2000

The Press and the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California

Heather L. Jack
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Jack, Heather L., "The Press and the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California" (2000). *Master's Theses*. 1997.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.78nx-gvwj>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1997

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**THE PRESS AND THE
1960 MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA**

A Thesis

Presented to

**The Faculty of the School of Journalism and Mass Communications
San Jose State University**

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Science

by

Heather L. Jack

May 2000

UMI Number: 1399801

UMI Microform 1399801

Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2000

Heather L. Jack

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. William Biggs

Dr. Kenneth Plowman

Dr. Joni Finney, National Center for Public
Policy and Higher Education

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Abstract

The Press and the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California

By Heather L. Jack

This research study examines the press coverage of the Master Plan for Higher Education by the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* from July 1, 1959 through June 30, 1960. This paper concentrates on the role of the press in California during the establishment of the Plan. This study also includes any factors effecting the state that may have influenced the decision in the early 1960s.

Three research methods are used in this study: content analysis, historical analysis, and statistical analysis. The study found that despite the low level of public discussion about the issue during the establishment of the Plan, it was covered more heavily than any other higher education issue during the period studied. Agenda setting theory is used in this study to reinforce the power of the press and the relationship between what the press writes about and what the public cares about.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter One: Introduction	1-7
Chapter Two: Literature Review	8-30
Chapter Three: Method	31-38
Chapter Four: Research Findings	39-64
Chapter Five: Conclusion	65-70
References	71-74
Appendix A	75-77

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible if not for the support of many individuals. I would like to begin by thanking my review committee members: Dr. William Briggs, Professor of Public Relations at San Jose State University; Dr. Kenneth Plowman, Assistant Professor of Public Relations at San Jose State University; and Dr. Joni Finney, Vice President of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. I am grateful to them for their guidance, support, and encouragement.

In addition, I am extremely thankful to Dr. Diana Stover for allowing me the opportunity to pursue my master's degree at San Jose State University. I would like to thank Bill Trombley for sharing his expertise. I would also like to thank Lois Jenkins for her support and friendship throughout this process, and for her review of the final draft.

This thesis is dedicated to my husband and my family for their constant support, encouragement, and love.

Chapter One

The Press and the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California

Introduction

By 2010, nearly 714,000 additional students will be knocking on the doors of California's colleges and universities (CPEC, 2000). California will face another historic decision—keeping college opportunity open for every student who can benefit from a college education or turning students away. In the late 1950s, California faced a similar decision. At that time, college enrollments were projected to grow from 420,000 students in 1958-59 to more than 1,000,000 in 1975 (Coons, 1968). The state had to find a way to accommodate this enrollment, or hundreds of thousands of high school graduates would be denied a college opportunity. Yet, as of 1959, California had no plan for dealing with this growth, known as “Tidal Wave I.” In response, California developed a plan known as the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education that enabled California to accommodate this growth. Forty years later, California faces a similar decision, yet has no plan for dealing with the growth, known as “Tidal Wave II.”

This study focuses on the press coverage from the first decision—a decision by California to accommodate the enrollment growth of the state—that led to the establishment of the Master Plan for Higher Education. This paper concentrates on the role of the press in California at the time of the decision, and how the press covered the issue in three major daily newspapers in the state. This study also includes any factors that may have influenced the decision in the early 1960s. The Master Plan for Higher Education was important to California and to the people who were given the chance to go

on to college. It is important to reflect on the role the California print media played during the establishment of this Plan. Research has never expanded past the scope of the Master Plan itself, a Plan that 40 years later is still referred to as one of the major educational accomplishments of the state. This study recognizes the importance the Plan, and expands to include the role of the press and what effect, if any, the press had on the outcome of the establishment of the Plan.

Education has always been an important factor in the lives of Americans. In 1900, only 7% of American youth graduated from high school; in 1940, the proportion rose above half—51% graduated—for the first time. By 1980, 71% were high school graduates and more than half of all graduates were enrolled in college (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The central role that education played was both a consequence of and an impetus to major societal changes as the nation transformed from rural to primarily urban, and from an agricultural to an industrial and then to an information-based economy.

In this context, the centrality of education was not a coincidence or automatic spin-off of other forces shaping America. On the contrary, it was the outcome of conscious, deliberate and often controversial decisions—public policy decisions of local, state and federal governments. The cumulative effect of these decisions was to make education legally compulsory for larger and larger numbers of young Americans and to create opportunities for greater proportions of individuals to participate in higher education. California was to become the leader in the education revolution.

At almost the “eleventh hour,” in late 1959 and early 1960, with the tidal wave of new students moving into and through California’s schools, the leaders of public and

private colleges and universities, under pressure and with support of the governor and the legislature, developed a plan that was to become a landmark in education history. The plan promised a place in higher education for every Californian who could benefit and established an organizational structure for meeting those needs. This was the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, which was approved by the legislature and later referred to as “ a scheme that became a model for the world” (Schrag, 1998, p. 37). California led the challenge of educational opportunity for every student who could benefit from a college education. That challenge, which began in the late 1950s, continues to confront educational opportunity in California today.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the print media coverage of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education. The literature reveals that the reporting of education issues has not been extensively studied in the past. However, there is some evidence that education reporting overall has increased and improved over the years (Hynds, 1989). The reporting of higher education issues by the print media is even more difficult to assess because no comparative studies of such coverage have been done. One empirical study of news coverage of higher education issues in California by William Chance suggests some problems still exist (Chance, 1993). One example, Chance noted, was that higher education stories placed more emphasis “on the symptoms” of issues rather than “the causes” (p. 1). Despite the increase of interest in education issues by policy makers, educators, and news media, higher education issues are still not considered at the top of the public agenda.

The 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education represented a major departure in public and education policy for California and beyond. As Pickerell and Dornin (1968) pointed out, the Plan “came to be emulated by other populous states and carefully studied by foreign educators seeking to modernize their educational system” (Pickerell & Dornin, 1968, p. 10). Four decades later, the Master Plan’s precepts seem to be deeply embedded in the civic life of California. There is little research or analysis on the ways that the Master Plan was perceived by other key institutions in the state, including higher education institutions as well as governmental institutions.

This thesis examines and analyzes the development and enactment of the Master Plan as perceived and covered by the print media in three major daily newspapers in the state. Throughout this paper agenda-setting theory is used to explain the results of the research. This theory relates the agenda of the state to how the press covered the Master Plan issue. Specifically, this study uses a combination of three methods: content analysis, historical analysis, and statistical analysis. Three major daily California newspapers are used to assess the coverage of the Master Plan and the role played by the print media in the creation and enactment of this historic policy.

Scope of Study

This study examines press coverage by three major newspapers in California beginning with the establishment of the Master Plan Survey Team in July of 1959. The sample was collected and studied using *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* during the time span from July 1959 to June 1960. The sample

includes all stories (news, editorial, and opinion) relating to the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The scope of this study incorporates four distinct phases. The first phase encompasses the development of the Master Plan by the Master Plan Survey Team, from July through November 1959. The second phase focuses on the first public unveiling of the Master Plan for its “sign-off” by the University of California Board of Regents and the State Board of Education in early to mid-December 1959. The legislative session of 1960, when the Master Plan legislation, also known as the Donahoe Act, was adopted by the legislature and signed by the governor, constitutes the third phase. The two months following the enactment of the Plan is the final phase.

Methods

This study uses three research methods: content analysis, historical analysis, and statistical analysis. The research uses content analysis as the primary research method in this study. The other two methods are used to augment the content analysis. By using a number of different methods the researcher is able to determine with more precision the subject being studied, a process called triangulation. All three methods are used to triangulate the research.

Delimitations

The delimitations in this study include the number of newspapers, and the time period under study. This study only analyzes three major daily California newspapers. All other publications that may have influenced policy makers during the time the Master Plan was under study are not included in this research. In addition, this study is limited

by the specific time under review, July 1959 through June 1960. Both of these delimitations effect the outcome of the research study.

Assumptions

There are a few assumptions made by the researcher prior to conducting the research. The researcher assumes that newspapers are the best communication medium to use for studying public policy issues, compared to radio or television. The researcher also assumes that to report on the press coverage of the Master Plan, the best time to cover the issue is during the establishment of the Plan. Finally, compared to other newspapers in the state, the three newspapers used in this study are assumed to be the most representative of the state at the time of the establishment of the Master Plan for Higher Education. These are the primary assumptions made by the researcher before the study began.

Contribution to the Field

The print coverage during the establishment of the Master Plan for Higher Education is the focus of this study. The literature review begins with the media as an institution and its development, including important trends that are drawn from the literature. Most of those who have studied and analyzed the news media have drawn critical and even negative conclusions about the quality of news coverage, and many of their views are discussed. In the middle section, the review covers the special cases of education (kindergarten through high school) and higher education (college and university), including how journalists report on the issues. Next it focuses on the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education, what it was and why it was important.

Lastly, the literature review discusses communications theory and its relationship to this study.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

The Media as an Institution and Its Development

Major questions about the media coverage of any subject include the issues covered, the extent they are covered, and the perspective from which they are covered. For instance, who decides what news is? Why do some public policy issues get more print coverage than others? In seeking to identify and explain important trends, scholars, some analysts, and critics have emphasized the structure of the news industry and the roles and responsibilities of journalists.

The structure of the media industry has changed significantly during the last 50 years. According to one media critic, Ben Bagdikian (1997), the number of controlling firms in media (such as newspapers, magazines, radio, television, books, and movies) has reduced significantly, dropping from 50 corporations in 1984 to approximately 10 corporations in 1996 (Bagdikian, 1997). This evidence suggests that 10 corporations control the majority of the information the public views, hears, and reads. Bagdikian asserts that there is a direct relationship between the number of institutions controlling the media and the issues that receive news coverage.

Another major shift in the print media industry is competition. The majority of daily papers no longer face competition in their market. Bagdikian (1997) states that “of the 1,500 daily newspapers in this country, 99% are the daily in their cities” (Bagdikian, 1997, p. xv). The reduction in competition among daily newspapers can present a problem. One concern from media critics is the imbalance of news coverage on issues of

primary concern to the public. In the 1960s, newspaper stories focused more heavily on business leader issues compared to public issues. "In 1967 there were 434 business and financial editors on daily newspaper staff compared to 12 labor editors" (Cirino, 1971, p. 102). This evidence suggests the preponderance of reporting likely reflects the interests of business and financial people, rather than the reporting of issues that may be of public concern.

This concern is also reflected in the news coverage of the elite population. Numerous critics have argued over the years that newspapers are disproportionately concerned with covering and legitimizing the activities of elite groups, such as corporate leaders. Those who use this argument point out that the most influential citizens are the same people who have access to the media.

Those who are in positions controlling access to media can take advantage of this fact to gain public support for ideas and policies which would not be accepted by the majority of people if they had to compete fairly in the open market place of ideas. (Cirino, 1971, p. 2)

This author suggests that if everyone had the same chance of competing for story ideas, the most influential people would not be the same people who control what issues receive coverage.

Other studies draw similar conclusions. In a study of news reporting in one Midwestern city with a population of about 70,000 people whose primary news market was served by two daily newspapers, the analysis found "newspaper references to individuals whose families were ranked in the highest social stratum were more than three times the proportion of these families in the local population" (Roshco, 1975, p.

62). Ironically, as competitive pressures on some newspapers have diminished, financial pressures have intensified.

