advisers to do so. Furthermore, advisers of Pacemaker newspapers were more likely to employ these student development practices than advisers at non-Pacemaker newspapers.

This finding is important for the practice of college newspaper advising. It provides a practical theoretical framework with which to base future research. It also provides a standard of training for college newspaper advisers. Since 57% of college newspapers are housed within student affairs divisions and 54% of advisers reports to a person within the department of student affairs (email communication, May 15, 2014), it makes sense that student affairs theory can serve as a foundation for college newspaper advising. Furthermore, student affairs theory aligns closely with effective adviser

practices outlined by Associated College Press (Brasler, 2001). Specifically, Chickering and Reisser's (1993) "Seven Vectors for Student Development" theory should be used as a model for college newspaper advisers.

As noted earlier, being a college media adviser is at times not a secure job. Each year several cases are reported in which advisers are fired due to conflicts they had with administration, in most cases because the adviser was acting within CMA ethical guidelines (p. 32). Advisers in this study were housed in a variety of departments (Table C). This study suggests that the reporting structure and the newspaper's home are not important to the success of the newspaper and the satisfaction of the adviser. Whether in student affairs, a journalism school, or independent of the institution, a bad adviser-editor relationship can occur anywhere. Rather, the key to a positive adviser-editor relationship lies in the following adviser practices: consistent written critiques that balances criticism with praise; allowing students to have complete editorial autonomy; challenging a student's personal, professional, and political bias as it relates to coverage; and supporting editors during personal and professional conflict, but ultimately allowing the student to make the final decision.

In all cases evaluated in this study, the newspaper is housed and the adviser's supervisor works within a department that seemingly promotes student development and success. Perhaps associations like CMA and ACP can showcase the educational and developmental value of the student newspaper at academic conferences that adviser supervisors are likely to attend. While most journalism educators recognize the importance of the student newspaper and the value of the First Amendment and a free press, the value of the student press is not often presented to student affairs professionals.

This paper shows that the student newspaper can be an effective tool in student development. Rather than challenge advisers who are promoting student development, student affairs administrators should enable newspaper advisers, training them in student development theory and giving them autonomy in their leadership. Furthermore, if the mission of student affairs is to develop students, then student affairs administrators should offer protection to advisers when students at the newspaper pursue issues that may be deemed controversial or unfavorable to the institution.

Perhaps a white paper on the value of student journalism could be distributed to all advisers to give to their supervisors, or at least used as a basis for discussions with supervisors over why the decisions they make align with proper educational values. Furthermore, student affairs professionals should note that those newspapers whose adviser practices align most closely with student development theory are more likely to win the Pacemaker Award. Such recognition not only rewards students, but also offers positive press to the institution, helping with student recruitment. By consistently promoting the academic, developmental, and democratic values of student newspapers to supervisors, adviser organizations can hopefully make the advisers' job a little easier as they will not have to be continuously fighting with administration.

Limitations of the Research

Like all research, this study has its limitations. I used a qualitative approach. This method was used because I wanted to gain a depth of understanding regarding adviser practices and student-adviser relationships. Also, because only a small amount of Pacemakers – roughly twelve — are awarded each year to collegiate newspapers, the sample size of Pacemaker newspapers would not have been large enough for a

quantitative study. However, although in-depth interviews can provide a wealth of detail about a specific subject and situation, its generalizability is not as sound as a random-sample, quantitative study (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006).

Also, the researcher conducted interviews of students at a national editor leadership conference. This was done because several editors of Pacemaker newspapers would be in attendance, allowing the researcher a rare opportunity to conduct in-person interviews of editors from a variety of institutions. However, due to the cost of the conference, the mere attendance of these students to such a conference indicates a certain level of commitment and investment their advisers and institutions have to them and the college newspaper, leaving out from this study any students whose advisers and institutions may not be as supportive.

Another limitation is the reliance on adviser and editor statements to form the basis of this research. The researcher chose the method of interviewing in an attempt to reach several editors and advisers representing a variety of institutions and Pacemaker status. However, as in any interview, the statements made by advisers and editors may not reflect reality, in an attempt by the subject to paint the most positive picture of himself. In contrast, a field study would allow the researcher to make his own interpretations, rather than relying solely on his subject's perception.

Suggestions for future research

By applying student development theory as its theoretical foundation, this study opened a new area of potential research in collegiate journalism — the link between student development and involvement in the college newspaper. This study focused on the adviser-editor relationship. Future research could include longitudinal studies

examining all students involved in the newspaper, and how they develop over their collegiate career, compared with another student population. This study also shed light on the sometimes tenuous adviser-supervisor relationship. Future research could delve deeper into this relationship, interviewing not only advisers, but also their supervisors, and determining if all parties are on the same page when it comes to the newspaper's role in student development.

