University of Nevada, Reno

The Student Journalist and Student Media Adviser

Perspective of Censorship in Student Media

at Public Universities across the United States

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Art in Journalism

By

Julia M. Moreno

Patrick File/Thesis Advisor

May 2019

N

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

We recommend that the thesis
prepared under our supervision by

JULIA M. MORENO

Entitled

The Student Journalist and Student Media Adviser
Perspective of Censorship in Student Media
at Public Universities across the United States

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Patrick File, Ph.D. , Advisor

Laura Crosswell, Ph.D., Committee Member

Rita Laden, Ph.D., Graduate School Representative

David W. Zeh, Ph.D., Dean, Graduate School

May 2019

Abstract

Julia M. Moreno: The Student Journalist and Student Media Adviser Perspective of

Censorship in Student Media at Public Universities across the United States

(Under the direction of Patrick File and Laura Crosswell)

This thesis examines issues of censorship for student journalists and student

media advisers at public universities. Using a mixed-method approach, this thesis

outlines the opinions of student journalists and student media advisers on

censorship practices. It also examines what type of topics lead to censorship

practices and the impact of censorship on student journalists and student media

advisers. The study indicates that Spiral of Silence Theory can explain how

censorship practices can silence the unique voices of student journalists and student

media advisers. After using survey data and interview responses, the study

concludes that censorship is an ongoing problem and creates a fear of isolation

among student journalists and student media advisers who have faced censorship.

To my parents, who have given me unconditional love and support.

Thank you for always being my best friends.

Acknowledgments

This thesis took a considerable amount of time, effort and energy to complete and I would not be able to finish it without the help of a few important people in my life.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Patrick File, the chair of my thesis committee, for spending countless hours working with me on this thesis. Your expertise and mentorship were a huge help throughout this process. Thank you for metaphors—I hope this nature walk of a thesis is enjoyable.

Secondly, I would like to thank the other two members of my thesis committee, Dr. Laura Crosswell and Dr. Rita Laden. Thank you for your invaluable feedback and help throughout this process.

Additionally, I would like to thank a few individuals who have been there for me throughout this whole process. To my parents, Rich and Pam Moreno, who have been there for me every single step of the way—from kindergarten to my master's you both have shown me the value of working hard for what I want. Getting my master's degree was a dream you both helped me make a reality. Thank you for being the voice of reason and thank you for always taking time out of your day to talk with me on the phone, Dad. I'm beyond lucky to have you both as my parents and my best friends.

To my wonderful and beautiful best friend, Vanessa Cruz, thank you for always being just a text away and for showing me the true meaning of friendship. Thank you for celebrating the small (and big) victories with me and listening to me

when I'm having a bad day. Our friendship is a once in a lifetime—you helped me throughout this process more than you know.

To the person who was in the proverbial trenches with me, Sarah Krutz, who I met in this graduate program. I always wanted to have "grad school friends," and I'm glad you've become a lifelong friend. Thank you for just being you—and also loving bullet journaling as much as I do.

And finally, thank you to Michael Fritz, who was a constant pillar of support, laughs, and love while writing this thesis. Without your patience and ability to always know when I need to take a break, this would not have been possible. Also, thank you to our dog, Tank, who sat on my lap while I spent hours typing and re-typing this thesis.

Table of Contents

List Of Tables

The Student Journalist and Student Media Adviser Perspective of Censorship in Student

Media at Public Universities across the United States

In April of 2018, the student government at the University of Mary Washington, a

public university, cut the funding of the student newspaper, *The Blue and Gray Press*, from

$13,765 to just $100 (Greschler & Kast, 2018). The student government gave multiple

reasons for the funding cut, such as the environmental impact of printing on paper, the

publication's poor distribution, and budgetary concerns. The bulk of *The Blue and Gray

Press'* expenses were paid from the school's annual student activities fees. Previous student

editors, however, said they believed the budget cut was due to news stories covering

campus issues the student government did not want to come to light (Greschler & Kast,

2018). In February of 2018, a student-run publication called *The Sunflower* at Wichita State

University, another public university, faced the threat of budget cuts. The proposed budget

was reduced from $105,000 to $55,000. Student editors said they believed the budget was

cut due to critical news stories and editorials written over the previous years (Perez

Tobias, 2018). In both of these instances, student government leaders proposed drastic

budget cuts to student media following conflicts between the student journalists and

university or student government officials (Greschler & Kast, 2018; Perez Tobias, 2018).

These incidents are two of a much larger number of student media censorship cases

on public colleges and universities that occurred just in 2018. In addition to attempting to

control student media through budgetary means, such as in the two cases mentioned,

censorship took other forms including purposeful theft of student newspapers to keep

them from being distributed and read, attempts by school administrations and student

government officials to influence news coverage, direct and indirect pressure from school officials on student media advisers to influence the ways student journalists cover news, and bullying.

As noted, censorship on college campuses can occur in a variety of ways. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, or FIRE, a non-profit group that focuses on civil liberties in academia, compiled a study of censorship cases on college campuses in 2018. In its report, FIRE specifically noted instances when newspapers were stolen from racks, therefore depriving readers from even having access to news and information. According to FIRE, there were eight instances of newspapers being removed from distribution racks, which is the highest number of reported thefts since 2014 (Burnett, 2019). The first newspaper theft during the year 2018 occurred at Kansas' Butler Community College on January 31. The college's student media, *The Lantern,* lost nearly a third of their 1,400 newspapers from the student media racks. The student representatives for *The Lantern* said they believed it was due to a critical story regarding a former football player who was charged with murder (Burnett, 2019). Just a year earlier, the Student Press Law Center only recorded one instance of newspaper thefts, so the jump in eight thefts in 2018 was significant (Student Press Law Center, 2017).

In addition to budget cuts and newspaper thefts, censorship on college campuses can also manifest in ways that are more institutional in nature. For example, in 2016, the American Association of University Professors, the College Media Association, the National Coalition against Censorship and the Student Press Law Center partnered to create a report about threats to the independence of student media. According to the report, "A March 2016 survey of college and university media advisers affiliated with the College Media

Association revealed that over a three-year period more than twenty media advisers who had not previously shared their stories reported suffering some degree of administrative pressure to control, edit, or censor student journalistic content" ("Threats to the Independence," p. 1, 2016).

This pressure was reported from every segment of higher education and from every institutional type, public and private: four-year and two-year, religious and secular colleges and universities ("Threats to the Independence," 2016). The advisers said they did not make their cases public because of a fear of losing their jobs. "In many cases, college and university officials threatened retaliation against students and advisers not only for coverage critical of the administration but also for otherwise frivolous coverage that the administrators believed placed the institution in an unflattering light" ("Threats to the Independence," 2016, p. 1). The report outlined seven censorship cases that occurred in 2016 at various public and private universities across the United States.

All of these cases illustrate the focus of this thesis, which is a study of the subjects that are likely to trigger or spark efforts to interfere with the creation and distribution of news by student media organizations on those campuses. Student media hold an important role within the university hierarchy and "overall, student newspapers are expected to function as important sources of information for students, faculty, and administrators" (Hapney, 2012, p. 41). Kanigel (2006) argues that college newspapers play an important role in their campus communities for four primary reasons. The first is that newspapers are a way for student journalists to observe and report on campus life such as protests and athletic events. Second, they provide a place for students, faculty members, administrators and staff members to speak out about issues and topics they want to express. Third,

student newspapers, much like professional news media, serve as watchdogs in the public's interest on college administration, faculty, student government, and other types of institutional authorities. And last, they are a training ground for new journalists (Hapney, 2012).

The central theme of this study was to look at why censorship happens to public university student media, despite legal strongholds in place that are designed to prohibit it. To get to the heart of that issue, the study asked the following questions:

- What forms does censorship take?

- What is the impact of censorship on student journalists—how does it affect those who have experienced it?

- From the perspective of student journalists and student media advisers, what student media topics seem to garner more censorship?

Literature Review

In order to understand why censorship matters to student media, it is important to first understand the central arguments regarding First Amendment theory as well as First Amendment protections for student journalists. This information will provide a solid foundation to then move on to other important aspects of censorship and student journalists. After the overview of the First Amendment, the next few sections will address: high school student journalists and censorship, private university student journalists and censorship, the role of advisers and censorship, student fees, and, filling the gaps in prior research on public university student journalists and censorship. Finally, there will be a section on Spiral of Silence Theory, which is when individuals stay silent on topics when

they feel their views are in opposition to a majority viewpoint (Noelle-Neumann, 1974).

Spiral of Silence Theory will be applied to the data to see if it can explain why some student

journalists and advisers feel afraid to speak out against censorship practices.

The primary focus for this study is on the sections of the First Amendment that

concern freedom of speech and the freedom of press, which provide student journalists the

right to cover news events or topics on public university campuses across the United

States. Paired with the Fourteenth Amendment, which prohibits state or federal

governments or agencies—including public universities—from restricting the rights of

American citizens, these two amendments allow citizens to freely express their opinions,

ideas and information. The First Amendment gives citizens the ability to participate in civil

discourse as well as the freedom to express ideas, which promotes democracy and the

marketplace of ideas where everyone can collectively express themselves. This is also

referred to as legitimizing democracy (Balkin, 2016). That is not to say the First

Amendment is easy to define; throughout the years there have been many discussions,

court proceedings, and thought pieces written about what protections are included in the

rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It is important to first understand the

First Amendment and its role in legitimizing democracy in order to understand how

censorship violates the First Amendment rights of student journalists and, ultimately, leads

to a delegitimization of the democratic process by removing an essential tool that promotes

public transparency and accountability.

Balkin discussed three ways to look at First Amendment theory. The first two ways

are somewhat opposite viewpoints of looking at democracy-based theory. The third way

was Balkin taking his criticisms of those first two points to make a democracy-based theory

that included all the important aspects of the first two viewpoints and incorporated his own viewpoint to explain how the First Amendment legitimizes democracy. Balkin's assessment of these theories relates to student media and censorship because student media and public universities are essentially a microcosm of the relationship between the government and the mainstream media.