Like other companies in America, the major media corporations, facing financial constraints and demands for profitable performance, have resorted to “downsizing” and other measures to reduce personnel costs. The result has often been smaller, younger staffs doing the actual reporting of news and editors who are more focused on the bottom line than on journalistic quality. According to a 50-state investigative report on reporters assigned to cover state government, “bureaus are shrinking, reporters are younger, less experienced, stories get less space and poor play, and all too frequently editors just don’t care” (as cited in Bohler, 1998, p. 70). These factors can influence the decisions about what is covered as well as the depth and accuracy of the coverage.

The primary role and responsibility of journalists is to report the news. “The press’ purpose ought to be to empower its readers and viewers by providing them with relevant information to make individual decisions” (Kann, 1994, p. 23). Reporters are responsible for providing accurate and adequate information to readers, thus allowing them to make an informed decision on an issue. Another role of reporters is to be attentive to the framing of issues. The information the reporter decides to use, or not to use, will determine the substance of the story they are covering (Tuchman, 1974). In addition, the framing of an issue can have a lasting impact. “How one frames the problem of analyzing news media depends upon one’s central interest: how press content comes to be what it is or how the public reacts to the reporting of particular events”

(Roshco, 1975, p. 6). This evidence suggests that news reporters have flexibility in the way a story is portrayed, or framed.

There has been a significant shift in media ownership over the years, and this change has also affected the media industry. While competition continues, critics are concerned about an imbalance of coverage of elite groups. The media industry also faces financial constraints, which have led to downsizing. All these changes in the industry affect journalists' ability to report news and information.

Limitations to better journalism.

Limitations placed on newspaper reporters are just as important to recognize as how journalists report news information. Limitations can leave the reporters unable to meet the standards of media critics. As Bernard Roshco, a former journalist, said: "One has to consider whether inherent limitations leave the media unable to meet the standards of performance some critics demand, somewhat like a nearsighted man condemned for being unable to see distant signposts" (Roshco, 1975, p. 7). For most, reporters will never reach the desired performance level of their critics.

Another limitation to better journalism is the public's concern over who or what defines news. The public's concern of the media industry is that people besides journalists define what information is called "news." Bagdikian states that, "authorities have always recognized that to control the public they must control information" (Bagdikian, 1997, p. xlv). This practice may produce favorable results for the media and media supporters. "The messages secretly implanted in the news are used to create and maintain views and attitudes favoring the establishment" (Cirino, 1971, p. 135).

Another limitation of news reporting is what some critics define as inadequate specialization of journalists. “For all recognizable newsworthy stories to be covered, each specialist must be a generalist, and vice versa” (Tuchman, 1974, p. 67). Newspapers expect reporters to be able to cover any issue on request. “Everyone [reporters] must be capable of doing everyone else’s work” (p. 67). The problem, according to Tuchman, lies in the fact that journalists and media reporters cannot report on an issue thoroughly without having the foundation of an issue as a working base. This limitation may influence the way a reporter decides to cover an issue, and from what angle the issue is framed.

In addition, some critics cite the lack of historical perspective, as a cause of poor or weak news reporting, as another limitation. This is not unrelated to the previous issue of specialization.

American journalists are often with reason criticized for lacking that sense of history, for lacking the long-term perspective required to explain and analyze the complex web of political, economical, social, and psychological events that are the stuff of news reports. (Altschull, 1990, p. 6)

Since some reporters are unaware of the history of the issue they are reporting, key questions that may be imperative to the story are not asked. The conditions of modern journalism may often render it difficult for reporters to cover multiple subjects in a sustained way and to focus on long-term issues rather than short-term outcomes. “It’s a very rare issue or event that can long sustain the interest and focus of our media” (Kann, 1994, p. 22). According to Peter Kann, at the time chairman of the Dow Jones Company, “the larger issue of our times are longer-term ones...and the biggest problems of societies take the longest time to resolve” (p. 18). Therefore, Kann states important public policy

issues can lose coverage to other issues that draw more consumers. For example, “episodes which emphasize man’s success—the moon flights, heart transplants, solo sailing, mechanical inventions—get plenty of coverage” (Cirino, 1971, p. 130).

Another problem cited by analysts is the continued shortages of staff, even in the face of increased expectations of reporters. Reporters are being hired with less experience (Bohler, 1998). The thrust of this argument is that less experience and fewer staff result in a reduction in the quality of reporting.

All these limits reflect the difficulty of the journalists’ job. The literature shows that several elements limit the reporters’ ability to report a story fairly and accurately. Journalists will always be criticized for their reporting style. Expectations of the press continue even as a journalist’s job becomes more challenging. These factors contribute to a decline in public confidence in the media industry.

Public confidence.

One major theme of many contemporary studies and critiques of newspapers and news media is the decline of public confidence. The evidence of this decline is substantial. It can be attributed to several factors.

The influence of special interests on the media industry is often cited for the decrease in public confidence, and some authors predict dire consequences. “The country will assuredly be off course in the future as long as the most vital element of our society—the communications system—is for sale and is primarily in the hands of those with special interests to promote” (Cirino, 1974, p. 14). One writer, James Dickerson, states “the public thinks we are too much influenced by and dependent upon government,

special interests, and other institutions we cover, and by the need to attract a mass audience” (Dickerson, 1986, p. 263). As noted earlier, the literature review illustrates why access to the media is a major concern.

The public trust of the media continues to diminish. A Times Mirror survey revealed that “71% of Americans not only don’t think we [the press] help solve problems but actually think the press get in the way of society solving its problems” (as cited in Stein, 1994, p. 9). According to Jack Nelson, a *Los Angeles Times* Washington bureau chief, “there must be trust between the public and the press, a difficult achievement in view of national polls showing a deep distrust of both newspapers and TV newscasts” (p. 9). Other critics and analysts take a little different view on the issue.

Some critics and analysts think the public’s interest in issues peaks when the bizarre is introduced. According to Kann, there is a “growing media fascination with the bizarre, the perverse, and pathological” (Kann, 1994, p. 19). Furthermore, “any attempt to influence public opinion can be considered propaganda of one sort or another” (Cirino, 1971, p. 180). Journalists are left to sift through the stories, find the news, report the news, and hope that propaganda is not part of the lead.

Public confidence in the media and the media industry continues to decline. This literature reveals that one major factor contributing to the decline of public confidence is the influence of special interests groups on the press. The Times Mirror survey further supported the notion that the public distrusts the media industry. The purpose of this section was to provide the reader with an overview of the media industry, and how the

role has changed over the years. The literature review will now shift to the news coverage of public policy issues.

Press Coverage of Public Policy Issues

The coverage of public policy issues (such as health care, education, crime, etc.) is sometimes one-sided. Most issues that are reported on are not covered in-depth from both sides of the issue. For example, Kann asks why “is population growth by media definition a crisis for brown or yellow societies, but not for white ones” (Kann, 1994, p. 22). Roshco supports Kann’s point and states:

As a social product, the press’s content reflects the society from which it emerges; as an organizational product, press content is a result of the workings of specialized organizations whose function it is to gather and dispense news. (Roshco, 1975, p. 5)

How public policy issues are reported depends on who is doing the reporting.

News reporters are looking for two things when they report news: importance and interest. Although reporters carry with them news values about what issues they want to report, a story needs to carry beyond the generality of the issue.

... seemingly neutral news values include presumptions about what make a quality story—most generally, the twin concerns that news should be important and it should be interesting. (Cook, 1998, p. 5)

Political issues meet both these criteria.

The political process allows for conflict based on issues and personality, thus usually providing the press with ample news to cover in an interesting way. According to Roshco, “the political arena illustrates why conflict is especially newsworthy: the issues are defined by the disputants; the outcome is in doubt” (Roshco, 1975, p. 17). This topic gives the press leverage when reporting political issues to the public.

The framing, how an issue is covered by the reporter, can sway public opinion. According to Klapper (1960), “communications researchers have established that news may be of limited force in swaying public opinions and attitudes” (as cited in Tuchman, 1978, p. 3). Another obstacle that news reporters face is the constant flurry of stories surrounding the Washington beltway.

Every day news goes beyond the boundaries of Washington, D.C. “The action [popular activism] that counts takes place in our cities and towns, not inside the Washington beltway or in the corridors of corporate or political power” (Kaplan, 1992, p. 137). It is important to the public that news reporters understand that what is happening in the daily lives of average citizens is not the same as what is happening in the daily lives of Washington’s citizens.

One reason why political news stories are so popular, the research indicates, is because they include the two things reporters require in a news story: importance and interest. Not every public policy issue contains this requirement. For example, education issues are not of interest to every citizen. In the next section, the literature review will provide the reader with information about how newspapers have covered the issue of education over time.

News Coverage on Education Issues

During the past 10 years, education reporting has increased (Hynds, 1989). In the 1980s, several critical studies of education moved it to the forefront of the agenda, making it a national issue. The increase in coverage can be traced back to the education reform era of *A Nation at Risk*. “Nearly a decade after the flurry that greeted *A Nation At*

Risk, the first manifesto of the education reform era, the impact of the media's treatment of our institutional learning enterprise remains hard to access" (Kaplan, 1992, p. 5).

However, any impact on how education is reported, or the frequency with which it is reported, is still unclear. One reason may be that education writers are still not given adequate resources to change the way education is reported. "Many newspapers have failed to allocate the personnel, space, or play that public interest and investment in education would appear to justify" (Hynds, 1989, p. 692). One example of this would be the fact that there are no national education columnists in the newspapers (Doyle, 1998). Furthermore, "no editor or syndicate seeks such a columnist" for their newspaper (p. 50).

As one might guess, education news is rarely a "hard news" story (Kaplan, 1992, p. 5). One theory for this is that: "There is simply no demand for education reporting; that is what editors and reporters say" (Doyle, 1998, p. 51). This may explain why the issue is covered sporadically, with some reporters covering the issue daily, and others covering the issue, in their opinion, when a story warrants attention.

Also, just because the newspaper may carry an education beat does not mean that stories are expected to give the enterprise a good name. "For many of journalism's decision-makers, facing an education beat does not obligate their paper or station to spread the good word about the learning enterprise" (Kaplan, 1992, p. 7). Newspapers do not believe it is their duty to teach the public about the education process. Despite this fact, "newspapers arguably remain the most complete and objective general source of information on education for the public, reducing as true a picture of schools as is possible in limited space and time" (Watson, 1998, p. 22). It is important to recognize

that while education is not covered at the same level as other public policy issues, the coverage has increased significantly from the past.

In 1987, Ernest Hynds conducted a survey on how education issues were being covered in large daily newspapers. Education editors were asked to answer questions about how the issue of education was being reported. The survey was sent to all newspaper dailies with a circulation of over 100,000. One of the major findings of this survey was that: "Large daily newspapers have improved the coverage of education" (Hynds, 1989, p. 692). The survey also reported that: "More than 90% of the respondents agreed that news of education gets less space than news of sports and news of business" (p. 694). In addition, the survey revealed that: "Only a third of the papers indicated that they periodically run a special page or section of education news" (p. 694).

One reason for the lack of coverage on education issues may be that they do not have anything, from the view of reporters, provocative to say. "Education's story has no unidentified flying objects or military victories, few schools, almost no shock value" (Kaplan, 1992, p. 5). Therefore, the public may not expect much from the education beat. "Americans do not ask for much in the way of education coverage and do not expect much and, consequently, do not get much" (Doyle, 1998, p. 51). These expectations trickle down from the public to the reporters, and this is reflective in the coverage of these issues by journalists.

According to Doyle, another challenge in reporting education news is that the members of the public believe they are qualified to discuss education issues at length (Doyle, 1998). "Education is one of the few issues that the public thinks that it is

qualified to discuss” (p. 67). One reason the public thinks it is so knowledgeable in this area is because everyone goes through some type of education process. Contrary to what the public thinks about education, the fact remains that the public still gets most of its information on education from news sources.