The researcher would most be interested in future research that attempts to generalize the results of this study. The questions could be quantified into multiple-choice questions and a survey could be distributed to hundreds of advisers and editors. This would be the best compliment to the current study.

Conclusion

Student development theory can provide a theoretical groundwork for college newspaper advisers. Specifically, this study found that adviser practices align with Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory: "the seven vectors for student development." Through common adviser practices, advisers are helping students move through the first four vectors. By offering consistent publication critiques, advisers are helping students develop competence (vector one). By helping students handle conflict, advisers are helping students manage emotions (vector two). By not practicing prior review, advisers are helping students move through autonomy toward emotional interdependence (part of vector three). And by challenging student biases', advisers are helping students develop mature interpersonal relationships (vector four).

Furthermore, advisers at Pacemaker-winning newspapers almost unanimously implemented these practices. This study not only suggests that student development

theory be used as a foundation for college newspaper advising, but it also shows that such practices are already in place by advisers at the college newspapers that win the most prestigious award in collegiate journalism.

References

ACPA — College Student Educators International. (2006). *Statement of ethical principles and standards*. Retrieved from www.myacpa.org/au/au_ethical.cfm.

Baxter Magolda, M.B. (2001). *Making their own way: narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus.

(2008). Three elements of self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4): 269-284.

(2009). The activity of meaning making: a holistic perspective on college student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6): 621-639.

Bickham, S. & Shin, J.H. (2008). Organizational influences on student newspapers: a survey of newspapers of ACEJMC programs. *Southwest Education Council for Journalism & Mass Communication*, (28), 1. Retrieved from http://swmcjournal.com/organizational-influences-on-student-newspapers/

Brasler, W. & Rolnicki, T. (2001). *Newspaper Guidebook*. National Scholastic Press Association, Minneapolis, Minn.

Brumback, A. (2011). Mo. University removes award-winning adviser. *SPLC News*. Retrieved from www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2219.

Chickering, A.W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A.W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

College Media Association. (2015). CMA Censured Schools. Retrieved from www.collegemedia.org/adviser_advocacy/censured_schools/

College Media Association. (2013). CMA's Code of Ethical Behavior. Retrieved from www.cma.cloverpad.org/Default.aspx?pageId=1111735.

Commons, M.L. (1992). Institutional atmosphere, individual development, and the higher moral stages. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association*, Boston.

Conlin, J. (2014, April 13). *Local News, Off College Presses. The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2014/04/14/business/media/turning-to-college-journalists-for-the-news-in-town-michigan.html

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2006). CAS statement of shared ethical principles. Retrieved from www.cas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/CASethicsstatement.pdf.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches.* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. Champaign, Ill.: Project Gutenberg.

Duscha, J. & Fischer, T. (1973). *The campus press: freedom and responsibility*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Erickson, Erik (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Filak, V. & Reinardy, S. (2011). Editor Toast: A study of burnout and job satisfaction among college newspaper editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* (66), 3.

Garrison, M.S. (2009). The Cognitive Development of Collegiate Students: A Brief Literature Review. *The Campbellsville Review*. Campbellsville, Kentucky. Volume 4: 87-100.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, C. (1982, 1993). *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goree, K. (2000). Teaching moral development in journalism education. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, (15), 2: 101-114.

Gross, F.L. (1987). *Introducing Erik Erickson: an invitation to his thinking*, Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Hamrick, F.A., Evans, N.J., & Schuh, J.H. (2002). *Foundations of student affairs practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hardin, N. (2011). Adviser quits, entire newspaper replaced at Pa. college. *SPLC News*. Retrieved from www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2183.

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology.* (W.R.B. Gibson, Trans.). New York: Macmillan.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: problem and process in human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.

(1994). *In over our heads: the mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(1999). Kegan's Orders of Consciousness. *New Directions for Student Services*, (88), 65. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

King, P.M., & Kitchener, K.S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohlberg, L.T. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive developmental approach. *Moral development and behavior: theory, research and social issues*. Holt, NY: Rinehart and Winston.

(1984). *Essays on moral development, vol. 2: the psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Komives, S.R., Woodard, D.B., & Associates (1996). *Student services: a handbook for the profession (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jorgensen, G. (2006). Kinsberg and Gilligan: duet or duel? *Journal of moral education*, 35(2): 179-196.

Lazarsfeld, P. (1944). The controversy over detailed interviews. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 8, 38-60.