The first viewpoint is Alexander Meiklejohn's theory, which considered freedom of speech as a means of legitimizing democracy because it allows for individuals only to discuss and educate themselves on politics (Meiklejohn, 1948). This view was largely echoed by the second viewpoint, which comes from Robert Post, who argued that public discourse serves as a way to legitimize democracy (Post, 2000). In Post's interpretation, the Supreme Court "has stated more than once that expression on public issues 'has always rested on the highest rung of the hierarchy of First Amendment values'" (Post, 1990, p. 626). Post (2000) insisted that the processes of communication must stay open to create public opinions. Post (2000) asserted that the public needs to know that the government is responsive to their wishes. "Public discourse is comprised of those processes of communication that must remain open to the participation of citizens if democratic legitimacy is to be maintained. The basic idea is that democratic legitimacy depends upon citizens having the warranted belief that their government is responsive to their wishes" (Post, 2000, p. 7). Post (2000) said democratic legitimacy happens when people believe that they are participating in self-governance and public opinion.

Balkin paired his idea with the two already established ideas from Meiklejohn and Post to say that three arguments about freedom of speech are needed to legitimize democracy. Freedom of speech needs to inform the public, which creates better decision-

making in the long run—this is Meiklejohn's stance (Balkin, 2016). Freedom of speech also

needs to give people the feeling that the government is responsive to public opinion—this

is Post's stance (Balkin, 2016, p. 1070). And finally, freedom of speech needs to show

appropriate concern and respect for people living under state's rules—this is Balkin's

assessment (Balkin, 2016, p. 1070).

Balkin outlined how freedom of speech legitimizes democracy, and student

journalists and censorship fit into his assessment in two ways: first, censorship is the act of

controlling the flow of information to the public through the student media, which

interferes with the sharing of information, i.e. news to the public, which in this case is the

general student body. Second, the role student media occupies on public university

campuses is very similar to that of the mainstream media in relation to federal, state, and

local government entities. Student media spurs political discussion and informs the student

body about issues that affect it, which was important to Meiklejohn. Student media gives

the student body the ability to inform, create public opinion on campus and also keep the

student government and the school administration in check, which was Post's main

concern. And finally, student media gives a platform for any and all students to express

their opinions, ideas, emotions and values regardless if that has anything to do with

political issues on campus. Student media has intended to not only respect but also provide

a platform for people's freedom to feel, think, and discuss what is important to them, which

was Balkin's assessment.

The job of a journalist, student or otherwise, is to seek the truth and to share

information with other citizens to allow them to make informed decisions on events, ideas,

and other topics of conversation. West (2015) argued that the mainstream media is not

only "simply conveying information to the public," but the press also plays a unique role to check on government abuse on top of conveying general information to the public. She argued that student journalists fulfill and further these "vital First Amendment functions" (West, 2015, p. 137). West (2015) also stated that according to the (Supreme) Court, "'the Framers of our Constitution thoughtfully and deliberately sought to protect the right of the press to praise or criticize governmental agents'" (West, 2015, p. 141).

Additionally, West (2015) stated that lack of protections for student journalists is a clear and present problem because student journalists do not have enough protections. "This is because the suppression of student journalists not only potentially violates the First Amendment's Free Speech Clause (as does the censorship of other student speech), but it also infringes on the constitutional guarantee of a free press" (West, 2015, p. 132). West (2015) argued that First Amendment protections should be strengthened instead of weakened to ensure that student journalists are given the protection they deserve. West stated that to allow censorship of any "student journalists thus comes at a high cost—the cost of silencing unique voices from our public debate" (West, 2015, p. 142). Therefore, student journalists should be afforded these protections as well (West, 2015).

For example, West (2015) discussed how landmark cases such as *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier* and *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District* are used to justify censorship in high school student newspapers. Both of those cases are used as a defense for administrators to use prior restraint or prior review to read high school student media publications before they are published (Benedict, 2007; Boggs, 2005; West, 2015; Ramey, 2009). The reason these cases are the standard for administrators to censor

is to ensure that high school students are not exposed to inappropriate information and that students are learning the lessons or activities in class. (Ramey, 2009).

West argued that the Supreme Court ruling for *Hazelwood* made an error by failing to recognize that student journalists hold a special role as part of the press (West, 2015). Boggs (2005) conducted a historical overview of how these court cases have defined allowable administrative censorship. Boggs (2005) found that high school students were not covering issues that could potentially be problematic with either their parents, the administration, or community members, and that gatekeepers such as teachers/advisers or members of the administration are the ones who decide what goes in the paper and what does not. In another study, Ramey focused on *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District* and how it applied to censorship of students' posts in online forums such as social media, email, and blog posts (Ramey, 2009). Ramey (2009) found that school officials had the authority to limit student expression, but added school officials need to have a better understanding of student speech and expression rights.

Benedict (2007), meanwhile, brought up the notion of using these landmark cases to censor student journalists at the public university level. Benedict (2007) concluded that college and university administrators should promote and hold student media to high journalistic standards as well as "guard against efforts by schools to restrict student speech for reasons that have nothing to do with education" (Benedict, 2007, p. 68). Benedict (2007) found that editorial control should also be consistent with high journalistic standards as well as the educational mission of the university and that university administrators should provide "regulation and control consistent with legitimate

pedagogical concerns for the benefit of the students, the school, and the public" (Benedict, 2007, p. 311).

Mark Ryan (1987) argued that student journalists are in a precarious position because of how their student media outlets are funded. Ryan (1987) explained that student media is funded by student fees, which means that every student is essentially funding student media, which requires student journalists to consider that every single student supports the student media and student journalists need to keep that in mind while covering events on campus. Ryan (1987) argues the ethical obligation and precarious situation in which student journalists find themselves requires them to not only report fairly on campus events but to also avoid covering topics that might be perceived as critical or negative (particularly of their funding source organizations) because of the use of student fees to fund student media. Student media operates with a genuine fear of funding being threatened in retaliation for negative stories. On the flip side, Ryan (1987) argued that university administrators and student government officials should encourage debate on campus while also "adopting a hands-off approach toward the newspaper" (Ryan, 1987, p. 521). However, just because Ryan argued that university administrators and student government officials *should* be doing this, this does not mean that university administrators are in fact respecting the First Amendment rights of student media organizations—as seen in the examples of censorship provided in the introduction of this study. Ryan (1987) stated that in addition to how the university administration and student government officials should treat student media, the student media outlet should also truly be an open forum of ideas. The student media can do this by upholding the journalistic ethics of being

honest, balanced, and unbiased as well as listening to the campus via open debates and publishing a variety of student opinions (Ryan, 1987).

In the analysis of the data in this study, student fees come up regularly as something that participants discussed, so it is important to address how student fees can be used as a way to censor student journalists. This is not to say that all student media across the United States are funded by student fees. Student media can also be funded by the university through a variety of ways, including being part of the communications or administration/public relations department, a student media class offered to the students through the university. Additionally, student media can be funded by alumni fundraising or online subscriptions (Save Student Newsrooms, 2018; Student Press Law Center, 2017).

While the focus of this study is censorship at public universities, it is important to briefly mention the First Amendment and private university student journalists, because this study is one of only a few studies that have surveyed student journalists from public or private universities. While this is not directly applicable to this study, it does provide insight on the basic relationship between student journalists, student media advisers and student government officials and administrators. Private universities are under a separate set of legal protections, so censorship is more prevalent and legally sanctioned for student media at private universities (Jenkins, 2018). Jenkins wrote about the "freeness" of student journalists at private universities. Student journalists in private universities have faced censorship from both the administration and their advisers (Jenkins, 2018). The researcher interviewed student journalists at private universities to ask them how they felt about censorship and the lack of First Amendment protections in private universities (Jenkins, 2018). Jenkins (2018) surveyed 49 schools affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges

and Universities in the United States. Jenkins (2018) wrote: "72% of student journalists said faculty advisers to their paper have the power to kill a story before publication online (70% for print), and 34% reported instances in which advisers have done so (30% for print)" (Jenkins, 2018, para. 12). Jenkins wrote that student journalists at public universities would not report nearly as high numbers of censorship practices. The study also reported that 48% of student journalists reported that school administrators/officials have asked them to stop pursuing a story (Jenkins, 2018). Jenkins (2018) also reported, "76% of student journalists who answered the survey said the publication has faced pressure from university personnel to change, edit or remove an article after it is been published in print or online" (Jenkins, 2018, para. 11). Courts have determined that private institutions have the legal authority to control the content published in student media. University officials argue they have the authority to safeguard the values of the university and if a story threatens those values then the administration has the right to censor it (Jenkins, 2018). Jenkins' study is one of the few that directly asks students their viewpoints on censorship via surveys. However, the present study does not address private university student journalists because the courts have ruled private schools may control student media content, so they fall under an entirely separate set of legal restrictions than public universities.

Studies have also explored the role of student media advisers in the management and operation of public university student media, particularly as it relates to the First Amendment. In 2010, Frazier looked at all the ways public university student media are controlled by administration. Frazier stated that student media are controlled by prior restraint, funding reductions, theft, and banning/confiscating/restricting distribution of

the publications (Frazier, 2010). Frazier argued that freedom of the press is often threatened by campus authorities and that advisers are often in a difficult place because they have to defend the First Amendment and protect their students against censorship, but are often employed directly by university administrators (Frazier, 2010). Loving (1993) compared the attitudes of advisers from public universities and private universities in 11 Midwest states. He argued that First Amendment rights of student journalists at public universities are at a lesser disadvantage because it is already a given that those students are protected by the First Amendment and the censorship happening at public universities is not as dire as the censorship happening at private universities (Loving, 1993).

While the studies above focus on censorship and student media, Trego (2018) was the first to focus on finding data to establish a pattern of how often censorship occurs, one of the first studies that has directly focused on this topic. Much like Jenkins' study reporting on private university student journalists, the Trego study focused on getting the numbers behind censorship and its prevalence. Through surveys she sent to 541 public universities, Trego conducted a quantitative analysis of how often censorship happened and which types of censorship occurred. Trego stated, "The topics that editors believe their administrators disapprove of them covering—with administrative decisions, personnel issues, and Title IX and sexual assault topping the list—are disconcerting, especially in a moment in which public awareness of the need for governmental transparency and outcry about sexual assault seem to be at an all-time high" (Trego, 2018, p. 119). Trego also found that most student journalists faced censorship at least once in an academic school year. Additionally, Trego said that while administrators did not think that censorship was a

problem, student journalists thought it was a serious concern (Trego, 2018). Trego stated

that roughly 51% of student media editors reported that administrators requested they not

publish a story or report on an issue that was related to censorship (Trego, 2018).