Aleta Watson, education editor of the *San Jose Mercury News*, writes that “newspapers remain the most complete and objective source of information on education for the public, producing as true a picture of schools as is possible in limited time and space” (Watson, 1998, p. 22). Despite being the most complete source on education issues, the fact remains that the media are selective about the education issues they do cover. “Much of the information the media offer about education comes from single, troubled schools in large cities or from the suggestions of the various commissions that have reported on education throughout the 1980s” (Drake, 1991, p. 57). Critical stories cause confrontational discussions between educators and the press.

Newspaper reporters and educators do not always see eye to eye. “Amazingly, despite their troubles, journalists and educators have retained perhaps their most notorious common trait ... [a] regrettable tendency toward arrogance” (Case, 1995, p. 25). Educators are concerned over the controversy that surrounds most education stories. “One of the biggest concerns of educators is that the media tend to turn every discussion or issue into a controversy” (Strickland, 1998, p. 102). For this reason, educators decide to steer clear of reacting to reporters, preferring to speak at meetings of other educators. “Though the print media churned out a heavy volume of analysis, professional educators kept their opinions out of the mainstream media, preferring to react, if at all, at

conferences of peers and in trade publications" (Kaplan, 1992, p. 143). This has led to a breakdown in communication between education reporters and academics. Meanwhile, education leaders continue to become more media literate (p. 132). This literacy could be used to strengthen the relationship between educators and the press.

In 1997, a survey was conducted by Public Agenda for the Education Writers Association titled *Good News, Bad News: What People Really Think About the Education Press*. The study was designed to find out what educators, journalists, and the public really think about how education is reported by the press. Among the major findings of the public views was that "the parents tend to rely on their own observations about local schools—the media is almost irrelevant" (Public Agenda, 1997, p. 1). Only 22% of the public cited newspapers, television, or radio as its source for information about schools, according to the survey.

Simply because a newspaper has an education reporter, does not mean the newspaper holds education in the same regard as other news beats. "Nearly 10 years into the reform era, the reporter who covers the schools has what is still considered one of the lesser assignments on a typical family newspaper or television station" (Kaplan, 1992, p. 9). Although education reporters are increasing in numbers throughout the industry, the education assignment is still not considered one of the more attractive newspaper beats for journalists.

Since the early 1960s, based on this literature review, education reporting has improved, and continues to improve. "Several recent reports in the media have begun to present a more positive view of education" (Drake, 1991, p. 57). Also, education stories

are allotted more newspaper space than in the past. As one of the leading experts on the issue said, “I am convinced that today’s coverage is better than it was a decade and a half ago; there is more space devoted to education and reporters are given more latitude, and many of the stories offer greater depth” (Doyle, 1998, p. 46). It is important to note, however, that more space given to education stories does not equate to a higher quality of reporting.

The quantity and quality of education reporting has changed over time. “The quality and volume of education reporting rose steadily, if slowly, in the 1980s and into the 1990s, notably since 1987” (Kaplan, 1992, p. 131). This change is also reflective in the reporting of higher education issues. Since the early 1960s, major newspapers have added higher education (college and university) reporters to their staff. Today, however, not every major newspaper has a higher education reporter.

News Coverage on Higher Education Issues

There has been no comparative analysis on higher education reporting in the United States. This confirms that little is known about the coverage of higher education issues. And while media critics have surfaced throughout this paper to raise issues of concern about education reporting and other news reporting in general, few higher education leaders share a similar view about how higher education is reported by the press.

One comparative analysis of higher education reporting in California was done in May 1993. This study included four major daily newspapers in the state and reviewed how the higher education reporters from these papers covered major public policy issues

affecting the future of higher education. A few examples of the issues William Chance included in this study, *The Press and California Higher Education*, were proposed student fee increases, university faculty teaching loads, lack of proportionality among students, and reduction in student financial aid availability.

Of course, the conclusion to this study found similar criticisms of the press as noted earlier in this literature review. One of the conclusions of this study was that higher education reporters have more freedom to cover the issues they wanted. Newspaper competition in the cities was slim to none. This allowed higher education reporters much more freedom in deciding what issues to cover and how often to cover them (Chance, 1993). Chance noted, however, that the major public policy issues affecting the future of higher education were mostly covered by these reporters (Chance, 1993).

According to Chance, one major conclusion of this study was that reporters felt that the lack of an independent news resource on higher education issues impeded their ability to accurately cover the news (Chance, 1993). The press interviewed for this study also thought that independent organizations needed to keep reminding reporters of their presence, what work they were doing, and how that would be helpful to reporters. One editor interviewed for this study said, “media are used to outreach and are receptive to it” (Chance, 1993, p. 37). This study provided ample information on the way higher education was reported in California in the early 1990s.

No analysis has been done on the press coverage during the passage of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. Despite the historic decision California was facing in

the late 1950s, California newspapers did not have any reporter assigned to higher education issues. This literature review was designed to provide readers with a background of information on the news industry and the changes that the industry has undergone since the early 1960s. The focus of this paper now shifts to the late 1950s and early 1960s during the establishment of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education.

The 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education in California

In the late 1950s, competition for students among all institutions of higher education in California was increasing. “Competition for dollars for students, and for new functions, programs, and campuses were rapidly increasing between and among various segments of public higher education” (Coons, 1968, p. 19). California had no plan for providing educational opportunity for every student who wanted to enroll in college. The roles of the University of California, the state colleges, the junior colleges, and private institutions was not clearly defined. In June of 1959, a Master Plan Survey Team was created to put together a plan for California’s colleges and universities. The plan was suppose to include a role for each of the higher education systems. Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe (D-Bakersfield) was the key legislator who introduced this plan to the Assembly.

In 1959, Donahoe was the chairwoman of the Assembly Education Commission. She introduced a resolution to a new master plan “for development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education, in the junior colleges, state colleges and the University of California, and institutions of higher education of the state” in order to meet “the needs of the state during the next 10 years

and thereafter. . .” (Stadtman, 1970, p. 388). The resolution was overwhelmingly adopted by the California Legislature in April 1960 (Kerr, 1992).

Donahoe’s resolution reflected a growing national concern about the provision of higher education, particularly as the “baby boom” population approached college age. In 1956, President Eisenhower had appointed a committee to study education beyond high school. The second report by this committee recommended that “vigorous efforts be made to remove barriers to the pursuit of education by all talented youth” (as cited in Coons, 1968, p. 14).

What was the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education.

The Master Plan was both a political and an educational plan. It established the principle that there would be a place in college for every Californian who was motivated and able to benefit (Stadtman, 1970). It outlined clear missions for the University of California, the state colleges, and the junior colleges. As one of its leading architects, Clark Kerr described it many years later: “What we really were engaged in was negotiating a treaty among the constituent parts of higher education in California that would, at the same time, be acceptable to the Governor and Legislature of the State” (Kerr, 1992, p. 47).

The Plan changed the way the systems of higher education operated, the programs they offered, and the students they enrolled. The projected enrollment increases were of sufficient magnitude that the University of California and the state colleges could become more selective and still expect dramatic growth. With respect to selectivity, for instance, the University of California, at the time of the Plan, admitted the top 15% of high school

graduates. Under the provisions of the Master Plan, the University was to admit students from the top 12 ½%. At this time, the state colleges were accepting approximately the top 50% of high school graduates. Under the Plan, they were to admit from the top 33% (Kerr, 1992; Stadtman, 1970; Master Plan, 1960). The junior colleges were to absorb the remaining students except for a relatively small portion that would attend private colleges and universities. The Master Plan provided that any student who did relatively well in the community colleges would be able to transfer to a four-year public college or university. This Plan gave the state colleges five new campuses, the University of California, three, and the community colleges had the prospect of many (Kerr, 1992).

The governing structures of higher education also changed. A coordinating council was created with representatives from all four segments of higher education, which is known today as the California Postsecondary Education Commission (Kerr, 1992; Master Plan, 1960). The state colleges were given master's degree authority across the board. Prior to the Master Plan, the state colleges had been required to ask the Regents of the University of California for permission to offer master's degree programs (Kerr, 1992). The Plan also created an independent board of trustees for the state colleges.

Private colleges and universities also benefited from the Master Plan. "To the point of the 1960 Master Plan, the private sector had begun to exert its influence so that its interests could be better protected in the face of public expansion" (Palola, Lehmann, & Blischke, 1970, p. 85). For the first time, the private colleges received an opportunity to participate in making decisions through representation on the new the coordinating

council. These decisions included the locations of new public campuses. In addition, financial support was added for the state tuition scholarship programs, which assisted private colleges and universities more than public campuses (Kerr, 1992; Master Plan, 1960).

The community colleges were no longer a part of secondary education; they were part of higher education. “They [community colleges] were given the opportunity to provide guaranteed universal access to higher education for the first time in world history anywhere” (Kerr, 1992, p. 55). This was of great significance since many students would have been unable to complete a four-year program without this option (Hansen & Weisbrod, 1969).

The importance of the Master Plan.

Whether one looks upon the Master Plan as a peace treaty among California’s colleges and universities or as an enactment of a profound educational principle, or both, two facts seem inescapable: California became the first governmental entity in the world to commit itself to educational opportunity for all its citizens who could benefit, and without the Master Plan California would not have been able to meet the demands of its growing population. Noted California historian Kevin Starr later referred to the Master Plan as “an attempt to create an educational utopia” (Schrag, 1998, p. 38).

Historians may someday rank the California Master Plan with the GI Bill as one of the most important events in the modern history of higher education, for its impact went well beyond California. For several decades after its enactment, other states and

eventually other nations sought to emulate its provisions for extending educational opportunity and educational quality (Schrag, 1998; Smelser & Almond, 1974).

The press and the Master Plan.

Despite its historic importance, two factors mitigated against press coverage of the Master Plan. Both stand in stark contrast to the conditions that govern press coverage of higher education in our times. The first factor was that, in the 1950s and early 1960s, no newspaper reporter in the state had higher education as his or her “beat.” In fact, it was not until 1964 that a major California newspaper assigned a reporter to cover higher education as a full-time, ongoing responsibility.

William Trombley was the first higher education reporter for the *Los Angeles Times* (Trombley, 1999). He did not begin working for the *Los Angeles Times* until fall of 1964. He was originally hired to write about the Southwest but one week before starting work at the *Times*, Trombley was asked to become the higher education reporter. Prior to that time, the newspaper had one reporter covering education, which included both K-12 and higher education (Trombley, 1999). According to Trombley, there were no designated higher education reporters before the Free Speech Movement began in fall of 1964.

The second factor was that the committee of educators who developed the Master Plan met in private. There were no requirements that these meetings be open to the public or to the press. So it was not until the committee, which was called the Master Plan Survey Team, had reached consensus and reported its findings that its work was accessible to the press. “In general not until the latter weeks of the work of the Survey

Team did the representatives of the working press manifest great interest in asking for interviews or briefings. . .” (Coons, 1968, p. 42).

The news coverage of the Master Plan can be divided into four distinct phases. The first was the development of the Master Plan from July through November 1959. The second phase was the first public unveiling of the Master Plan for its “sign-off” by the University of California Board of Regents and the State Board of Education in December, 1959. The third phase was the legislative session of 1960 when the Master Plan legislation, also known as the Donahoe Act, was adopted by the legislature and signed by the governor. The final phase includes any press coverage from the Plan following a two-month period after the adoption of the Plan, May through June 1960.