Lewis, T.F. (2006). Discriminating among levels of college student drinking through an Eriksonian theoretical framework. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, (27): 28-45.

Light, D.W. (1973). An analysis of Erickson's and Piaget's theories of human growth. Final report. *National Center for Educational Research and Development.* Washington, D.C.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindlof, T. & Taylor, B. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods: 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Mencher, M. (1970). *The Student Newspaper: Report of the Special Commission of the Student Press to the President of the University of California*. Washington, D.C. : American Council on Education.

NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (1990). *Standards of professional practice*. Retrieved from www.naspa.org/about/standards.cfm.

Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in college*. New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.

(1973). *To understand is to invent: the future of Education*. New York: Grossman Publishers.

Schraum, B. (2012). East Carolina fires adviser in wake of streaker controversy. *SPLC News*. Retrieved from www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2311.

Schutz, Alfred (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

U.S. Department of Education (2015). *Digest of Education Statsitics, 2013 (NCES 2015-011)*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84

Wimmer, R. & Dominick, J. (2006). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Winston, R., Creamer, D., Miller, T., & Associates (2001). *The professional student affairs administrator*. New York: Routledge.

Witherspoon, M. (2009). *Managing the College Newsroom.* Minneapolis, MN: Associated Collegiate Press.

Wheeler, D. (2015, September 30). The Plot Against Student Newspapers? *The Atlantic*. www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/09/the-plot-against-student-newspapers/408106/

Zelditch, M. (1962). Some methodological problems of field studies. In *Issues of participant observation.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Zweifler, S. (2011). Ill. College journalists, administrators at odds over adviser's removal. *SPLC News*. Retrieved from www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2228

Appendix A: Invitation to Students

Hello MSCNE participant!

I'm Joseph Dennis, a doctoral student at the Grady College. I also work at Grady, and will be assisting Cecil Bentley (MSCNE director) during the week. I obtained your email from the roster of MSCNE participants.

I'm hoping you'll be willing to participate in a research study I am working on for my dissertation: "Managing Editors: Seven Vectors of Highly Successful College Editors." For this study, I am hoping to interview several college newspaper editors and advisers to try to determine what advising practices are most beneficial in supporting student editors and developing successful college newspapers.

I will be conducting interviews outside of MSCNE class time at a coffee shop on campus or in downtown Athens, and will buy you a coffee or other non-alcoholic beverage of your choice ☺ Interviews will last no longer than 60 minutes, and if you need to leave at any time during the interview you are free to do so. The questions I will ask will be about your relationship with your adviser, the production process of your publication and your leadership practices with staff. Your responses will be disseminated with other editor responses to discover patterns of successful practices in successful newspapers. All responses will be kept confidential in the final study – you will not be personally identified with your comments.

If you are willing to participate or if you have any questions about this study, please email me at joedennis@uga.edu or call me 706-296-3832. If you are willing to participate, we can set up an interview time and location convenient for both of us.

Your participation or lack of participation in this study will not impact your participation in MSCNE. I look forward to seeing you at the MSCNE opening dinner on July 26!

This study is being conducted with the approval of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Georgia. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 609 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Thanks for your consideration!

Joseph Dennis

Appendix B: Editor Interview Consent

STUDENT EDITOR INTERVIEW CONSENT

I agree to take part in a research study titled, "Managing Editors: Seven Vectors of Highly Successful College Editors", which is being conducted by Mr. Joseph Dennis from the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia (706-296-3932). I do not have to participate in this study if I do not want to. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. Refusal to participate in the interview will not affect access and/or eligibility for the Management Seminar for College Newspaper Editors. I can ask to have the information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, and/or destroyed.

The reason for this study is to determine what advising practices are most beneficial in supporting student editors and developing successful college newspapers.

- The researcher hopes to find commonalities among participant answers and also identify any outlying methods.
- If I decide to take part, I will be invited to participate in an interview not longer than 60 minutes held at a coffee shop in downtown Athens. The interview will be audio recorded for the purposes of disseminating the information. The audio will not be publicly released and I will not be personally identified in the final project, although certain demographic data related to my institution and newspaper may be attached to what I say (i.e. "An editor at a large public university newspaper in the Midwest said …"). The audio recording will be destroyed one year after the final study is released, no later than July 2016.
- The research is not expected to cause any harm or discomfort. I can quit at any time.
- Those who are selected and voluntarily participate in the interview will receive a coffee beverage of their choice from the researcher.
- The researcher will answer any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: 706-296-3832.
- I understand the study procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to take part in this study. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

_____	_____	_____
Name of Researcher	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Name of Participant	Signature	Date

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Appendix C: Editor Interview Guide