"Additionally, 22.8% of editor-respondents reported at least some instance of subtle or

overt administrative threats to the funding of their publications. Prior review by

publication advisers was also commonly experienced, with 65.3% of editor-respondents

reporting at least some instance of this" (Trego, 2018, p. 95).

This study aims to pick up where Trego left off, going beyond the numbers and

digging more deeply into the reasons for censorship of public university student media.

Trego established the data that indicated censorship occurred with public university media

in spite of legal protections like the First Amendment, and her thesis was one of the few

that distinctly focused on surveying student journalists on censorship practices at public

universities. This study digs deeper into the stories behind censorship from the individuals

who have faced censorship issues. The study employs a mixed-method approach using both

quantitative and qualitative practices to shed more light on individual perspectives

through in-depth interviews with student journalists and advisers, asking how much or

how little censorship plays a role in their work. The study also incorporates surveys to

understand the general landscape of censorship practices as well as the level of

understanding of the First Amendment student journalists at public universities have. The

questions Trego posed in her survey were different from those in this study. Trego focused

on more in-depth questions on compliance with censorship practices and how much of a

role the administration plays in censorship practices. In addition to that, she focused on

whether or not gender or ethnicity played a role. The survey in this study asked more

general questions to find out how student journalists define censorship. Additionally, this study explores which forms censorship takes, how it has an impact on student journalists, which topics garner more censorship, and why. Pairing the survey data with interview data can answer the questions posed at the beginning of the study: which topics garner more censorship, what forms censorship takes, and the impact of censorship on student journalists and advisers.

In order to better understand why some student journalists and advisers fear speaking out about censorship, this study incorporates Spiral of Silence Theory. The Spiral of Silence Theory is the notion that individuals fear speaking out against what the majority of the public thinks and feels, because of fear of isolation (Noelle-Nuemann, 1974). It was a theory that Noelle-Nuemann developed after a 1965 German election, which saw a conservative party surge past its more liberal counterpart in the months before the election due to what she saw as social pressure for conformity (Arnold, 2010). Foss and Littlejohn (2009) stated that individuals that belong to the majority opinion feel more comfortable stating their viewpoints. The majority opinions are created by mass media, which signals to the public which opinions are shared by the majority (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009, p. 927). Noelle-Nuemann (1974) suggested that individuals possess the ability to intuitively understand social norms and discern which norms and behaviors are in line with the majority viewpoints. Foss and Littlejohn (2009) explain:

> Majority views are made to seem even more dominant than they might really be—
> thanks to their perpetual media coverage and its implicit or explicit endorsement—
> while minority views are made to seem even less popular or more distant from the

mainstream than might actually be the case, due to the media's tendencies to

marginalize or even ignore them entirely. (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009, p. 927)

This is not to say that media inherently creates the societal narrative on topics—the

media rather just amplifies the feelings of the majority opinion. Foss and Littlejohn (2009)

stated that public opinion creates a force that not only dictates attitudes and behaviors but

also enforces societal norms and "keeps people in line" (Foss & Littlejohn, p. 928, 2009).

"The spiral keeps spiraling until minority views ultimately disappear from both media and

individual expression, and the majority views become the only ones deemed acceptable"

(Foss & Littlejohn, 2009, p. 928).

As it relates to student media and censorship, Spiral of Silence Theory depicts an

environment in which the minority (for example: students who have faced censorship) feel

less comfortable speaking out against censorship because the majority (for instance:

administrators and student government officials) squash the minority voice from speaking

out against practices like prior restraint, funding threats, and not allowing university

sources to talk with reporters. "Drawing on psychological research on conformity,

behavior, and social norms, Spiral of Silence Theory is based on the claim that individuals

feel tremendous pressure to conform. We are afraid of being isolated from society and also

of being ostracized or criticized for failing to go along with the majority relative to specific

issues under debate. Being banished from a group—or in extreme cases, being exiled or put

in solitary confinement—is among our deepest fears" (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009, p. 927). The

Spiral of Silence Theory can explain how a culture can be created where student journalists

are afraid to speak about censorship for fear of repercussions such as funding threats or

even damage to their credibility as journalists.

Method

For this mixed-method study, I sent surveys to 200 student media organizations from various newsrooms at public universities across the United States, in order to get general data about the state of censorship according to student journalists from different university sizes and geographic locations. I also interviewed 21 participants from various places across the United States, focusing on in-depth interview questions to understand how censorship has an effect on student journalists and advisers.

I applied the Spiral of Silence Theory as a theoretical lens to understand why some student journalists and advisers might be afraid to speak out against censorship practices. As outlined in the literature review, Spiral of Silence Theory explains why some individuals in society tend to stop expressing what they think and feel if their opinions are in the minority. Over time that minority opinion is lost because the majority opinion overwhelms the conversation (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009). This theory applies to this study because Spiral of Silence Theory can explain two things: why student journalists and advisers fear the repercussions of speaking out about censorship as well as why student journalists and advisers avoid controversy and otherwise self-censor.

Researcher Background

I worked as a reporter for four separate student-run media organizations and I held editor positions at two of those student-run media organizations. I experienced four distinctly different student-run media newsrooms and how they operate as well as the relationship of those newsrooms with student government and the university administration. I faced issues of censorship from an adviser of the student newspaper during my junior year of my undergraduate career and wanted to know if other student

journalists had faced some of the same issues I had. Previously, I've written on this topic and I noticed a lack of student perspective on censorship and the First Amendment. I wanted to fill a gap in the conversation about the First Amendment rights of student journalists by asking student journalists their perspective on the issue, not the perspectives of lawmakers, professors, or First Amendment attorneys. I have the knowledge of how student media works while also understanding how censorship can have an effect on a student's confidence and ability to perform as a journalist.

Participants

I interviewed 21 participants and surveyed 52 student journalists. Lindsie Trego, who wrote a thesis on the prevalence of censorship in 2018, provided me with an excel spreadsheet with a list of 541 student media organizations from public universities across the United States. A random number generator chose 50 schools from the four major geographic areas (West Coast, Midwest, East Coast and South) in the United States. The geographic areas were chosen according to U.S. Census Bureau data. Two hundred (200) student media organizations were chosen each time from that list. IRB approval was given on October 31, 2018. There were two batches of surveys sent out.

The interview participants were found through a few different avenues. One was the *Save the Student Newsrooms* campaign, which had surveyed student newsrooms in April 2018 about censorship issues. The *Save the Student Newsrooms* campaign gave me access to an excel spreadsheet with contact information for those individuals who had talked about censorship issues. I conducted four interviews from that spreadsheet. Four of the participants were found via the College Media Advisers listserv, where an email was sent out to advisers asking if they would be willing to be interviewed. One of the advisers put

me in contact with a student journalist who faced censorship issues. Three interview

participants came from the surveys I conducted in which student journalists said they were

willing to be interviewed after finishing the survey. Five of the participants interviewed in

the fall semester of 2018 were from the same university and worked at the same student

media organization. A sixth participant who was from the same university and student

media organization was interviewed in the spring semester of 2019. Some of the

participants were also found via a snowball sampling where one participant put me in

contact with another participant to interview who she or he thought would have some

experiences that would fit in the purview of the research.

I emailed all the participants initially, asking them if they would be interested in

participating in the study and then an interview time was set up.

Data Collection

I collected data through structured interviews. I used the voice memo application on

an iPhone 7 and the Photo Booth app on a Mac laptop computer to record my interviews

with the participants. Each interview began with a brief overview of what the study was

about and then the participants were told their responses would not be traced back to

them, which is why pseudonyms were used when describing the participants and the

locations of which public university they attend or work. I started by asking the

participants to state their major while in school, why they got involved with student media,

and what drew them to journalism. Then I asked the participant to define both the First

Amendment and censorship. Then I moved on to asking them to give specific examples of

censorship that happened to them. For the adviser interviews, the questions were the same

as the student journalist interviews except it specifically asked advisers what they did in

situations where censorship occurred. I interviewed twenty of the participants over the phone and one of the participants in person. Each interview, one per participant, ranged from 15 minutes to 60 minutes. Participants were sent a transcription of their interview to review for accuracy. To see the full lists of questions used, see the appendices for the interview guides.

The surveys were created on Qualtrics, which is an online survey platform, and sent out via email to student journalists from each selected school. The first batch of surveys was sent on November 14, 2018 with two email reminders sent out December 3, 2018 and again on January 24, 2019. The second batch of surveys was sent out on February 4, 2019 and another email reminder was sent on February 19, 2019 and another one was sent on March 13, 2019.

Data Analysis

I used content analysis to address the research questions posed at the beginning of the study. The 21 interviews were fully transcribed using two different approaches: Temi, a transcription processing software, and traditional transcription methods without the help of software. After the interviews were transcribed, I sent the interviews back to all 21 of the participants to be reviewed. This study included thematic analysis, which is a form of qualitative research analysis. I used N-Vivo 12 to identify keywords that were frequently mentioned in all the interviews. I then created multiple categories from an initial read-through of the interviews and using N-Vivo 12 to categorize the themes. Themes are created by looking at patterns within data, an explanation of themes is in the definition of terms, below. After re-reading the transcribed interviews, the categories were condensed down to three to five categories. Then I found quotes that fit into these three themes,

highlighting and using these quotes to reinforce the themes. Each theme was synthesized by looking back at the research questions posed at the beginning of the study to see if the questions were answered. I analyzed the survey responses using Qualtrics reports and content analysis of the short answer questions in order to understand which responses and Likert scale questions would fit the categories chosen above.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to clarify the meaning of terms used in the study:

- Student Media Adviser: Spelled with "er" versus "or," according to the *Associated Press Stylebook* (Associated Press, 2019). Someone who usually has a background in journalism either professionally or academically. This person provides advice, feedback, and mentoring to student journalists. This includes critiques after the student media has been published, as well as guidance on grammar and sentence structure (Hapney, 2012). Additionally, advisers teach student journalists how to correctly write balanced stories using AP style as well as other aspects of journalism that are needed in the professional world.

- Bullying: In the context of this study, bullying refers to the power imbalance between campus authorities including school administrators, faculty members, and student government officials and student journalists and student media advisers. This form of censorship occurs when negative words or actions are used against a student journalist or student media adviser in

an attempt to influence the way that news is covered or, in some cases, not covered.

- Chilling Effect: A form of self-censorship. After student journalists have experienced other forms of censorship, they tend to restrain themselves in the effort to protect the newspaper from facing more censorship.