Mass Communications Theory

One communications theory this literature review encompasses is agenda setting theory. The role of agenda setting in mass communications has evolved over the years, tracing back to Walter Lippmann (McCombs & Bell, 1996). “It was Lippmann’s thesis that the mass media, primarily newspapers and magazines in his day, create our pictures of the world” (p. 94). Forty-five years later, his idea was put to an empirical test.

At that time two researchers from the University of North Carolina wondered whether the topics selected by the news media to represent the “world outside” limited the kinds of events that people used to interpret that world. They also wondered if the public’s perception of reality depended on which topics the news media covered and emphasized in their daily presentation of events. (as cited in McCombs & Bell, 1996, p. 94)

Their research influenced a new theory known as agenda-setting theory.

This theory encompasses two parts. The first part “pertains to the transmission of issue or object salience from the media agenda to the public agenda” (McCombs & Bell,

1996, p. 94). An example of this would be that the events covered by the press are the same events on the public agenda. The second part of the theory “pertains to the news media’s role in framing those issues and objects in the public mind” (p. 94). How the media frames an issue is the way the public may define the issue. McCombs and Shaw (1972) conducted the first Lippmann thesis test and found that “there was a strong relationship between the public’s and the media’s agenda of issues” (as cited in McCombs & Bell, 1996, p. 96).

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the print media coverage of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. The agenda-setting theory connects the relationship between what the media covers and the public agenda. The literature review has covered the level of public confidence in the media based upon how the media covers various public policy issues including those of education and higher education. The literature review has also discussed the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education, what it was, why it was important, and how the press covered the Plan.

The advent of corporate control, the resulting drop in public confidence, and the pervasive sentiment that the public has no voice have combined to change the practice and output of the media industry. The central concept for this research is that the media cover the issues of importance to elite groups and glaze over major public policy issues that may be important for the general public to know. In doing this, the public agenda is defined by the coverage of news and not necessarily by what issues are of importance to the public. This research identifies the role the press played during the establishment of

the Master Plan for Higher Education. It addresses the major public policy issues of the time and reports on why the press did or did not cover the issue.

Research Questions

This study will answer the following questions:

1. How comprehensively does the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* cover the Master Plan and the events leading up to it?
2. What are the major frames (news, editorial, and opinion) used by each paper to report this issue?
3. What is the difference in coverage between the newspapers? In what ways did the coverage differ; in what ways was it the same?
4. What is the tone of the news items covered, and how did it differ from editorials and opinion articles written about the Master Plan?
5. What explains the quantity and quality of the coverage?
6. How is the Master Plan, and the process that leads to it, influenced by press coverage? Why or why not?
7. Who did the press rely on as information sources?
8. How does agenda setting theory help explain the research findings?

Chapter Three

Method

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the print media coverage of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. This study uses three research methods: content analysis, historical analysis, and statistical analysis. These methods provide alternative ways for looking at how the media covered this issue. In addition, they allow the researcher to be able to triangulate the research in order to relate the findings back to the importance of the Master Plan during the period under study.

Content Analysis

The primary research method used in this study is content analysis. The criteria of the research are based on Stempel and Westley's (1981) approach and include the selection of the unit of analysis, the category construction, the sampling of content, and the reliability of coding.

Selection of the unit of analysis.

The unit of analysis for this study is newspaper coverage. More importantly, the study examines whether or not the newspapers covered the issue comprehensively. The data sources include the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle*. In the 1960s, the *Los Angeles Times* had the largest newspaper circulation in state (Editor & Publisher, 1960). The *Sacramento Bee* was the major paper covering legislative issues from the state capitol. Lastly, during that time, the *San Francisco Chronicle* gained more daily newspaper circulation of any newspaper in the United States, and later became the dominant newspaper of Northern California (*San Francisco*

Chronicle, 1960). The independent variables in this study include placement, byline, tone, story length, frequency, and number. The dependent variables include all the factors that contribute to an influential story, such as the number of information sources quoted or the depth of the article.

The content analysis is based on both the quality and quantity of the coverage by each newspaper in this study. The quality of the news coverage includes the placement of each story, the byline, and tone. The quantity of the news coverage includes the space allotted to each article (ie. story length), the frequency, and the number of the articles appearing in each newspaper. Story length will be measured by word count, not column inches, because the newspaper articles copied varied in size. Each article had to contain some language about the Master Plan for Higher Education in order to be qualified for the study.

In addition to finding articles on the Master Plan, this study also counts the number of articles appearing on general higher education issues. The scope of this study was expanded for the purpose of understanding the level of press coverage the Master Plan received in comparison to other higher education issues. This portion of the study counts any story related to higher education excluding student athletic stories, stories about a university's medical center or hospital, University of California extension stories, stories that pertained to a specific faculty member of a University or college, and obituary stories. This last step allows the researcher to understand the level of importance each newspaper placed on the Master Plan issue.

Category construction.

This section pertains to what category system is used for this analysis. The researcher created her own category system for this study after thorough review of similar category systems.

Professor Denis McQuail (1977) wrote a book titled *Analysis of Newspaper Content* and provided a good example of category construction. Using McQuail's concept, the researcher constructed a category system pertaining to the coverage of the Master Plan. The researcher separated articles by content (news, editorial, and opinion) and then separated the content by the four phases of the study. The initial breakdown of articles uses stories pertaining to the political process, institutional issues, miscellaneous, and editorial. The second step divides the news articles by author in order to report on any consistency among reporters covering the Master Plan issue. The results of this research are reported in section one of chapter four.

Sampling of content.

The major issue of sampling content is to "make sure that the sample represents the population that is intended to the represent" (Stempel & Westley, 1981, p. 124). In order to meet these criteria, the researcher reviewed every day of the 12-month study. For each newspaper, the researcher analyzed the main, local, and editorial sections for every paper. Because all the newspapers in the study were formatted differently, adjustments had to be made by the researcher when reviewing each of the newspapers. Finally, all three newspapers were available for review using microfilm at the San Jose State University library.

This study includes every day, from July 1, 1959, through June 1, 1960. The time frame selected for this study incorporates four distinct phases. The first phase encompasses the development of the Master Plan by the Master Plan Survey Team, from July through November 1959. The second phase focuses on the first public unveiling of the Master Plan for its “sign-off” by the University of California Board of Regents and the State Board of Education, from December 1 to December 20, 1959. The legislative session of 1960, when the Master Plan legislation, also known as the Donahoe Act, was adopted by the legislature and signed by the governor, constitutes the third phase. First two months following the adoption of the Master Plan in April 1960 is the final phase.

Reliability of coding.

This method refers to the researcher and her ability to be concerned with consistency of classification. Using Professor McQuail’s model as a guide, the researcher developed her own classification codes based on the newspaper content. The reliability of coding remained consistent through the defining of clear categories and by verifying that all codes were relevant to the study. In addition, the researcher conducted a trial run, followed by spot checks, once the coding had begun to ensure reliability.

Strengths and weaknesses.

Content analysis has several strengths. First, it is economical both in terms of time and money. In addition, this kind of research does not require a large group of staff, and no special equipment is needed. Unlike other research, if a mistake is made while conducting content analysis research the entire project is not wasted. Usually only parts

of the analysis will need to be redone. This type of research is unobtrusive; meaning it has no effect on the subject being studied.

Content analysis research also has weaknesses. The first weakness is that it is limited to the examination of communication that is recorded. A content analysis can not be conducted on any information that is not recorded in some way. Another weakness is that it is hard to obtain a complete definition of the issue being studied. In order to avoid confusion about what articles are included in this study, the researcher has taken the necessary steps in identifying what articles are included and excluded from this study.

Historical Analysis

The second research method used in this study is the historical method. Because the Master Plan for Higher Education occurred nearly 40 years ago, it is very important to make sure that the study reflects the time in which it happened. This is the purpose for this method of research. “Historical methods help create a web of relationships that may ultimately answer the questions originally posed” (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 24).

This method supplements the other two methods of research in an attempt to reduce any uncertainty in the final results of the research study. “The process of decreasing uncertainty in an unobservable domain is an inferential one and in fact the same that content analysis follows” (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 24). The researcher includes historical data in order to provide the study with adequate information about events that were happening during the time of the study, such as other major challenges facing the state. Knowing the historical context of California in the late 1950s and early 1960s, one may assume certain factors could have impacted more or less coverage on the issue of

study—the amount of coverage by three prominent papers on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Strengths and weaknesses.

This method provides the researcher with a number of advantages. In most instances, government documents will provide a researcher with relevant data to do a historical/comparative analysis. The sources used for historical/comparative analysis are extensive and provide the researcher with adequate tools. Thirdly, as with the use of existing statistics, there is no end to the reporting on historical data or historical resources needed to do a historical/comparative analysis (Babbi, 1998, p. 328). Of course, this can be regarded as a strength as well as a weakness.

The author wishes to note a few more weaknesses with this method. First, the researcher must always be aware of any “bias in your data sources” when using the historical/comparative method (Babbi, 1998, p. 329). Bias in data sources can change the outcome of the study if a resource is relied on too heavily and additional historical sources do not corroborate the findings. Another weakness, noted by Babbi, is that organizations tend to study themselves. Therefore, it is important for researchers to examine the original documentation and draw their conclusions, rather than the conclusions drawn by an organization.

Statistical Analysis

As a supplemental source of data, this study will use the method of analyzing existing statistics. Existing statistics “can often provide a historical or conceptual context within which to locate your original research” (Babbi, 1998, p. 319). The purpose of this

research study is to investigate the print media coverage of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. Existing statistics provides additional source data and gives the researcher a better understanding of the research findings. For this study, existing statistics examines available records on state demographics, higher education, and school enrollment figures, and state migration. The existing statistics are compiled to better understand the research results of this study.

Strengths and weaknesses.

One strength of existing statistics is added validity to one's research. Another strength is the additional sources available for research on existing statistics. "The availability of existing statistics make it possible to create some fairly sophisticated measures" (Babbi, 1998, p. 324). In addition, over the years, the World Wide Web has increased the availability of statistics to the researcher.

A few weaknesses have been noted about this method. One major weakness with this method is that when a researcher bases his/her research on what statistics exists, the researcher is limited to what statistics actually exist (Babbi, 1998). Another weakness with this method is that it "depends heavily on the quality of the statistics themselves" (p. 322). The researcher is responsible for making sure that each study reports the statistics accurately. Lastly, "the process of record keeping affects the records that are kept and reported" (p. 323). If record keeping has been consistent over time on particular issues, reporting statistics on those issues will be easier than if record keeping for issues has been inconsistent over time or has changed the process for which its records are kept.

Using the existing statistics, the researcher is able to provide a context for the research results of the study. The researcher will be able to gather statistics vital to the purpose of the study. The strengths and weaknesses of this method will be used to provide the researcher with the tools to report on the existing statistics most relevant to the study.

The last two research methods provide the researcher with supplemental support for the primary research method, content analysis. The researcher uses all three of these methods to triangulate the research and provide an overall framework to the reader about the results of the study. As California faced a historic decision in April of 1960, most Californians were unaware of the decision about to be made by a handful of individuals. The researcher tests whether or not the press coverage reflected the importance of the issue, and how the public agenda (using agenda setting theory) of California played a role in the press at the time the Plan was enacted.

Analysis of the Data

Using the primary research method, content analysis, the researcher breaks down the each newspaper article by author, subject, section, and page number. In addition, each article is categorized on the basis of four phases of the Master Plan adoption process. Following the results of the content analysis, historical information about California's higher education system is reported. Lastly, a statistical analysis is used to provide valuable information about the states demographics, school enrollment numbers, and migration at the time of the Master Plan enactment.