INTERVIEW GUIDE: EDITORS

1. How would you describe your adviser's leadership style?
2. Describe your working relationship with your adviser? How often do you interact?
3. Describe the role of your adviser in the publication of your final product (whether in print or online)?
4. Describe a moment of conflict in your role as editor and if/how your adviser assisted you.
5. Does your adviser help develop a sense of competence in students? How?
6. Does your adviser encourage students to balance their own feelings while producing an objective article? How?
7. Does your adviser encourage students to take an editorial stand on issues of importance to them and the campus community? How?
8. Does your adviser encourage students to cover people on campus that might be considered oppressed or unpopular? Explain.
9. Have you become more confident in your abilities as an editor with the support of your adviser? Explain.
10. Has your adviser encouraged students to continue pursuing issues in spite of obstacles placed in front of them? Explain.
11. Has your adviser ever helped you see the other side of an issue/situation, even though you may not have changed your viewpoint? Explain.
12. Not thinking specifically about your adviser, what do you think is the most important trait of an adviser?

Appendix D: Invitation to Advisers

Hello fellow college media adviser!

I'm Joseph Dennis, a doctoral student at the Grady College at the University of Georgia. I also work at Grady as the director of diversity and high school outreach, and advise the campus magazine UGAzine.

I'm hoping you'll be willing to participate in a research study I am working on for my dissertation: "Managing Editors: Seven Vectors of Highly Successful College Editors." For this study, I am hoping to interview several college newspaper editors and advisers to try to determine what advising practices are most beneficial in supporting student editors and developing successful college newspapers.

I have already interviewed your student editor at the MSCNE conference he/she attended at UGA in July. I'm hoping you'll be willing to be interviewed, via phone, as well. Interviews will last no longer than 60 minutes, and if you need to leave at any time during the interview you are free to do so. The questions I will ask will be about your relationship with your editor, the production process of your publication and your leadership practices with staff. Your responses will be disseminated with other adviser responses to discover patterns of successful practices in successful newspapers. All responses will be kept confidential in the final study – you will not be personally identified with your comments.

If you are willing to participate or if you have any questions about this study, please email me at joedennis@uga.edu or call me 706-296-3832. If you are willing to participate, we can set up an interview time convenient for both of us. **If you wish not to participate, email me and I will no longer attempt to contact you.**

This study is being conducted with the approval of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Georgia. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 609 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Thanks for your consideration!

Joseph Dennis

Appendix E: Adviser Consent

ADVISER INTERVIEW CONSENT

I agree to take part in a research study titled, "Managing Editors: Seven Vectors of Highly Successful College Editors", which is being conducted by Mr. Joseph Dennis from the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia (706-296-3932). I do not have to participate in this study if I do not want to. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I can ask to have the information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, and/or destroyed.

The reason for the study is to determine what advising practices are most beneficial in supporting student editors and developing successful college newspapers.

- The researcher hopes to find commonalities among participant answers and also identify any outlying methods.
- If I decide to take part, I will be invited to participate in a phone interview not longer than 60 minutes at a time convenient to both the researcher and me. The interview will be audio recorded for the purposes of disseminating the information. The audio will not be publicly released and I will not be personally identified in the final project, although certain demographic data related to my institution and newspaper may be attached to what I say (i.e. "An editor at a large public university newspaper in the Midwest said …"). The audio recording will be destroyed one year after the final study is released, no later than July 2016.
- The research is not expected to cause any harm or discomfort. I can quit at any time.
- The researcher will answer any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: 706-296-3832.
- I understand the study procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to take part in this study. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

_____	_____	_____
Name of Researcher	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Name of Participant	Signature	Date

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 609 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Appendix F: Adviser Interview Guide

INTERVIEW GUIDE: ADVISER

1. How would you describe your leadership style?
2. Describe your working relationship with your editor? How often do you interact?
3. Describe the your role in the publication of the final product (whether in print or online)?
4. Describe a moment of conflict your editor encountered and if/how your, as adviser, assisted him/her.
5. Do you help develop a sense of competence in students? How?
6. Do you encourage students to balance their own feelings while producing an objective article? How?
7. Do you encourage students to take an editorial stand on issues of importance to them and the campus community? How?
8. Do you encourage students to cover people on campus that might be considered oppressed or unpopular? Explain.
9. Do you think you have instilled confidence in your editor and his/her abilities? Explain.
10. Have you encouraged students to continue pursuing issues in spite of obstacles placed in front of them? Explain.
11. Have you ever helped your editor see the other side of an issue/situation, even though you may not have changed his/her viewpoint? Explain.
12. What is the most important trait for a college newspaper adviser?