- Censorship: *Black's Law Dictionary* defines censor as: "to officially inspect and delete material considered offensive" (Garner, 2004, p. 236). Kanigel (2006) also defined it as demanding prior review or approval by an administrator, adviser, publication board or other governing entity. Additional forms of censorship include: removal/thefts of newspapers, cutting funding based on stories, and/or "disciplining editors or advisers for the content of the newspaper" (Kanigel, 2006, p. 120).

- Norms: These are the reinforced and established behaviors by the majority viewpoint holders that can differ depending on a school's geographic location or its campus culture. Foss and Littlejohn (2009) defined the ability to ascertain what the established norms are as a "sixth sense" and they described this as a way to shape our behaviors to fall in line with the majority (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009, p. 928).

- Prior Restraint: This is the practice of administrators banning, inhibiting, or restraining the publication of student media. *Black's Law Dictionary* defines prior restraint as violating the First Amendment (Garner, 2004). This is also the practice of "a governmental restriction on speech or publication before its actual expression" (Garner, 2004, p. 1232).

- Prior Review: A slightly different practice from prior restraint, when administrators demand to see student media before it is published or distributed (Hiestand, 2002, p. 1,).

- Student Media: Student produced work that could include student newspapers, student magazines, online student newspapers or magazines. Student media are considered a training ground for future journalists and serve as a community watchdog (Kanigel, 2006).

- Student Journalist: Students who hold some sort of position such as an editor or reporter within their student media. Student journalists interview sources, write stories using information from the interview, and submit it to inform the campus community. Student journalists have also usually taken classes on how to report and conduct ethical journalism (Hapney, 2012).

- Thematic Analysis/Themes: One of the most common forms of qualitative research, thematic analysis (Guest, 2012) is the practice of looking for and examining patterns within the data to create "themes" (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes turn into data points that describe a certain phenomenon, which is associated with a research question (Daly & Gliksman, 1997).

Results

The themes in this study are: Censored Topics, Types of Censorship and the Impact of Censorship. These themes were synthesized through comparing all the major aspects in each interview along with survey data and finding a common thread or discussion that occurred with each participant. Additionally, all of the themes were analyzed while looking at how Spiral of Silence Theory can explain two phenomena that are evident in the results

of this study. The first is that student journalists and advisers do not speak out against censorship because of the threat of repercussions, and the second is that student journalists and advisers self-censor to either avoid controversy altogether or avoid future controversy or repercussions. In this study, Spiral of Silence Theory is evident in the three themes related to censorship. The first theme is Censored Topics, which is where Spiral of Silence Theory starts and establishes a set of rules on which topics go against the norms, which were explained in the definition of terms. The second theme is Types of Censorship, which are the tools used to reinforce the norms. The third theme is the Impact of Censorship, which shows how censorship, self-censorship, and the fear of repercussions can lead to a fear of isolation.

Before moving onto the results of this study, it's important to first address the level of First Amendment understanding among both the interview participants and survey respondents. The First Amendment is what protects student journalists and college media advisers from censorial practices, in addition to serving as an essential means of legitimizing democracy (Balkin, 2016; West, 2015). For the purposes of this study, it was crucial to ask if student journalists and advisers understood those protections in order to assess whether a lack of understanding about the First Amendment led to more censorship practices. The surveyed student journalists were asked to rate their First Amendment knowledge and the survey results are shown below:

Table 1
First Amendment knowledge among student journalists

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
1. Not Well At All	2	3.92%
2. Slightly Well	6	11.76%
3. Moderately Well	15	29.41%
4. Very Well	19	35.29%
5. Extremely Well	10	19.61%
Total	52	

As for the interview participants, the student media advisers said they understood the First Amendment well and that they taught the student journalists they work with about the First Amendment. As for the student journalists, it was split between whether or not they felt they understood their First Amendment rights. One student journalist, Emily Ling, a senior and double major in literary journalism and philosophy, said it is not a requirement to take classes explaining the First Amendment, and student journalists often have to seek out guidance on the First Amendment. As a result, she admitted she is not quite as well-versed in the First Amendment as she would like to be. However, another student journalist, Andre Wood, a junior and journalism major, said it is a requirement to take classes on the First Amendment as a journalism major at the public university he attends and working at the student media requires student journalists to have a good understanding of it: "We have to be the first defenders of our own First Amendment rights at a student level." He said he believed he had a good understanding of his First Amendment rights. The findings of this study indicate that student journalists and advisers still might face censorship practices even when they know their First Amendment rights.

The three themes found in this study (Censored Topics, Types of Censorship, and Impact of Censorship) are discussed below.

Censored Topics

This section focused on how Spiral of Silence Theory first manifests in student media at public universities. This is an important distinction to remember in order to understand the main two phenomena mentioned above.

Topics that came up frequently with both the interview data and survey data were issues of race, sexual assault, politics, athletics, women's reproductive rights, and the #MeToo movement. For example, one survey response to the question about which topics can trigger acts of censorship stated: "We very recently (within just the last two weeks) ran a story regarding a student-athlete being charged with a crime. After his parents made an angry phone call to the university, we were ordered by the communication department to remove the story from our website…" Another survey response included details about how stories about sexual assault or legal issues cause acts of censorship for student media. The response said, "on sexual assault, we weren't prevented from publishing, but we are strongly discouraged. On this and other legal issues, the University's general counsel censors reports we receive."

The major topic that dominated this section of the study was the idea that any negative coverage of a school's administration was problematic, which was not a surprising finding because of recent mainstream media coverage of administrative censorship against student media at public universities. Two survey responses from student journalists said they wanted to report on controversial stories about the university president, but their advisers warned the student journalists not to make enemies out of the administration. As

a result, the stories either did not run or did not include any negative aspects. Those are just two examples, but there were 16 other responses that indicated that any stories about the administration were subject to serious deliberations because of a fear of retribution or criticism.

In interviews with five student journalists from the same university and their adviser, Nallely Costard, they all mentioned an incident during which a past student government official tweeted racist statements. Student journalists wrote and published multiple stories about it. Sarah Beattie, a recent graduate, said, "I don't know if there was just kind of this unspoken thing that (student government) does not like (student media) and the (student government) does not talk to the (student media). So, it was really hard to cover them." Sarah said that because of this unspoken, somewhat adversarial relationship between student journalists and student government officials, there was a general feeling among the journalists that the stories they wrote about student government should all be positive and focus on the good things the student government was doing on campus. This is the norm established by the majority opinion holders, the administration, in order to keep the majority opinion holders, the student journalists and advisers, in line. Adviser Nallely said, "of course anything that was going to make (student government) look good was favorable…anything that was in favor of positive things happening in the university." Later on in her interview she said, "Anything that adversely portrayed (student government) in any kind of negative light was always in an uproar.

The adviser, Nallely, by far faced the most pressure to keep silent on censored topics versus the other participants who were all student journalists. This is where Spiral of Silence Theory was most clear in the study. Adviser Nallely said she felt substantial

pressure from school administrators to prompt students to cover more positive topics. To relate this to Spiral of Silence Theory, the adviser was put in the position of starting the spiral in order to prevent any negative coverage. Nallely recalled one example, which was when student journalists wrote a story about diversity within the student government. She said the student journalists frequently approached her for advice on how to accurately cover it before it was published. She said that when her boss, who also oversaw the student government, learned of the story she was called into a meeting.

> I had a meeting with (my boss) where she was like, 'you need to shut this down. It's not going to happen. They don't need to publish a story like this.' Basically essentially what I was told was that it was going to reflect poorly on (student government) and that I needed to ensure that we were doing everything we could to only publish good things about (student government) because (student government) does good work and that, you know, everything that came out of the (student media) needed to be, you know, in support of what (student government) was doing.

Since Nallely held a position that had direct contact with the student journalists, she said she felt pressured to push the student journalists to put a positive spin on any and all stories that focused on student government. "It was kind of always like 'well remind them about (student government), without (student government) money, they wouldn't be able to operate,'" Nallely said. Nallely said in the meetings with other student government administrators in the university, she would hear countless times how the student government should pull the funding, which is in the form of support via advertising,

because of the critical stories written about the student government. Nallely eventually left her job as an adviser because of the pressure from the administration.

The example above shows how Spiral of Silence Theory insinuates itself at a student media organization. The administration attempts to push the advisers, who are in direct contact with student journalists, to stop negative stories from the very beginning of the news-gathering process. This is evident in another example from Andre Wood, a student journalist, who discussed the pressure his student media adviser faced after a negative opinion article appeared in the student media. After the opinion piece was published, there were emails from the director of the school of mass communication asking the adviser when the opinions editor would be fired for allowing the negative opinion story to run. The opinions editor was eventually fired, but under the guise that she would not be able to work at the student media while studying abroad and not because she had published the negative opinion piece. Andre found the emails between the administrator and his adviser after he became editor-in-chief.

However, this does not mean that student journalists always stop covering the topics that garner more censorship. Andre said he continually pushes the student journalists who work with him to cover controversial story topics. He said regardless of how problematic a story idea might be, his rule is that if the story is thoughtful, constructive, relevant, truthful, and well-written the student media will print it. "At no point have I said we're not running [a story], because it's too controversial. I couldn't...that's not something I would do and feel like I did my job to the fullest," he said. And that same sentiment was seen in other interviews. Amy Wyatt, student journalist and senior journalism major, said she pushes the student journalists she works with to cover

anything and everything. She works three jobs to afford going to school and does not have as much time to cover breaking news stories. She said at first student journalists are hesitant to cover breaking news, but once they begin to realize they are the first to cover something they get excited to cover more controversial stories.

For some at public universities, there is no pressure to cover story topics a certain way and there are not any topics that cause problems for student journalists. Two advisers from the same public university were interviewed, Corinne Fleming and John Allen, who both agreed their institution had no issues with censorship. But there is always a caveat—Corinne said she's noticed she has to educate administrators on First Amendment protections for student journalists. Corinne recalled that a new dean who came from a private university complained to her about why the student media was covering negative stories and why Corinne, who is the chair of the journalism department, was not coming down harder on the adviser and student journalists. She first let the student journalists talk with the dean to explain how the student media is not an extension of the public relations department. Eventually she and John had to speak with the dean to clear up how student media works for public universities. Corinne said: "She told us how it was on her previous campus, which was not true news. It was again, PR releases basically. There's never any negative news apparently at her previous campus. So, that's not the case here."