Chapter Four

Research Findings

The primary research method, a content analysis, is covered in the first section of this chapter and is divided into three parts. The first portion of this section gives a comprehensive review of Master Plan articles by topic, placement, and author for each newspaper in the following order: the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle*. This information illustrates the major frames (news, editorial, and opinion) used by each newspaper, as well as the tone of the articles written. The second part of this section outlines the print coverage on the four phases of development and the adoption of the Master Plan, and provides the reader with the articles included in each phase. Section two reports on the historical aspect of California in the 1960s. And the final section analyzes existing statistics relative to the study.

Content Analysis

Part One: Comprehensive Review.

In 1960, the *Los Angeles Times* had the largest circulation in the state (Editor & Publisher, 1960). For this reason, the researcher expanded the 12-month study to not only include any story about the Master Plan but also any story relating to higher education. This study excludes articles about college athletics, teacher education as it related to public schools, and any individual-specific stories on students or faculty from colleges that were included in headlines but were not related to higher education. One example would be headlines appearing in the *Los Angeles Times* that read, “UC Student Drinks Poison,” or “UC Will Find Home for Blind Girl, Dog.”

From July 1959 to June 1960, there were 227 articles pertaining to higher education found in the *Los Angeles Times* based on the search criteria. Of those 227 articles, 34 articles (about 15%) related to the Master Plan. Chance (1993) listed the subject and frequency count for each of the articles included in his study. Using his study as a guide, the researcher has included a list of subject categories and frequency for the year of study. The following list includes all articles about higher education, excluding the articles pertaining to the Master Plan issue, for the *Los Angeles Times*.

Articles (news, editorial, and opinion) appearing on higher education: 193

1. State Issues: 16

Adult education (2)

Fees (1)

How many people served (1)

Financial aid (14)

Fellowships (1)

Grants (5)

Loans (1)

Scholarships (4)

Other (3)

2. Institutional Issues: 67

Presidential or executive appointments (20)

University of California (11)

University of California Regents (1)

State colleges (1)

Community colleges (3)

Private colleges (4)

Commencement (13)

Enrollment (11)

University of California (1)

Community colleges (1)

National focus (1)

Departmental (1)

Admissions (1)

Other (6)

New campuses (8)

University of California (4)

State colleges (1)

- Community colleges (2)
 - Private colleges (1)
 - Resignations (2)
 - Retirements (2)
 - Student activities (11)
 - Fraternities
 - Fraternity killing (4)
 - Fraternity regulation (3)
 - Fraternity injury (1)
 - Fraternity hazing (1)
 - Student housing (1)
 - Other (1)
- 3. Miscellaneous: 90
 - About Stanford University (4)
 - About University of California, Los Angeles (11)
 - Art center opening at Occidental College (2)
 - Campus overseas (4)
 - Gifts to colleges (2)
 - High school students receive college credit (3)
 - Teacher credentials (2)
 - Other (62)
- 4. Editorials: 15
 - Adult education (2)
 - Fees (1)
 - Classes (1)
 - Federal aid (1)
 - Fraternity killings (2)
 - Academic growth (1)
 - UCLA open house (1)
 - Foundations giving to higher education (1)
 - College admission (1)
 - Other (6)
- 5. Opinion Articles: 3
 - Educational opportunity (1)
 - Federal Aid (1)
 - Inspirational (1)
- 6. Column Articles by Raymond Moley: 2
 - Education Act (1)
 - Harvard University (1)

This article review suggests that the Master Plan issue was covered more extensively than any other higher education issue during the period studied.

In an effort to understand the type of news coverage by the *Los Angeles Times* on the Master Plan issue, the articles are divided into various categories based on content: political process, institutional issues, miscellaneous, and editorial. Several articles were written about the political stages of the Master Plan and passage of the Plan by the legislature. These articles are included in the category of political process. Other articles related specifically to institutional issues, such as enrollment at the University of California. All stories at the institutional level are included under the institutional issues category. The third category, miscellaneous, includes all other news stories that did not fit into either the political process or institutional issues. Any editorial written about the Master Plan is included in the fourth category, editorial. The stories appearing on the Master Plan, 34 in all, are as follows:

1. Political Process: 19

- Adoption of the Plan (1)
- Approval and Sign-off by the governor (1)
- Approval by the Assembly (2)
- Approval by the Senate (1)
- Constitutional Amendment sought for two provisions rejected by the legislature (1)
- Department of Education and UC Regents approve Plan (1)
- Department of Education and UC Regents meeting (2)
- Department of Education and UC officials appointed to work with legislators on Plan (1)
- Enrollment and costs of additional students at committee session (1)
- Final passage by Legislature (2)
- Fourth Master Plan proposed (1)
- Reports to be submitted to Liaison Committee (1)
- Sen. Richard Richards asks for a state college in Los Angeles (1)
- State Board, UC officials, and Liaison Committee approve format (1)
- Support of the Plan by Dorothy Donahoe (1)
- Support of the Plan by Governor (1)

2. Institutional Issues: 7

- University of California (3)
- Enrollment (1)

- New campuses (2)
 - Community colleges (1)
 - Doctorate degrees (2)
 - Entrance requirements (1)
- 3. Miscellaneous: 7
 - Budget for scholarships (1)
 - Dorothy Donahoe (3)
 - Executive appointments (2)
 - Enrollment (1)
- 4. Editorial: 1
 - Academic growth (1)

There was little consistency on the part of the writers of the news articles. During the time of the study, the *Los Angeles Times* had an education editor, Dick Turpin, who focused on both K-12 education and higher education issues. Of the 34 articles about the Master Plan, 12 (about 36%) are by Turpin. Three of the 12 articles by Turpin are included in his weekly column, *Report Card*. This column usually includes one major story emphasis, followed by other round-up issues pertaining to both education and higher education. Ten out of 33, approximately 30%, of the articles are from wire stories such as the *Associated Press* or *United Press International*. Below is a breakdown of the news coverage according to the byline of each story.

- Dick Turpin: 12
 - News stories (9)
 - Report Card* column (3)
- Times staff reporters: 3
 - From La Jolla (1)
 - From Berkeley (1)
 - From Sacramento (1)
- Wire stories: 10
 - Associated Press* (5)
 - From Berkeley (1)
 - From Sacramento (4)
 - United Press International*, Sacramento (5)
- No byline given: 8

From July 1959 through June 1960, the research reports 278 stories on higher education for the *Sacramento Bee*. Of the total, 55 articles directly relate to the Master Plan for Higher Education. Of the 55 articles, 48 are news articles. In addition, for that same time period, the *Sacramento Bee* wrote 12 editorials on higher education issues, seven of which pertained to the Master Plan. The stories appearing on the Master Plan include:

Political Process: 39

- Acceptance of Plan by UC Regents and the State Board of Education predicted (1)
- Amendment to the Master Plan is killed (1)
- Approval and Sign-off by governor (1)
- Approval by the Senate (1)
- Approval to sweep Master Plan proposals affecting functions (1)
- Approved and sent to the floor by Senate Finance Committee (1)
- Approved by UC Regents and State Board of Education (1)
- Attack of the Plan by Assemblyman Bruce F. Allen (1)
- Attack of the Plan by Lyman Glenny, national expert (1)
- College costs of educating additional students (1)
- Constitutional amendment introduced to state legislature (1)
- Constitutional amendment proposed (1)
- Constitutional amendment stripped from Plan (1)
- Department of Education and UC Regents meeting (2)
- Educators tell state legislature they want plan in statutory form (1)
- First appearance in legislature (1)
- First hearing by the state Senate Education Committee (1)
- First Plan unveiled for UC Regents and state Board of Education (1)
- Joint Budget Committee endorses the Plan (1)
- Junior College bill introduced (1)
- Master Plan on top of agenda for Governor (1)
- Passed by Assembly, sent back to Senate for action (1)
- Passed by Legislature, sent to governor (1)
- Plan endorsed by Governor Brown (1)
- Plan reaches the senate floor (1)
- Role of junior colleges (1)
- Role of the state colleges (1)
- Senate/Assembly joint hearing on February 4 (1)
- Senator George Miller introduces his own legislation (1)

- Support from legislative and education leaders for California State University policy board (1)
- Support of Plan by Roy McCall, president of College of the Desert (1)
- Support of the Plan by Clark Kerr (1)
- Support of the Plan by Dean McHenry (1)
- Support of the Plan by Governor Brown (1)
- Support of the Plan by Julian McPhee, President Of Cal Poly (1)
- UC, CSU construction proposals (1)
- Use of private architects in state colleges hailed by Assemblyman Gordon Winston (1)
- Warns if Master Plan not accepted by legislature, it will be submitted as amendment (1)

Institutional Issues: 8

- Doctorate degrees (3)
- University of California (3)
 - Role of the University of California
 - Enrollment
 - Admission requirements
- State Colleges (2)
 - Stanislaus challenged by survey team for new campus (1)
 - Enrollment at Sacramento State College

Miscellaneous: 1

- Dorothy Donahoe (1)

Editorial: 7

- Calls for legislative attention to Plan at joint meeting held on Feb. 4th (1)
- Coordinating council for state colleges (2)
- Doctoral degrees (1)
- Master Plan signed by Governor Brown (1)
- Master Plan unveiled to liaison committee (1)
- Senate approved Master Plan (1)

The analysis of reporters for this newspaper appears to be quite interesting.

Sixteen news articles, approximately 33%, are attributed to specific writers of the newspaper. Five out of 48 news articles come from wire news services. Over half of the news articles, 27, are not attributed to a specific writer for the *Sacramento Bee* or otherwise. A more complete breakdown is listed below according to the byline of each story.

Sacramento Bee staff writers: 16

Leo Rennert, from Berkeley (7)

Richard Rodda, from Sacramento (6)

Herbert Phillips (1)

James Brown, from Davis (1)

Richard Van Brackle (1)

Wire Stories: 5

Associated Press (1)

United Press International (2)

From Berkeley (1)

From *Los Angeles Times* (1)

McClatchy News Service, from Berkeley (2)

No byline given: 27

From Berkeley (2)

No reference (25)

From July 1959 to June 1960, there are approximately 216 articles about higher education in the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Of the total, a little over 15% (31 news articles) are directly related to the Master Plan for Higher Education. There are 12 editorials that appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on higher education for this period of study, two pertaining to the Master Plan. The stories appearing on the Master Plan include:

1. The Political Process: 23

Approval by UC, Department of Education, and Governor Brown (1)

Approved by Assembly (1)

Approved by Assembly Education Committee (1)

Approved by Senate Education Committee (1)

Approved by UC and the Department of Education (1)

Brown announces reservations about Plan (1)

December meetings to be held on report (1)

Governor Brown asks for agreement on Plan (1)

Governor won Master Plan with slight change (1)

Legislature reorganizes Master Plan (1)

Legislature urged to act on Master Plan (1)

Master Plan introduced into House and Senate (1)

Meeting with liaison committee (UC & Department of Education) (2)

Plan drafted by UC Regents and State Board (1)

Plan reaches upper House floor (1)

- Senate approves Master Plan and sends to Assembly (1)
- Senate Education Committee meeting (1)
- Senate revises Plan (1)
- Senator George Miller's Plan (1)
- State college coordinating board (2)
- Supports amendment giving state colleges' board (1)
- 2. Institutional Issues: 6
 - Doctorate programs (1)
 - State college representatives discuss Plan (1)
 - Entrance requirements (1)
 - New campuses at state colleges (1)
 - University of California (2)
 - Enrollment (1)
 - Admissions requirements ((1)
- 3. Other: 2
 - Assemblywoman Donahoe dies (1)
 - Public forum of educators to discuss Plan (1)
- 4. Editorial: 2
 - Doctoral degrees (1)
 - Supports Master Plan (1)

Nearly half, 14 out of 33, of the stories in the *San Francisco Chronicle* are not attributed to any reporter. Seven news stories are by staff reporter Jackson Doyle, five by James Benet, and one by the *Chronicle's* political editor, Earl Beherns. Four news articles appearing in the *San Francisco Chronicle* are by the *Associated Press*.