The survey results show that while student journalists are concerned about being censored, the fear of censorship is not pervasive. The results are shown below:

Table 2

On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your level of concern about censorship happening? (1 being 'none at all,' and 5 being 'a great deal.')

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
1. None at all	10	19.23%
2. A little	20	38.46%
3. A moderate amount	12	23.08%
4. A lot	4	7.69%
5. A great deal	6	11.54%
Total	52	

These results show that when the two categories "a little" and "a moderate amount" are added together roughly 62% of respondents say their level of concern of censorship occurring is present, but censorship is not something truly affecting the student journalists in day-to-day operations. In other words, student journalists acknowledge censorship acts as something that could occur, but not a problem they have to contemplate constantly while working for their student media. Unlike the respondents who answered "a lot" or "a great deal," which when totaled together comes out to about 19%, they have a concern that censorship is going to occur more often than not. Another survey question asked the participants how often they think about censorship occurring in their jobs at student media. About 55% of responses reported that they think about censorship happening "sometimes" and about 17% of responses reported they think about censorship happening "never."

Types of Censorship

One of the central questions to this study was finding out which forms censorship takes. In this section the types of censorship are the tools used to reinforce the Spiral of Silence Theory.

It was important to first evaluate how the participants defined censorship and censorship practices because when analyzing the results, one of the biggest findings was how much the forms and definitions of censorship differed. Each participant was asked to define censorship and also share any censorship experiences they have faced. This study found that even though censorship has a definition, it's not just a neat dictionary definition. Censorship takes many forms and meanings.

For example, Nallely, an adviser, defined censorship as, "...Threatening full funding resources, you know, (or) space allocations whatever it might be in the hope that you'll scare someone into not publishing something is censorship. As well as outright blatant 'like you cannot publish this, we won't allow you to publish this.'" Daniel Hill, student journalist and recent graduate, defined it as "the removal of content for the purposes of either negating someone's point of view or trying to protect someone's interest." Some of the participants, including student journalists Emily Ling, Hannah Torres, and Mark Gray used the words stopping or prohibiting in their definitions. For instance, Mark, who is a senior and journalism and media production major, defined censorship as: "...attempting to stop someone from printing information or publishing information that could potentially damage something or someone's reputation...I understand that some people don't like that information to get out..." And other student journalists Sarah Beattie, Andrew Stewart, Samuel Perez, and advisor John Allen defined censorship as someone exerting a power (legal, financial or otherwise) over another person to dictate what can or cannot be written.

Student journalist and recent graduate, Samuel, a recent graduate, defined censorship as "the government or anybody (with) power that has control over what you may or may not be trying to say exercising that control."

As for the survey data, out of the 52 respondents, 75% of respondents said they do not face censorship issues, but 25% of the respondents said they have faced censorship issues. This was not a surprising finding because Trego's (2018) study found the censorship of student journalists occurs only once an academic school year on average. This study's survey also asked student journalists to define censorship. The 52 survey responses reflected the same sentiment as the interviews—many described censorship as the prohibition or stopping of expression of speech, some included the power relationship between an outside force and student journalists, while others described it as prior review/restraint or the suppression of information.

One aspect of Spiral of Silence Theory focuses on how public opinion is formed. It develops through the suppression of the minority voice and the promotion of the majority voice. For the purposes of this study, each public university is being treated as the majority opinion and the different forms of censorship are ways that the minority voices, student journalists and advisers, are essentially muzzled. This is also how norms and behaviors are created and reinforced. In the definitions of censorship, it was clear that each respondent looked at censorship as a way to suppress the student journalist voice from the campus conversation. Spiral of Silence Theory also explains why these forms of censorship happen—stories about controversial topics garner practices of censorship because these stories represent two problems: negative coverage of something on which the university administration or student government does not want any attention, creating a "spiral." The

other facet that creates a "spiral" is that the story is written by the minority opinion-

holders, which, in this case, refers to the student journalists. Student journalists have two

roles in terms of being minority opinion-holders. Student journalists are both the reflectors

of *other* minority opinions of other students on campus by writing about those

perspectives, in addition to also serving in the role of minority opinion holders when it

comes to censorship practices from the majority opinion holders. This is especially true

when the majority opinion-holders do not want to see critical news coverage, controversial

subjects, or certain negative views come to light. Censorship is a tool that contributes to

creating a silence "spiral" within each public university community where censorship

practices are evident. For example, one survey response said, "we were told that a story of

ours was biased and one sided, because it only directly quoted two sections of commentary

from a survey, but in the story, we highlighted what the entire survey results were." The

respondent further indicated that quoting every section of the survey wasn't necessary to

tell the story, but because the highlighted results of the survey painted the university

president in a negative light he complained to the student media board and required the

student journalists to put all of the survey results into the online story (potentially burying

the most pertinent parts of the survey in a mass of data). The president created a "spiral"

by complaining about the story and calling it biased. Additionally, he used censorship tools

by requiring the student media to present the survey information in a form more favorable

to him by changing the overall news focus of the story. In the respondent's view, "We are

completely defeating the entire purpose of what we are trying to teach these journalism

students by telling them it is OK to be censored when it is someone of power doing so."

The participants touched on several censorship practices such as: administration and student government threats to student journalists and advisers, sources not talking to student journalists, and bullying. This section will also briefly discuss threats to the funding of student media and includes some of the stories from participants who have faced such censorship.

One participant, Dominick Grabowski, an advisor, said that censorship at public university student media organizations generally comes from two places—the administration and student government. Other participants discussed problems with university administration and student government as well.

In one instance, student journalist Andre said a column about the social construct of "whiteness" that appeared in the opinion section of the student media outlet caused problems for the organization. Previously, anonymous flyers were dispersed on campus with Nazi symbols. He said that the university president took weeks to respond to the flyers and when she did finally respond, she did not call them racist, she just said the flyers did not align with the school's values. However, after the column ran it created a massive controversy for the student media and many of the students on the campus were outraged. Following the publication of the column, the president of the public university condemned the student media organization and called the column racist. Andre recalled:

> However, when the (student media) printed this column it was literally in a matter of hours that she had a letter from her desk specifically calling the column racist, which that's a very specific kind of classification for the content—to say that this piece of content is indeed racist and that the university does not stand by it, which is very different from the language she uses with the flyers.

Andre said this opened up the floodgates for not only racist individuals to feel more emboldened on campus, but it also "opened the door for our student government president to call for a de-funding of the (news)paper." The norm in this instance was established by the university president through not addressing racist flyers and reinforced by calling the student media organization racist and allowing the student government president to call for a defunding of student media.

In another instance, an adviser lost his job over a story that was published by the student media at a public university. Adviser Garrick Russell said a week after the story was published, he was called into a meeting to discuss the article. A week after that meeting, his performance evaluation was put on hold and then a week after that, he was told the administration was eliminating his position and rewriting the job description. Garrick said:

> So it was just boom, boom, boom. One right after another in a month period of time. I went to the department head and he said this was as big as surprise to him as it was to me. That he never asked for this, didn't know anything about it. So it was his first time in academia that someone has made a decision like this without even asking for his input. So, this provost that we've made mad, he just made this decision all on his own, you know, I mean this is the sort of thing that you talk about and plan ahead for if you're going to do it. And he did it immediately after the story. There's no doubt in (my) mind, it was just a retaliation for that.

Garrick also said he encountered problems with the administrations when he first started working as an adviser. The student media published a story about a local business owner who required young women to disclose their height and weight on job applications. The

student journalist who reported on the story was told by the business owner "you don't know who you're messing with," and the student journalist put that quote on the front page of the newspaper. This story upset the administration because the business owner gave monetary gifts of up to $8,000 to the football team. Garrick recalled:

> So, you know, all hell broke loose after that. I got called into the Dean's office about that. No, I wasn't, I wasn't doing a good job. I wasn't helping them not look bad, but she never could tell me what was inaccurate about story. And the guy actually changed his job application to take those questions off.

Garrick said in this instance the department chair backed him up, but that he was still uneasy around the administration. This instance shows that the administration, the majority opinion-holder, was outlining what the acceptable norm is when Garrick first started working as student media adviser. Eventually when Garrick and the student journalists he advises did not abide by the norm, the administration fired him as retaliation for not falling in line.

Participants also discussed problems with student government. For instance, two student journalists who work at the same student media organization, Emily and Hannah, said they dealt with funding threats from student government officials following several stories that put the student government in a bad light. In one instance, members of the student government stole all of the newspapers, so that the student body was not able to read them. And in another instance, student government officials denied the student media organization's application for student fee funding to cover printing costs and a small stipend for student journalists at its annual budget session. During the senate hearing, student government officials said the environmental costs of the newspaper was the reason

for denial of funds, but the student government also brought up negative coverage of a concert event the student government sponsored. Emily said, "I remember explicitly when we were up there and they were grilling us about that article, the president of the senate was like, 'why should we fund you if you're going to publish fake news?'" Since the senate would not approve the funding, all of the student journalists working with Hannah and Emily currently do not get paid and the student media is now completely online. Again, the norm in this instance is the student government not wanting negative coverage and using censorship practices like stealing newspapers and taking away funding to stop the student journalists from publishing negative stories.

Another form of censorship mentioned frequently in the interviews was sources not talking to student journalists. This is one of the forms of censorship that is somewhat murky, however. As one student journalist, Sarah, said, "It's just hard when people don't want to talk to you always and sometimes your story needs a university aspect to it." Sarah said at first, she wouldn't define this as censorship, but throughout the interview she talked about how difficult it was to cover stories on the student government because sources wouldn't talk, which meant they couldn't cover stories to the fullest extent. Sources, specifically the administration or student government, not talking to student journalists does not allow them to write a balanced story, it minimizes student journalists, and it is a way to dictate if or when a story will be published.

Another student journalist, Charlotte Robbins, who is a senior communications major, mentioned this same problem in her interview and also said she had a hard time defining it as a censorship. "People take a long time to get back to us or basically (they) dictate when the story will be published because they won't speak with us until this certain

time…so it's not too big of a deal, but it feels like they're just kind of taking advantage of us a little bit or just kind of dismissing us as like not as serious at other news publications because we're students," Charlotte said. This is another area where Spiral of Silence Theory is evident—specifically when administrators do not respond to student journalists writing stories. This creates a circumstance or force that can potentially control the narrative of public opinion. Foss and Littlejohn (2009) discussed how public opinion is a force used to bolster behaviors, norms, and keep people in line. This form of censorship is a tool to create or shape public opinion in such a way that it places student journalists at a disadvantage. This is because when administrators or student government officials do not respond, it dictates when a story can be published, how it can be covered, and the flow of information to the campus or public. Student journalist Sarah recalled encountering this same problem in her interview:

> I think (student government) stuff was hard to dive into because they were all very supportive and protective over each other. In retrospect there were stories we should have covered about (student government) but I just think we were deterred from covering them because we thought or knew that no one would talk to us and that's why we didn't even try. But yeah, there was definitely like some fishy (student government) stuff that I heard about later that I wish that we had covered and I wish that we had talked about.

Another student journalist, Chloe Wright, senior psychology major, said she had problems with administrators not wanting to talk to her or other fellow student journalists. She recalled being kicked out of open meetings and not getting responses to countless emails and calls. "We weren't ever getting any responses or we were going to our sources

of the administration and they were basically telling us, 'Well, no, don't, don't write about that. Write about this.' And they were refusing to answer questions unless it was about the topic that they had just told us to write instead," Chloe said. Eventually, Chloe, who is currently the editor-in-chief, wrote an editorial outlining the problems they've been having with administrators not talking to them. She had to go to a meeting with the school's attorney, the public relations team and the marketing and communications dean along with her advisor. They told her they wanted the editorial taken down and she refused.

Another form of censorship discussed by the participants was bullying. The term bullying for this study was defined as the power imbalance between administrators and student government officials and student journalists and student media advisers. Additionally, the definition of bullying included any negative words or actions used against student journalists or advisers in an attempt to influence the ways news is covered or not covered. It is important, however, to recognize there is a difference between constructive criticism and bullying—the imbalance of power and abusing that power in order to influence news coverage determines when simple constructive criticism can become something more intimidating, i.e., bullying. Hannah, who is a senior and literary journalism and philosophy double major, mentioned that bullying was a problem as a student journalist. She said frequently whenever a person has a problem with a story, the person takes his or her complaint straight to the administration rather than to the student journalists. Rather than refer the complaints directly to the student media, the administrators often intervene by wanting to schedule a meeting with the media adviser or the student journalists. Once again, this is a form of bullying that creates a silence spiral where student journalists are intimidated by the administration about mistakes in stories

or negative coverage and there is an imbalance of power between the administration and the student journalists. Hannah discussed how it feels when someone tries to bully her about a mistake in a story: "...it's extremely degrading. It's extremely frustrating. We're journalists that are in training...making these kinds of mistakes, we're students. And this is where we learn and this is how we learn and we do our best to correct any mistakes that were made." Andre talked about the same issues in his interview. He said he has noticed that administrators use their power to bully his faculty adviser, which is difficult because that is the person the student journalists go to for advice on stories and journalism in general. Garrick also mentioned bullying in his definition of censorship: "To me censorship is more than just refusing to let you write or print something it goes and into the intimidation and bullying and that sort of thing also."

Impact of Censorship

In the above sections, it was established that censored topics serve as the impetus for Spiral of Silence Theory and that the types of censorship continue the Spiral of Silence Theory by reinforcing the established norms and behaviors to keep student journalists and advisers in line. This section will discuss the fear of isolation and answers the two questions that were posed at the beginning of the study, specifically the dual phenomena of why student journalists and advisers do not speak out against censorship because of the threat of repercussions and why student journalists and advisers self-censor to avoid controversy altogether or prevent future controversy.

Foss and Littlejohn (2009) said that the fear of isolation creates a tremendous amount of pressure to conform, and that individuals will go to great lengths to not feel isolated from society. In order to see if this was evident, each of the participants in the

surveys and the interviews were asked how censorship makes them feel. In the survey, one respondent stated, "it made me feel trapped and like the truth was less important than not ruffling feathers. It was really disheartening." Another said it felt like they could not trust the administration and questioned what else the administration was trying to hide. One answer stated:

> Censorship is incredibly frustrating. I feel like I cannot do my job, and I cannot do my duty to the public to be informative, if I don't have all the information or if I'm not allowed to share the information. I also feel anxious, since it's like there's just a few, little student journalists facing down the behemoth that is University administration when it comes to challenging policies or behavior that restrict the flow of information.

This was also how the student journalists and advisers responded in their interviews about how censorship made them feel. For example, Sarah said when she was facing pushback from covering the student government official who tweeted racist comments:

> It kinda made me feel like I was doing something wrong when I knew I wasn't, but I was worried it was just too harsh...I think what happens with censorship all the time is we as reporters worry that it's us, that we're doing something wrong—that maybe we didn't fact check for the 500th time—but we know we did. It just makes us second guess (ourselves).

The fact that Sarah was second-guessing her abilities as a student journalist is a clear example of Spiral of Silence Theory. Foss and Littlejohn (2009) mentioned that individuals

are afraid of going against the grain and it is apparent that Sarah was putting the blame on herself and thus continuing the silence spiral.

Another student journalist, Lauren McCarthy, is no longer pursuing journalism after facing backlash for a story she worked on. She and her advisor, Alton Foster, both discussed the same incident in their interviews. Alton said that the student journalists did a story on a sexual assault on campus based on police reports, and after the story had published, the administration called Alton telling him not to deliver any of the newspapers, to take the story off the website and the administration wanted to review stories before they were printed. Alton and Lauren were called to the office of the president of the college and Alton had to explain his role as an advisor and the First Amendment protections for student journalists. The president was worried about the university getting sued, but when Alton explained the situation, the administration backed off. However, Lauren said she felt naked and that the administration was trying to hide something. She said that during the situation it was made clear to her by faculty that she had done something wrong. "I would say it's one of the reasons why I'm no longer a journalism major. I was just burned in that field…I didn't realize how much people could hate you for what you thought was doing the right thing and it was really hard," she said. It is clear that Spiral of Silence Theory was evident again in this example with Lauren specifically. She left the field of journalism because she had faced backlash from a story she wrote, her experience contributed to the Spiral of Silence Theory by not speaking out against it and she was also afraid of the repercussions of talking about censorship, so she conformed to the norm. The norm in this situation was that the administration did not want coverage of a sexual assault in the student media and

when Lauren went against this norm, she faced backlash that led to her eventually leaving the journalism field.

Participants discussed some of the lasting effects of censorship like the chilling effect and self-censorship. These forms of censorship, particularly self-censorship, are examples of how the Spiral of Silence Theory can explain why student journalists and advisers avoid controversy to prevent censorship. Student journalists and advisers work to protect their staffs from both of these things. Andre discussed the chilling effect as something he actively tries to combat as editor-in-chief because he saw how much of an impact censorship had on his colleagues. He said that he still prints columns about topics such as sexual freedom of women and taking away the stigma of strippers, but he receives "nasty, nasty responses." He said he does not share the negative feedback with his fellow student journalists because he wants to prevent a chilling effect. "So there's a lot of things that I'll just keep in my email for my records, but I don't even bother sharing just how nasty they actually are," Andre said. Hannah shared the same sentiment. She said her writers are fearless on covering whatever topics they wish on campus, but she and her managing editor, Emily, protect them from the unconstructive feedback. She said, "...I don't tell the writers just because I don't want that effect. I don't want anyone to ever be scared or ever be intimidated or feel bullied by stuff like that."

Another advisor, Perry Collins, who worked at a public university for over 15 years and helped the student media win multiple national awards, was removed from his position. Perry was fired after backlash about the student media not covering a club-related event on diversity. He said after he was fired and not allowed contact with the student journalists, they were angry, frustrated and there was a chilling effect on their work as they

began to refrain from pursuing sensitive or controversial news stories in an effort to not

create more problems for the student media organization. This type of chilling effect is

another aspect of Spiral of Silence Theory and it creates a fear of isolation, of not being able

to conform to what the majority wants (and in this case, what school authorities want).

Student journalists and advisers often try to actively combat the chilling effect because they

understand that other student journalists might self-censor in an attempt to stop

administrative or student government retaliation for negative coverage.

As for self-censorship, there were two questions that addressed self-censorship. One

survey asked student journalists if they self-censored with a "yes" or "no" question. The

results showed that about 43% of respondents self-censor and about 57% of respondents

do not self-censor. If a student journalist answered "yes" to the question on if they self-

censored or not, they were then asked to rate how often they self-censor on Likert scale.

About 57% of the respondents said they self-censor "sometimes," about 19% of

respondents said they self-censor "about half of the time" and 14% of respondents said

they "never" self-censor. Only one person reported they self-censor always and only one

person said they self-censor "most of the time." This was not reflected in the interview

findings. Most student journalists and advisers said they know self-censorship is very

present for their staffs. Adviser Dominick said he thinks self-censorship happens because

student journalists fear that the administration is going to punish them for writing negative

stories. He also said in the case where student journalists have already written a negative

story, they do not want to create even more censorship so they self-censor. One student

journalist, Chloe, said she frequently goes to her advisor on stories that are controversial.

"I'll explain all of my arguments and then I'll show her what I've already written...She'll look

at what I've written and she's like, 'well you don't have this or this or this.' And I'm like, 'well I don't want to step on anyone's toes. I don't want the president of the university walking through the doors asking for me,'" she said. Another student journalist, Amy, said even though she hasn't faced censorship she still struggles with self-censorship. She was told by one of her writers that a piece she wrote was too opinionated so now she's hyper-aware of not coming across as biased. She said she does not write political pieces anymore. Charlotte, who has also never faced censorship, mentioned self-censoring is not the only reason she does not publish something, but it is definitely an aspect she takes into consideration when she's covering a controversial story.

Self-censorship is an example of how far student journalists are willing to go to avoid retaliation for writing negative stories. The mere fact that most of the interview participants talked about self-censorship as being a prevalent issue for their student journalist staffs shows that the fear of isolation is strong among student journalists who have faced backlash from censorship.

Discussion

This study was important because it focused not only on censorship as a whole as it applies to student journalists and advisers, but it also incorporated a theoretical framework, Spiral of Silence Theory, to explain its three major themes. This study found that controversial topics such as sexual assault, negative stories about school administration or student government, race, and gender, frequently serve as the catalysts for instances of censorship practices to occur. This study also found that censorship takes many forms, including sources not talking to student journalists, administration and student government threatening to take away funding, bullying, and external and self-

imposed pressures to write a certain way. Perhaps one of the most surprising findings of this study was that funding threats are a more prevalent issue for student journalists and advisers at public university student media than initially thought, which is a disservice to not only the pillars of what journalism is about, i.e. the role of the press in advancing public discourse and holding public officials accountable, but also the education of student journalists and the jobs of advisers. This study also found that student journalists and advisers who have faced censorship felt isolated, not supported by the university, and tend to self-censor. However, even though the participants in this study faced censorship, they continued to protect other student journalists from backlash, bullying, and other negative feedback in efforts to stop the perceived isolation from trickling down to other student journalists.