Part two: Four phases of the Master Plan.

This portion of the research focuses on four distinct phases of news coverage by the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the Master Plan. The first phase is from July 1959 through November 1959. The second phase is from the first public unveiling of the Master Plan for its “sign-off” by the University of California Board of Regents and the State Board of Education at a joint meeting held on December 18, 1959. Any news coverage pertaining to this meeting or other meetings held on this Plan in the month of December is included in this phase. The

third phase is from the legislative session of 1960 when the Master Plan legislation, also known as the Donahoe Act, was adopted by the legislature and signed by the governor. The final phase includes news coverage following the adoption of the new Master Plan through June 30, 1960.

Phase one.

The Master Plan Survey Team held its first meeting in late June of 1959 (Coons, 1968). From July 1959 through November 1959, the survey team met regularly to discuss the establishment of the Master Plan report, due in December to the State Department of Education and the University of California Regents for approval before it could be sent to the legislature. This phase includes all press coverage on the Plan and the establishment of the Plan by the survey team for this four-month period.

In the *Los Angeles Times*, three news articles appear from July 1959 through November 1959. The article “UCLA Professor to Aid UC Head” is the first evidence found on any establishment of the Master Plan Survey Team. The article does not mention the survey team, or its members, but discusses the relationship between a UC professor and the master plan survey. The second article, “Tougher UC Entrance Requirements Sought,” mentions a recommendation by the survey team to narrow the admission criteria for students entering the University of California or the state college campuses. Neither story attributes to any reporter, or attributes the information to any reference source, and both can be found in the local section of the newspaper.

The third story appears on November 30, titled “Committee Will Weigh College Master Plan.” This story outlines the December meetings planned to discuss the Master

Plan for Higher Education. The story includes information on the enrollment crisis that the state would be facing in the future. Dick Turpin wrote the article. Reference sources in this story include Miss Dorothy Donahoe, chairwoman of the Assembly Education Committee, and Governor Brown.

Three news articles on the Master Plan appear in the *Sacramento Bee* from July 1959 to November 1959. The first article, "Plan Would Bar State Colleges from Conducting Basic Research," appears in late October of 1959 and is the first evidence of a public discussion about the Master Plan. The article focuses primarily on the doctorate degree conflict between the University of California and the state colleges. The two sources for the article include J. Burton Vasche, chief of the state college division of the state education department, and Carl Frisen, population expert for the state finance department. This article is not attributed to a specific reporter.

The second article, "UC Regents Hear of Pending Growth," is about a regents meeting that had been held on the University of California Davis campus to discuss the enrollment surge the University of California would be facing in the near future. The sources quoted in the article include: Emil M. Mrak; chancellor of the campus; Clark Kerr, president of the University of California; and Conrad A. Elvehjem, president of the University of Wisconsin. A *Sacramento Bee* staff reporter wrote this article.

The final article included in this phase, "Brown Calls For Improved Higher Education," focuses on Governor Brown's commitment to the Master Plan and how it would be one of his primary objectives during his term in office. This article is not

attributed to any specific reporter, and the Governor is the only news source referenced in the article.

From July 1959 to November 1959, four news articles appear in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Three of the stories do not include a byline, and one story is attributed to the *Associated Press*. Three of the stories cover institutional issues, and one article discusses the political process of the Master Plan.

The first story, "State College Doctorate Study Asked," introduces a special commission to "decide whether State colleges should be allowed to grant doctorate degrees" made up of committee members from the liaison committee (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 1959, p. A10). This story also informs readers of the December meetings in Berkeley on the Master Plan. This story is written as if the reporter is actually observing the committee unveiling. The byline is from Sacramento. The second story is also from Sacramento, "Brown Asks Master Plan for Colleges." This story is written as an endorsement by Governor Brown of the upcoming Master Plan to be agreed upon by a liaison committee consisting of Regents from the University of California and the State Board of Education. Governor Brown is the only quoted source for this news article.

The third story is out of Los Angeles, and gives detail information about a meeting being held by representatives from the 14 California state colleges on the Master Plan for Higher Education. The meeting discusses a report by Glenn Dumke, President of San Francisco State University. The report was not made public, so little details of the report are included in the story. President Dumke is the only person quoted in the story.

The final story in this phase, "Colleges, UC Urged to Get Tough," is also out of Los Angeles. This story leads with the toughening of entrance requirements in the future for both the state colleges and the University of California. The requirements are recommended by the liaison committee of the University of California and Department of Education studying the Master Plan. This article is from the *Associated Press*, and no sources are listed in the story.

Phase two.

In December of 1959, the survey team shared its report with liaison committee, which represented both the State Board of Education and the University of California. The three-day meeting, December 17-19, was the first time the meetings were open to the public and the press. This phase will include any press coverage on the Master Plan from December 1 to December 20, 1959.

From December 1 through December 20, eight stories appear in the *Los Angeles Times* relating to the December meetings held on the Master Plan. *The Los Angeles Times'* education editor, Dick Turpin, wrote every story included in this phase.

The stories are as follows:

Headline	Section	Page
1. Reports to Decide Future Roles of State Colleges	I	1, 7
2. Junior College Future Role Called Vital	I	1, 22
3. Billion State College Expenditures Seen by '75	I	1, 23
4. Solutions to Doctorate Issue Told Educators	I	1, 13
5. Climax Nears on Ph.D. Battle	I	16
6. Master Plan Sought for Higher Education	I	5
7. Master Plan for Colleges Recommended	I	1, 24
8. State Regents Approve Master Education Plan	I	1, 9

All of the news stories are included in the first section, Part I, of the newspaper. Six of the eight stories appear on the front page. One of the stories, "Climax Nears on Ph.D. Battle," is included in the weekly column by Turpin, titled *Report Card*.

In order to understand the relationship between story sources and the Master Plan Survey Team, the initial members of the team are listed below (Coons, 1968).

1. Arthur Coons, President, Occidental College and Chairman, Master Plan Survey Team
University of California (2)
2. Dean E. McHenry, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles
3. Thomas C. Holy, Special Consultant in Higher Education, University of California
- State Colleges (2)
4. Glenn S. Dumke, President, San Francisco State College
5. Arthur D. Browne, Specialist in Higher Education, State Department of Education
- Community Colleges (2)
6. Howard A. Campion, Associate Superintendent, Los Angeles City Schools, Retired
7. Henry T. Tyler, Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association
- Private Colleges (1)
8. Robert J. Wert, Vice-Provost, Stanford University

Coons is referenced in every article, and quoted directly in seven of the eight articles. In addition to Coons, one article quotes Governor Brown; one article quotes various UC Regents; one article quotes Arnold Joyal, president of Fresno State, and Lloyd Morrisett of UCLA, chairman of the subcommittee on institutional capacities and area needs. And one article quotes Harold Campion, member of the survey team. Five of the eight articles use Coons as the only news source.

From December 1 through December 20, 1959, 14 news articles appear in the *Sacramento Bee* relating to the December meetings held on the Master Plan. Fifty

percent of the news articles written during this phase, seven out of fourteen, are by one reporter, Leo Rennert. The stories are as follows:

	Headline	Section	Page
1.	State College, UC Blueprint Revealed	A	1,8
2.	UC State Colleges Rift Flares Anew	A	1
3.	Bigger State College Role is Proposed	A	1,8
4.	Parley to Resolve Row of UC, Colleges is Slated	C	1
5.	Educators Fear Political Blight on Master Plan	C	1
6.	Solons Predict Approval of the Education Plan	A	1,8
7.	UC, State Boards Okeh Higher Education Plan	A	1,4

All of the news stories appear on the first page of either Section A, first section of the newspaper, or Section C, the local section. Five of the seven stories appear on the front page of the newspaper. The remaining two stories appear on the first page of Section C.

The remaining seven stories are from either a wire news source or no bylines are given. The remaining stories are as follows:

	Headline	Section	Page
1.	Education Unit Opposes State College Plans	A	12
2.	Three More UC Campuses Are Proposed in Report	A	8
3.	State College Board Idea Wins Praise	A	12
4.	Tripling of UC College Costs By '75 Is Foreseen	A	14
5.	Okeh Is Foreseen For University, Colleges Plan	A	7
6.	State, UC Aides Will Seek Final Accord On Plan	A	6
7.	Pact Would End UC, College Row	A	1

All of these news stories are included in the front section of the newspaper, with one appearing on the front page.

During phase two, nine news articles appear in the *San Francisco Chronicle* that relate to the December meetings held in Berkeley on the Master Plan. James Benet wrote at least half, five out of nine, of these news articles. Two articles focus primarily on the

report by the Master Plan survey group at the meeting with University of California and the Department of Education officials. One article, "State Plans Huge College Expansion," gives a comprehensive look at the report submitted by the Master Plan survey team, however, it does not quote any source other than the report authors. The second article, "State College Spending to Hit \$1 Billion in 1975," focuses more on California's future college budget according to President Arnold Joyal of Fresno State College. Joyal reported this figure during the liaison committee meeting held on December 8.

The third article leads with the coordination of state colleges and whether or not the Plan should contain such a recommendation. The Plan also discusses in great detail the doctorate issue between the University of California and the state colleges, mainly if the state colleges would be allowed to award degrees under the Plan. Arthur Coons, chairman of the Master Plan Survey Team, is the only source quoted in the article. The fourth story, "Regent Plan for State Colleges," simply tells about the unveiling of the Master Plan at the December meetings. The primary focus of the article is the coordinating board for state colleges and whether or not state colleges should be allowed to offer doctorate degrees. The final article, by James Benet, is "Top College Group OKs Master Plan." This story reports the approval of the Plan by the liaison committee, the University of California and the State Department of Education. Arthur Coons, Clark Kerr, Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post, and Senator Donald L. Grunsky are quoted throughout the article.

Two stories in this phase are by Jackson Doyle. One story focuses on the two campus sites for new state colleges. The second story, "A Master Plan for Higher Education," gives an overview of the upcoming meetings to be held on the Master Plan. This is the only news article that discusses the public forum of the meetings and the controversy between having the December meetings open or closed to the public. The eighth article, "No Chance Seen for State College Regents," voices the opinion that few legislators support the recommendation of a state college coordinating system. No legislators or other sources are quoted as supporting this opinion. The last article focuses on the support by Roy Simpson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for a coordinating body by state colleges. Roy Simpson is the only source quoted in this story.

In addition, one editorial on the Master Plan is included in this phase. The editorial, "Which Way for State Colleges," states that if state colleges are going to be allowed to offer doctoral degrees, the University of California and the state colleges need to maintain the "merit of that degree" by keeping one coordinating board between the two systems of higher education. In addition, the editorial adds the concern about duplication of degrees and manpower for the same programs between these two systems.

Phase three.

The third phase is the legislative session of 1960 when the Master Plan legislation is adopted by the legislature and signed by the governor. This phase includes news articles from December 21, 1959, through April 27, 1960, which is the day the Governor signed the bill into office. There are 18 articles appearing in the *Los Angeles Times* during this phase, and they include:

Date	Headline	Section	Page
12/27/59	More Funds for Scholars Urged	II	3
1/6/60	Plan to Cope With College Enrollment Rise..	III	1,28
1/9/60	Master Plan for Education Gets Support	III	1
2/13/60	Master Plan for Colleges Defended by Brown	I	4
2/27/60	Master Plan for Colleges Asked by Gov. Brown	I	5
3/3/60	Richards Asks State College by Airport	III	2
3/10/60	Fourth Master Plan Proposed on Education	I	16
3/12/60	6 Named to Aid Plan on Higher Education	I	3
3/27/60	Education Leaders Ask Master Plan Essentials	I	3
3/30/60	UC-State College Master Plan OK'D	I	2
4/5/60	Changes OK'd for Colleges Master Plan	I	16
4/5/60	Kern County Lawmaker Dorothy Donahoe Dies	III	1, 2
4/6/60	Master Education Plan Passed by Assembly	I	23
4/6/60	Rites for Miss Donahoe of Assembly Slated	I	29
4/7/60	Miss Donahoe Paid Tribute by Assembly	I	26
4/7/60	Master State College Plan Sent to Brown	I	2
4/10/60	Education Plan New Milestone	II	7
4/27/60	Brown Oks Master Plan for Schools	I	10

All but six stories, a little over 65%, are in the front section of the newspaper. None of the stories appear on the front page. Two stories appear in Section II of the newspaper. Four articles are found in Section III of the newspaper, with three appearing on page one.

Half of the news stories, nine out of eighteen, were from news wires—all stationed in Sacramento. Five of the news articles are from *United Press International*, and four are from *Associated Press*. Four stories have no byline. Three stories in this phase are by Turpin, with two appearing in his *Report Card* column. The final two stories are attributed to a *Los Angeles Times* news correspondent.

Seven out of eighteen stories are written based on either the Master Plan or separate bills under the Master Plan proposal, and none of the stories include quotes from any individual person. Five of the seven stories are from wire news sources, not *Los Angeles Times* news reporters. Three articles in this phase are about Dorothy

Donahoe's death and the instrumental role she played in the passage of the Plan through the legislature.

The only editorial written about the Master Plan by the *Los Angeles Times* is included in this phase, December 26, 1959. The editorial, "A Blueprint for Academic Growth," endorses the Master Plan and the future of academic growth. The editorial states,

The importance of the master plan for higher education just approved by the university of regents and the State Board of Education, therefore, cannot be overemphasized. Without comprehensive planning now we will have to choose between dollars or scholars in the future—and we cannot afford to waste either. (*Los Angeles Times*, 1959, p. 4)

The editorial concludes by asking the public for support of this Plan.

During phase three, December 20, 1959, through April 26, 1960, there are twenty-eight news articles that appear in the *Sacramento Bee*. Eighteen are not attributed to any reporter. Five articles are by Richard Rodda, one is by Richard Van Brackle, and one is by Herbert Phillips, political writer for the *Bee*. Two of the stories are by *United Press International*, and one is by the *Associated Press*. The articles appearing in this phase are listed below.

Date	Headline	Section	Page
12/26/59	Straight A Requirement To Enter UC Denied	A	4
12/29/59	Legislators Set Hearing on UC, . . .	B	1
2/9/60	UC Chief's Aide Boosts College Master. . .	A	10
2/12/60	Legislator Raps Master Plan for. . .	A	14
2/26/60	Governor Urges Okeh of Master. . .	A	2
2/27/60	McPhee Labels Master Plan for Education	A	11
3/1/60	Education Plan Amendment Proposal. . .	A	8
3/4/60	Master Ed Plan is Attacked by National. . .	C	1
3/4/60	Education MP First Hearings are. . .	A	11
3/8/60	Legislature Joint Budget Committee. . .	A	6
3/9/60	Legislation on Education Plan is Prepared	A	5

3/10/60	New Colleges Plan Enters Legislature	A	11
3/12/60	Special Conference Is Set on Ed Plan. . .	A	5
3/15/60	Amendment to Education MP Plan. . .	A	8
3/15/60	Junior Colleges Would Get Aid. . .	A	9
3/16/60	Education Proposal Loses Key Features	A	6
3/18/60	College Head Calls for Approval of Master. . .	A	23
3/21/60	UC President Calls Education Master Plan	A	6
3/23/60	UC, College Board Plans Advances	A	1
3/24/60	Brown Endorses Key Education Plan	A	8
3/26/60	Education Leaders Would Take 2nd. . .	A	6
3/28/60	Key Measure In Master Plan for Education. . .	A	10
3/30/60	Higher Education Master Plan	A	1,4
4/5/60	Dorothy Donahoe Dies. . .	A	1
4/6/60	Education Master Plan Is Advanced	A	1, 10
4/7/60	Legislature Passes Master Plan. . .	A	14
4/7/60	Solon Lauds State College Design Plan	A	14
4/15/60	Solons Student Junior Colleges'. . .	A	3

Six of these stories appear on the first page of the local or main sections, with four appearing on the front page of the newspaper. Every news article, excluding one article on the death of Assemblywoman Donahoe, is about the political process of the Master Plan.

In addition, four editorials are written on the Master Plan during this phase. Two of the editorials discuss the coordinating council recommended in the Plan for the state colleges and emphasize why it is important to include persons from the public, rather than only educators on the council. The third editorial publicly supports the Plan and discusses the importance of the Plan for California. The final editorial in this phase discusses the senate approval of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

From December 21, 1959, through April 27, 1960, 17 news stories appear in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the Master Plan. Almost half of the stories are not attributed to any writer. Five stories are by Jackson Doyle, and one is by Earl Behrens. Three

stories are attributed to the *Associated Press*. Ten stories quote at least one source, with two quoting more than one source. Seven stories attribute the story to no one. The 17 news articles included in this phase are listed below.

Date	Headline	Section	Page
12/25/59	B' Average Still Admits You to UC	A	1,11
1/30/60	Brown Has Doubts On Education Plan	A	7
2/12/60	New Higher Education Plan Blasted	A	4
3/2/60	Legislature Gets State College Bills	A	10
3/9/60	Miller Will Offer Own College Plan	A	6
3/16/60	Master Plan For Colleges Mutilated	A	16
3/17/60	Senators Strip College Plan	A	13
3/23/60	Master Plan Changed by Senate Unit	A	10
3/27/60	Don't Wait On Education Master Plan	A	14
3/28/60	The New Master Plan For State Education	A	11
3/29/60	State Senate Gets Colleges' Master Plan	A	8
3/30/60	Education Plan to be Discussed	A	11
3/30/60	Senate OKs Master Plan for Colleges	A	1
4/5/60	Master College Plan Gets OK of Assembly	A	10
4/5/60	Assemblywoman Donahoe Dies at 49	A	10
4/6/60	College Plan Nears Final Passage	A	1, 10
4/7/60	Legislature Snags One School Bonds, . . .	A	1,6

The *San Francisco Chronicle* did not design its newspaper using multiple sections, just page numbers. Therefore, story placement by this newspaper could only be based on page numbers. Four news articles in this phase appear on the front page of the newspaper.

In addition to 17 news articles, one editorial on the Master Plan appears during this phase. The editorial, "College Master Plan Can Work," gives support of the Plan. In addition, the editorial criticizes the way the news articles about the Master Plan have been written, and denounces "that every virtue [of the Plan] was being removed from the charter of co-existence between the state colleges and the University of California, nothing being left but hollow mockeries" (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 1960, p. 24).

Phase four.

The final phase of the content analysis research concentrates on the press coverage of the Master Plan from April through June, 1960. This Plan was the first of a kind for the state of California, and the researcher thought it would be important to get an idea of any press coverage appearing in the aftermath of such an establishment. Phase four includes press coverage on the Master Plan from April 27, 1960, to June 30, 1960.

During this phase, four news articles appear in the *Los Angeles Times*. Three of the four stories focus primarily on the University of California, two of the stories are about a new campus and one story is about future enrollment. The fourth story was an executive appointment story.

Three news articles appear on the Master Plan during this phase in the *Sacramento Bee*. The first story discusses the final approval by Governor Brown on the Master Plan. One story is about enrollment issues at Sacramento State College. The third story pertains to the University of California and how it was planning to deal with future growth and expansion of the state. None of these news articles are attributed to any specific reporter, and two are wire stories.

Only one article appears in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the Master Plan during phase four. The article, "UC Has Plan for 214,000 in 2000 AD," focuses primarily on the University of California enrollment predictions and growth accommodations. The article quotes Clark Kerr.

Historical Analysis

The second method used in this study is historical research. As the previous section has demonstrated, California was facing a major decision—whether or not to accommodate the enrollment growth expected to hit California’s college and universities. This growth led to budgetary competition within the state budget for various state services, including higher education. In addition to financial constraints, the political environment of the state was another important factor in deciding how the state should proceed (Smelser & Almond, 1974).

While the Master Plan Survey Team estimated costs to accommodate the expansion of growth, many people thought the costs were underestimated (Smelser & Almond, 1974). During that same period, demands from other state services, such as welfare and healthcare, were also increasing. The financial pressures led to consideration of cost saving strategies for higher education, such as year-round operation.

The first campus of the University of California was established in 1848, the campus known today as the University of California at Berkeley (Palola et al., 1970). Over the next fifty years, the University of California expanded to include five additional campuses.

The passage of the Master Plan positioned the University of California as the only research-based multi-campus public university system, and the only public university in California permitted to award doctoral degrees. As evidenced by this focus, the “organized research budget for the university increased more than tenfold” between 1950

and 1970 (Palola et al., 1970, p. 54). The university was clearly designated the most prestigious of the California public systems of higher education by the Master Plan.

By fall of 1947, seven state colleges had been established with a total enrollment of 19,300 students (Palola et al., 1970, p. 75).

The Education code had long defined the primary function of the state colleges to be the training of teachers, although as early as 1935, the legislature authorized courses for students in the fields other than teacher education so that the state colleges could serve general regional needs. (p. 75)

A major issue between the state colleges and the University of California was the right to offer doctoral degrees. When the state colleges lost this battle, it made obtaining state support for research difficult. “The state colleges had a foot in the research door, but financing was so modest that the university maintained a virtual monopoly on organized and sponsored research (Palola et al., 1970, p. 55). The joint doctoral program, included in the Master Plan for Higher Education, was virtually nonexistent following the Plan’s enactment.

One of the strengths of the California’s system of higher education has been the community colleges. In 1910, the first public community college was established in Fresno, California. By 1960, there were approximately 62 community colleges throughout the state.

This section illustrates the financial and political pressures California and its public colleges confronted in the late 50s and early 60s.

Statistical Analysis

Analyzing existing statistics provides additional source data to the content analysis and historical research methods by including demographics, school and college enrollment information, and information relevant during the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Demographics of the State

In 1960, California was the second largest among the states (Census, 1961a). In 1960, California's population increased to 15, 717, 204 from 10, 586,223 in 1950, an increase of 48.5%. Only 8% of the population was non-white. Approximately 35% of the population was under the age of 18 (Census, 1961b; Census, 1952).

School and College Enrollment

High school and college enrollment in California was expected to boom in the 1960s. The future enrollment forecast enabled the state to begin planning for the enrollment demand of college-age students. In 1960, California had the largest number of students enrolled in high school compared to all other states (Census, 1961a). It was also the leader in the number of students enrolled in a college or university and second in the nation in the number of higher education institutions within a state.

In 1960, 447,995 students were enrolled in a California college or university (Census, 1961b). Future enrollment predictions forced state leaders to decide whether or not California's colleges and universities would be able to accommodate future enrollment demand or to deny students an opportunity to higher education. Governor Brown, with assistance from the Master Plan Survey Team, supported a plan that kept the

doors to college open to any student who could benefit from a college or university education.