According to West (2015), "The [U.S. Supreme} Court has stated that protection of the press is 'not for the benefit of the press so much as for the benefit of all of us.' This is no less true for student journalists, and the special value they add to our democracy" (West, p. 151). Additionally, West (2015) said that when student journalists' protections are weakened it silences unique voices. The data presented in this study largely supports her argument. Most of the student journalists in this study have faced censorship in some form—they did not feel like the administration supported them and they often felt like they were helpless in situations, and as a result they changed the way they might write about a topic or cover a story, which therefore silences or at least muffles their unique voices.

In both the surveys and the interviews, the student journalists and student media advisers were asked what their level of understanding was of the First Amendment—and they all said they understand their First Amendment protections relatively well. West

(2015) discussed that the importance of the press and freedom of speech is necessary and when these protections are weakened it leads to a lack of informing the public on important information, removes the scrutiny of government officials, and again it stifles student journalist voices.

Another parallel between the literature and the results in this study was Frazier's (2010) assessment of the problems that advisers face. Frazier concluded that advisers feel pressure to protect the rights of student journalists, and it was clear that this was also very much a concern for the advisers in this study. For instance, Nallely faced this type of pressure and said she eventually left her job because of administrators pushing her in the direction of violating the First Amendment rights of the student journalists she worked with. Two other advisers, Garrick and Perry, also faced this issue. Both were fired because they would not tell their students to stop covering negative stories. It was clear that Frazier's (2010) findings matched what was found in this study. The advisers were on a tightrope of sorts trying to balance protecting their student journalists' First Amendment rights while also trying to protect their jobs.

Lastly, Boggs (2005) found in her study that student journalists self-censor and tend to cover stories that will not lead to censorial practices. The theory of Spiral of Silence Theory was applicable in explaining why student journalists and advisers tend to self-censor to avoid controversy. It was clearly evident in this study that self-censorship was a prevalent problem for the student journalists. Student journalists discussed that they did not pursue stories as much as they could have because they knew it would cause problems for either the student media itself, the student journalist, or the adviser. Spiral of Silence Theory explained namely, the fear of future controversy and the fear of isolation caused

student journalists to self-censor. For example, student journalist Chloe was hesitant to speak out against censorship even when she was invited to be a keynote panelist at a journalism convention. She said she was worried if she spoke on the topic the university would think she was capitalizing on the incident and potentially casting the university in a negative light. And Nallely expressed fear that if she spoke out her job would be in jeopardy. She also said she wanted to protect the student journalists from being pressured by the school administration. This fear of speaking out, the Spiral of Silence Theory, eventually forced Nallely to leave her job.

The survey data, however, also showed that self-censorship was not nearly as prevalent as previous research suggested. This could be because not all of the student journalists who were surveyed had directly experienced censorship. While Boggs' study (2005) focused on high school media advisers, who indicated they feared speaking out against censorship at their schools, his findings were remarkably similar to the accounts of college media advisers queried in this study. One of the primary differences between the two groups was that the college advisers in this study said they would not pull a story from being published, while the ones that Boggs interviewed indicated they would do so. However, this difference is most likely because there are legal strongholds in place that ensure a greater amount of freedom to public university student journalists.

This study focused on three major themes—Censored Topics, Types of Censorship, and the Impact of Censorship. These were expressed in the interviews with 13 student journalists, 8 advisers, and a survey of 52 student journalists. The participants discussed problems they faced that were either ignored or swept under the rug, especially when it came to their opinions of how censorship makes them feel.

One of the challenges in this study was actually defining censorship because the participants all had such a broad range of experiences with censorship. Defining it can be equated to the quote from United States Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart when he described his threshold test for obscenity and pornography, "I know it when I see it" (Lattman, 2007; Stewart, 1964). And much like defining pornography, defining censorship is a "I know it when I see it" type of assessment for student journalists and student media advisers. It was important to try to understand the definitions of censorship from each participant because they gave a basis to understand the different ways censorship can be defined and in turn, the various forms censorship can take. For instance, some participants discussed the threats to funding, whereas others talked about the power imbalance between those who censor and those who have been censored.

Another interesting finding was that some of the participants were hesitant to say they had faced censorship. This was because many of the student journalists understood that accusing an administrator or student government official of censorship is a serious matter. Another finding that dovetailed with this was the reoccurring revelation that many student journalists had faced more censorship than they thought they had. Student journalist Sarah was by far the best example of this; she realized throughout the conversation that she had faced more censorship practices than she initially thought. It was an interesting progression that occurred over the course of the interview.

Another aspect of the study was to see if Spiral of Silence Theory can explain why student journalists fear the repercussions of speaking out about censorship. The interview responses were somewhat split between whether or not participants were afraid to speak out or not. All of the interview participants were asked if they fear repercussions for

speaking out against censorship to measure if this was a problem. Some of the interview participants said they were not really afraid of repercussions, including Charlotte and Amy, who said they have not faced censorship problems. Andre said he wants to bring attention to censorship because he does not want it to happen again to the student journalists who will replace him once he graduates. Adviser Garrick said he felt the same as Andre. He said initially he talked openly to everyone about the censorship he witnessed because he wanted people to know what was happening behind the scenes to him and the student journalists he worked with. However, Garrick also admitted he was surprised when he learned he would face repercussions for speaking out against it—and he did not think he would lose his job.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study was finding student journalists and advisers who have faced censorship issues and were willing to talk about them. The result was that the interviewed participant did not have the experiential knowledge that would help provide an inside look at how censorship had an effect on students. The student journalists who have not faced censorship can objectively speak about how censorship is 'bad,' but do not have a subjective viewpoint of how censorship affects them or how it made them feel. Additionally, there are 541 public university student media organizations, and the surveys in this study were sent to 200 student media organizations with only 52 responses, so a higher response rate might be necessary to achieve less sampling error.

Another limitation of this study is the theoretical interpretation of the results and the blind spots from the researcher. The Spiral of Silence Theory theoretical framework was used to see if it could explain the relationship between censorship and student

journalists and student media advisers. This might not be the best theoretical framework to understand this relationship and does not necessarily explain all of the aspects of how censorship can impact student journalists and student media advisers. Additionally, the researcher has faced censorship practices in the past, so there might be blind spots or bias in the discussion of the results.

<div align="center">

Future Research

</div>

For future research, it would be important to interview individuals who have participated in or threatened censorial practices. Based on the results of this study, the most appropriate subjects would be college administrators and/or student government officials. This could give an interesting insight into why individuals feel censorship is the best way to stop student journalists or advisers from negative coverage. Future researchers might also include additional questions asking student journalists to discuss what types of censorship practices they have noticed, their experiences with self-censorship and if they are afraid of isolation if they talk about censorship. These topics were not part of the survey prepared for this study. Additional ideas for future research should include a focus on the funding aspects of student media organizations because funding is something that clearly can be used as a way to control student media organizations.

Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to not only understand which topics garner more censorship, what forms censorship takes and also the emotional impact of censorship but to also understand if a theoretical framework, Spiral of Silence Theory, could explain why and how student journalists and advisers feel after they have faced censorship practices.

The topics that garner more censorship are: sexual assault, administration or student government decisions, diversity issues, politics, and athletics. The forms of censorship are: funding threats, bullying, backlash, lack of adviser job security, and withholding information. And finally, the impact of censorship can be damaging. It can force advisers to leave their jobs and shake their confidence in the belief of First Amendment protections, and for student journalists, censorship makes them question their abilities, credibility, and, in some cases, to decide to no longer pursue a career in journalism. The most compelling aspect of this study is how prevalent Spiral of Silence Theory is in censorship practices. The Spiral of Silence Theory was present in all three themes of this study. Spiral of Silence Theory shows that creating norms and behaviors that ensure conformity and prevent the coverage of any topics that might be construed as controversial or negative can damage the very essence of journalism—to seek truth.

The results of this study show that censorship practices are a deep-seated problem within student media organizations at public universities and based on the results of this study and recent mainstream media coverage on censorship, it seems that censorship practices are not going to decrease any time soon. It is important to educate student journalists and advisers about the First Amendment as well as the resources available for student journalists and advisers through organizations like the Student Press Law Center and FIRE. It is also important that student journalists know that they are an important voice at every single public university and they should not be silenced. As veteran television journalist Walter Cronkite once said: "Freedom of the press is not just important to democracy, it is democracy" ("Walter Cronkite," n.d.).

References

Associated Press (2019). *Associated Press Stylebook 2019.* New York, NY. Associated Press.

American Association of University Professors, the College Media Association, the National Coalition Against Censorship, The Student Press Law Center (2016). *Threats to the independence of student media.* Retrieved from http://aaup.org

Arnold, A. (2010, April 4). RIP Elisabeth Noelle-Nuemann. *The World Bank.* Retrieved from http://www.worldbank.org/

Balkin, J. M. (2016). Cultural democracy and the First Amendment. *Northwestern University Law Review, 110 (5),* 1053-1095.

Benedict, L. M. (2007). The First Amendment and college student newspapers: Applying Hazelwood to colleges and universities*. The Journal of College and University Law, 33(2),* 245-310.

Boggs, T. J. (2005). *The first amendment rights of high school students and their student newspapers* (Master's thesis, West Virginia University). Retrieved from http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/305419034?accountid=452

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3 (2),* pp. 77-101.

Burnett, D. (2019, January 30). On student press freedom day, a look back on censorship

in 2018. *Foundation for Individual Rights in Education.* Retrieved from

https://www.thefire.org/

Clemente, M., & Roulet, T.J. (2015). Public opinion as a source of deinstitutionalization: A

"Spiral of Silence Theory" approach. *Academy of Management Review, 40 (1),* 96-114.

Daly, K. & Gliksman, M. (1997). *The public health researcher: A methodological approach.*

Melbourne, Australia. Oxford University Press.

Elisabeth Noelle-Nuemann Her life and scientific work (2019, N.D.). *The "spiral of silence*

theory" Theory. Retrieved from http://noelle-neumann.de/scientific-work/spiral-of-

silence/

Hiestand, M. (2002). *Prior review vs. prior restraint: Terms often used interchangeably,*

but distinctions are important. Retrieved from http://studentpress.org/

First Amendment (n.d.). In *Britannica Academic online*. Retrieved from

https://www.britannica.com

Fourteenth Amendment (n.d.) In *Britannica Academic online.* Retrieved from

https://www.britannica.com

Fourth Estate (n.d.). In *Dictionary.com online.* Retrieved from

https://www.dictionary.com

Frazier, E. M., (2010, N.D.). *Censorship and campus newspapers.* Paper presented at the

2010 NAAAS conference proceedings. Scarborough: National Association of African

American Studies. Retrieved from http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/1315737013?accountid=452

Foss, K.A., & Littlejohn, S. W. (2009) *Encyclopedia of communication theory.* Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e025xna&AN=495591&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Garner, B.A. (Ed.). (2004). *Black's law dictionary.* St. Paul, MN: Thomson-West.

Greschler, G., & Kast, M. (2018, May 16) Funding for a Virginia university's paper fully restored after being cut to $100. *Student Press Law Center.* Retrieved from https://splc.org

Guest, G. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis.* Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publishing.

Hapney, Terry L. (2012) *Student newspaper governance on public university campuses in Ohio: Higher education administrators vs. student journalists* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Dayton). Retrieved from http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/1651232900?accountid=452

Jenkins, J. (2018, May 8). *S*tudents' survey highlights censorship of Christian college newspapers. *Religion News Service.* Retrieved from https://religionnews.com

Justice Potter Stewart. 1964. Retrieved from https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/807738-i-know-it-when-i-see-it-jacobellis-v-ohio

Kanigel, R. (2006) *The student newspaper survival guide.* Ames, Iowa: Blackwell

Publishing.

Lattman, P. (2007, September 27). The origins of Justice Stewart's "I Know It When I See

It." *The Wall Street Journal.* Retrieved from https://blogs.wsj.com

Loving, J. (1993). *Censorship of student newspapers at public and private colleges in eleven*

Midwest states (Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Dakota). Retrieved from

http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-

com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/304070377?accountid=452

Mass Communication Theory (2019). *Spiral of Silence Theory.* Retrieved from

https://masscommtheory.com/theory-overviews/spiral-of-silence/

Meiklejohn, A. (1948). *Free speech and its relation to self government.* New York, NY.

Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Meiklejohn, A. (1965). *Political freedom the constitutional powers of the people.* New

York, NY. New York Oxford University Press.

Noelle-Nuemann, E. (1974). *The spiral of silence theory a theory of public opinion.* Journal

of Communication.

Perez Tobias, S. (2018, February 27). Proposed cut to Wichita State student newspaper

– is it payback for critical coverage? *The Wichita Eagle.* Retrieved from

https://www.kansas.com

Post, R. (1990). The constitutional concept of public discourse: outrageous opinion,

democratic deliberation, and Hustler Magazine V. Falwell. *Harvard Law Review,*

103(3), 601-686.

Post, R. (2000). The constitutional status of commercial speech. *UCLA Law Review, N.A.,*

1-57. Retrieved from

https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.goo

gle.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1189&context=fss_papers

Ramey, R. C. (2009). *The school official's ability to limit student First Amendment freedom:*

Exploring the boundaries of student speech and expression in school as defined by the

united states federal courts (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa). Retrieved

from http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-

com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/304901600?accountid=452

Ryan, M. (1987). The First Amendment on Campus: The rights of the student press v. The

rights of the students. *Journal of College and University Law, 14 (3),* 505-528.

Student Press Law Center (2019). *Newspaper theft resources.* Retrieved from

https://splc.org/newspaper-theft-resources/

Trego, L. D. (2018). *Mapping the landscape of college press censorship: A quantitative*

analysis of administrative pressures on college newspapers (Master's thesis, University

of North Carolina). Retrieved from

http://unr.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-

com.unr.idm.oclc.org/docview/2058819236?accountid=452

Walter Cronkite. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/8366486-freedom-of-the-press-is-not-just-important-to-democracy

West, S. R. (2015). Student Press Exceptionalism. *Education Law & Policy Review, 2,* 131-151. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2685699

Appendix A
Student Editor Interview Guide

Background: My thesis focuses on interviewing students to get their perspective on which topics garner more censorship in public university student media and why. I determined I wanted to study this subject after reading a recent thesis (published in April 2018), which studied the frequency of censorship of student media on public university student campuses. The paper, however, did not delve into what subjects or topics can trigger censorship of public university student media by college administration, student government, or other university entities. My thesis will investigate which topics or subjects have resulted in episodes of censorship. I will also study whether there is a geographical component (does censorship occur more frequently in certain geographic parts of the country) and if so-called "taboo topics" change due to different political or historical events happening in that moment.

I want to start off with some questions about you and your media operation, and then ask about your specific experiences as an editor.

What year are you in school?
How long have you been an editor?
What is your major?
Why did you decide to focus on journalism?
What made you start working for your student media?
How well do you think you understand the First Amendment-- what it means and how it works?
In your words, what does censorship mean?
Have you ever faced censorship for a story you've written or published?
What topic was the story covering that was censored?
How did that make you feel?
Are there certain story topics that are or have been more acceptable to university administration versus others?
Are there certain "taboo topics" you avoid covering?
Do you think student writers and editors "self-censor" to avoid potential criticism with administration or others? How do you handle that?
Do you ever fear speaking out about censorship for fear of repercussions?
Do you know anyone who has also faced censorship that might be willing to talk to me?
Is there anything else I should know about?

Appendix B
Advisor Interview Guide

Background: My thesis focuses on interviewing students to get their perspective on which topics garner more censorship in public university student media and why. I determined I wanted to study this subject after reading a recent thesis (published in April 2018), which studied the frequency of censorship of student media on public university student campuses. The paper, however, did not delve into what subjects or topics can trigger censorship of public university student media by college administration, student government, or other university entities. My thesis will investigate which topics or subjects have resulted in episodes of censorship. I will also study whether there is a geographical component (does censorship occur more frequently in certain geographic parts of the country) and if so-called "taboo topics" change due to different political or historical events happening in that moment.

I want to start off with some questions about you and then move onto your experiences as an advisor.

Where did you go to school?
Do you have experience working as a student journalist or editor when you were in school?
What drew you to journalism?
Why did you want to become an advisor?
How long have you been an advisor?
How well do you think you understand the First Amendment-- what it means and how it works?
In your words, what does censorship mean?
Have you ever worked at a student media organization where a story was censored?
Are there certain story topics that are or have been more acceptable to university administration versus others?
Are there certain "taboo topics" you have steered or would steer your students from covering? (If yes, why? If no, why not?)
Do you think your student writers and editors "self-censor" themselves to avoid potential criticism with administration or others? How do you handle that?
What did you do or would you do in a situation where censorship occurred or may have occurred?
How does censorship make you feel?
Did you ever feel like there would be repercussions for speaking out against censorship?
Is there anything else I should know about?

Appendix C
Survey Questions

Q1: My research will investigate topics or subjects that have resulted in episodes of censorship against student journalists. I'm also investigating if there is a geographical component to whether or not "taboo topics" change depending on the area student journalists are in. You have been asked to participate because of your experience as a student journalist and your input will help me better understand how censorship effects student journalists. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may change your mind and close your browser at any point. Your answers to this survey will remain completely confidential and no other participant will see them. By completing this survey, you are documenting your consent to participate in this study. This survey will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your time.

Q2: What is your academic standing in school?

Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior
Other (Please Specify)

Q3: What is your major?

Print Journalism
Public Relations
Advertising
Broadcast Journalism
Other (Please Specify)

Q4: What is your position within student media?

Editor in Chief
News Editor
Sports Editor
Features Editor
Photography Editor
Other (Please Specify)

Q5: In what geographic area is your school located? (Categories based on the U.S. Census Bureau)

West (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington)West (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington)

Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)

South (Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, District of Columbia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)

North East (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)

Q6: On a scale of 1 to 5, how well do you think you understand your legal rights as a student journalist, i.e. First Amendment protections? (1 being 'not well at all' and 5 being 'extremely well.')

1. Not well at all
2. Slightly well
3. Moderately well
4. Very well
5. Extremely well

Q7: Please define censorship in your own words

Q8: Using your definition of censorship, how often do you think about censorship occurring in your job in student media?

Always
Most of the time
About half of the time
Sometimes
Never

Q9: On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your level of concern about censorship happening? (1 being 'none at all,' and 5 being 'a great deal.')

1. None at all
2. A little
3. A moderate amount
4. A lot
5. A great deal

Q10: Have you ever faced censorship?

Yes
No

Q11: If you answered yes to the previous question, what topics were censored by administrators, student government officials, or other university entities? List below topics that have triggered acts of censorship.

Q12: If you answered yes to the previous question, how does censorship make you feel? Please describe below.

Q13: Are there certain story topics that are or have been more acceptable to cover according to your university administration versus others? List topics you feel might be censored below.

Q14: Do you or other student writers or editors "self-censor" to avoid potential criticism with administration or others?

Yes
No

Q15: If you answered yes to the previous question, how often do you self-censor?

Always
Most of the time
About half of the time
Sometimes
Never

Q16: To which gender do you most identify?

Female
Male
Transgender Female
Transgender Male
Gender Variant/Non-Conforming
Not Listed (Please Specify)
Prefer Not to Answer

Q17: What is your ethnicity?

Hispanic or Latino or Spanish Origin
Not Hispanic or Latino or Spanish Origin

Q18: What is your race?
White
Black or African American
American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Island
Other (Please Specify)
Prefer Not To Answer

Tables

Table 3
Using your definition of censorship, how often do you think about censorship occurring in your job in student media?

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
Never	9	17.31%
Sometimes	29	55.77%
About half of the time	7	13.46%
Most of the time	6	11.54%
Always	1	1.92%
Total	52	

Table 4
Have you ever faced censorship?

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
Yes	13	25.00%
No	39	75.00%
Total	52	

Table 5
Do student journalists self-censor?

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
Yes	21	43.75%
No	27	56.25%
Total	52	

Table 6
If you answered yes to the previous question, how often do you self-censor?

Scale	Choice Count	Percentage
Never	3	14.29%
Sometimes	12	57.14%
About half the time	4	19.05%
Most of the time	1	4.76%
Always	1	4.76%
Total	52	