Migration into California

In addition to demographics and school enrollment figures, migration into California also played a role in the challenges to the state. Of the total population growth of the state between April 1950 and April 1960, 3,145,000 was accounted for by net migration. This figure represents the number of people moving into the state during this period (Census, 1961b).

All of the data on population growth, enrollment demand, and migration reinforce the situation California was facing in the early 1960s. One of the leading concerns at this time was the major growth in college-age persons.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

In 1960, the leaders of California were faced with a decision: provide college opportunity for any student who could benefit or deny access to hundreds of thousands of students. Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe led the effort, with assistance from the Master Plan Survey Team and with support of the governor, to establish a plan for accommodating the anticipated growth of students expected to hit California's colleges and universities. The purpose of this research study is to review and report on the press coverage of the 1960 Master Plan of Higher Education in California by three major state newspapers.

Research indicates that there has been a significant shift in the way higher education is reported in newspapers over the years. Today most major newspapers have a separate person covering education and higher education issues. In the early 1960s, most newspapers were using the same reporter to cover both topic areas. This research study suggests, however, that while the three newspapers in the study had education writers, they were not necessarily the same people who wrote the articles on the Master Plan issue. This may have prevented in-depth stories from being written on the issue, because people who write on one subject are generally better informed on that subject. A reporter who understood the political climate may have had the ability to apply pressure on the survey team, legislature and governor. In addition, reporters in the education field may have been less inclined to talk to the same news sources, because they presumably would

be better informed about the education sources compared to reporters who did not cover the issue on a regular basis.

One major finding of the research is that the Master Plan was covered more heavily than any other higher education issue during the period under study. From July 1959 to June 1960, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* had a larger portion of news articles on the Master Plan issue than any other issue on higher education. Approximately 15% of all news stories in the *Los Angeles Times*, 17% in the *Sacramento Bee*, and 15% in the *San Francisco Chronicle* focused on the Master Plan.

Since newspapers covered the issue extensively, the newspaper reporters assigned to the story defined the issue as an important one for the public to acknowledge. These acts of support for this issue, coupled with state leaders support of the issue, created a supportive climate for the public on this issue. Agenda-setting theory posits that the public form opinions of the issues based on how they are covered in the press. The media informed the public of their own support of the Master Plan in the way that they covered the issue.

Despite the lack of reporters assigned to a higher education beat in the 1960s, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Sacramento Bee*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* still had writers who covered the issue. There were a small number of critical stories written about the Master Plan issue. Most writers focused primarily on the political process of the Master Plan.

Another major finding of the research is that private meetings prevented press discussions about the Master Plan and isolated the conversation to a small group of individuals. When Coons agreed to head the Master Plan Survey Team, it was with the understanding that the meetings would remain closed off from the public (Coons, 1968). According to Coons, the survey team would not be as effective if the meetings were open to the press. “The team believed it would be impossible to carry through the work of planning, of necessity involving the frankest discussions, if every meeting were open and subject to reporting in the public press” (Coons, 1968, p. 42). By excluding the press from the discussion, the debate was limited to a handful of players.

Out of the 112 news articles appearing in the three newspapers, approximately 34 different news sources were used. Of those 34, 18 news sources were used only once in the stories. The leading sources included Arthur Coons with 19 references and Clark Kerr with 14 references. Legislative leaders made up about one-third of the number of references, with Governor Brown quoted in about 12 articles. Three members of the Master Plan Survey Team were quoted in various articles, and five college presidents were quoted once each. This finding suggests that a small number of education leaders and their legislative allies were able to control the public information and therefore the press coverage, at least during the establishment of the Plan.

Most news articles did not attribute or identify sources of information used in the stories. Today, most news reporters use a handful of sources to complete one story. In order for the story to be considered objective, a reporter is usually required to have at least two sources of information, one person from each opposing viewpoint. During the

time of study, 27 news articles (nearly 25%) did not identify the news sources used in the story.

Lastly, the research indicates that the *Sacramento Bee* covered the issue more thoroughly than any other newspaper. The establishment of the Master Plan was not covered as an education story but as a political story. Again, one reason for this could have been the closed meetings held prior to the creation of the Plan. As the Plan became more public during the legislative process, the capitol paper covered the issue more frequently. This may be one reason why the *Sacramento Bee* covered the issue more in terms of quantity and quality than the other two newspapers.

Contribution to Practice and Theory

The purpose of this study is to analyze the print coverage of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. This study uses agenda-setting theory to examine the relationship between what the media covers and the public agenda. The research indicates there is a strong correlation between the way the press covered the Master Plan issue and the way the public may have felt about the issue. Most of the stories publicly supported the establishment of the Master Plan while few articles expressed criticism. In addition, the research suggests that the public's view of the establishment of the Master Plan was limited because public discussion of the Plan was kept to a minimum until the Plan was approved by the legislature.

Limitations of the Study

There are two major limitations to this study. First, technology did not allow the research to be compared to other major public policy decisions of the late 1950s and early

1960s. For example, the Master Plan for Higher Education could not be compared to the water use plan adopted during the same period without extensive research. Today, technology allows a researcher to compare many topics with communication databases. Forty years ago, the databases did not exist. In addition, no newspaper included in this study had a higher education reporter covering the issues in late 1959 and early 1960. The press coverage of the Master Plan may have been affected if each newspaper had a reporter covering only higher education issues.

Contributions of the Study

The research indicates that little is known about how higher education issues are covered. In California, one study evaluated the press coverage of the early 1990s by four major newspapers in the state. This study is the only research conducted on the press coverage of the Master Plan for Higher Education, and one of the few studies on the press coverage of higher education issues in California. This study contributes significant resources to understanding of the press: how they cover public policy issues; the shift in education reporting; and the development of the higher education beat.

Future Research

Future research might include a current analysis of higher education reporting in California, since an analysis has not been conducted in the past five years. In addition, future research might include press coverage on recommended changes to the Master Plan: how today's press covers the issue, which news sources are quoted, and how supportive the news articles appear. Finally, additional research in this area could

include an analysis of the education and higher education press and how the industry has changed over the years.

This was one of the most important public policy decisions in California's history. The research indicates that the press covered the issue systematically but only after the major decisions by the Master Plan Survey Team and the higher education leaders had been made. Today, public policy decisions about our colleges and universities can not take place behind closed doors. It seems unlikely, given the more extensive inquiry on the part of today's press, that such a momentous decision could be made without public knowledge. Even if such a decision was made under public scrutiny, it could not have been completed in such a short period of time. These differences indicate a much-changed relationship between the press and public-policy makers in the last 40 years.

References

A blueprint for academic growth. (1959, December 26). *The Los Angeles Times*, p. 4, section C.

Altschull, J. Herbert. (1990). From Milton to McLuhan. New York: Longman.

Babbi, Earl. (1998). The practice of social research (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bagdikian, Ben H. (1997). The media monopoly (5th ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Berger, Arthur Asa. (1998). Media analysis techniques. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bohler, Robert. (1998, September 26). "Teaching Tomorrow's Journalists by Example Today." Editor & Publisher, 70-71.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), (2000). Providing for Progress: California higher education enrollment demand and resources into the 21st century. Sacramento: Warren Fox.

Case, Tony. (1995, June, 3). Educator makes a plea to the press. Editor & Publisher, 25-26.

Chance, William C. (1993). The press and California higher education. San Jose: The California Higher Education Policy Center.

Cirino, Robert. (1971). Don't blame the people. New York: Random House.

Cirino, Robert (1974). The Power to Persuade. New York: Brantam Book, Inc.

College master plan can work. (1960, March 29). *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. 24.

Cook, Timothy E. (1998). Governing with the news. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coons, Arthur G. (1968). Crisis in California higher education. Los Angeles: The Ward Richie Press.

Dickerson, James R. (1986, February). Messages: The Washington Post media companion. Allyn and Bacon. The Washington Post Writers Group. pp. 262-265.

Doyle, Denis P. (1998). Education and the press: Ignorance is bliss. In Gene Maeroff (Ed). Imaging education (pp. 46-57). New York: Teachers College Press.

Drake, Norman. (1991, September). School reform or media reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 71, p. 57.

Editor & Publisher (November 19, 1960). Newspaper circulation figures. September-December, 1960. Editor & Publisher 93, 3.

Gerbner, George. (1967, Summer) "Newsmen and schoolmen: the state and problems of education reporting." Journalism Quarterly, 44, 211-224.

Hansen, W.L. & Weisbrod, B. A. (1969). Benefits, costs, and finance of public higher education. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

Hynds, Ernest C. (1989, Autumn). "Survey finds large daily newspapers have improved coverage of education." Journalism Quarterly, 66, 692-696, 780.

Kerr, Clark. (1992). The California Master Plan of 1960 for Higher Education. In Sheldon Rothblatt (Ed.). The OECD, The Master Plan and the California Dream: A Berkeley Conversation. (pp.47-61). Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Kann, Peter. (1994, October 29). 10 Disturbing Trends in U.S. Journalism. Editor & Publisher, 127, 18-22.

Kaplan, George R. (1992). Images of education: The mass media's version of American schools. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Krippendorff, Klaus (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Master Plan Survey Team. (1960). A master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975. Transmitted to the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

McCombs, Maxwell & Bell, Tamara. (1996). The agenda-setting role of mass communications. In Salwen, Micheal B. and Stacks, W. Don (Eds.), An integrated approach to communication theory and research (pp. 93-110). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McQuail, Denis (1977). Analysis of Newspaper Content. London: Royal Commission on the Press.

Palola, E. G., Lehmann, T., & Blishcke, W. R. (1970). Higher education by design: The sociology of planning. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

Pickerell, A.G. & Dornin, M. (1968). The University of California: A Pictorial History. Berkeley: The Regents of the University of California.

Public Agenda (1997). Good News, Bad News: What people really think about the education press. New York: Steve Farkas.

Roshco, Bernard. (1975). Newsmaking. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

San Francisco Chronicle (1960). June 10. In house advertisement.

Schrag, Peter. (1998). Paradise lost: California's experience, America's future. New York: The New Press.

Smelser, N. J. & Almond, G. (eds.). (1974). Public Higher Education in California. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stadtman, Verne A. (1970). The University of California 1868-1968. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

State college doctorate study asked. (1959, October 16). *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. A10.

Statistical Abstract of the United States (82nd ed.). (1961). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Stein, M.L. (1994, December 17). Has Journalism Run Amok in Sensationalism? Editor & Publisher, 127, 9-10.

Stempel, Guido III & Westley, Bruce H. (1981). Research Methods in Mass Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Prentice-Hall. pp. 120-131.

Strickland, Dorothy S. (1998). Reading and the media. In Gene Maeroff (Ed.), Imaging education (pp. 101-115). New York: Teachers College Press.

Trombley, William. Personal interview. April 30, 1999.

Tuchman, Gaye. (1974). Making news. New York: The Free Press.

Tyack, David & Cuban, Larry. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Vol II, Characteristics of the population, Part 5, California. (1952) Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Vol I, Characteristics of the population, Part 1, United States Summary. (1961a) Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Vol I, Characteristics of the population, Part 5, California. (1961b) Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Watson, Aleta. (1998). The newspaper's responsibility. In Gene Macroff (Ed.), Imaging education (pp. 13-26). New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Part	Page
8/12/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	UC Professor to Aid UC Head	III	2
10/15/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Plan Would Bar State Colleges. . .	C	1
10/16/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	State College Doctorate Study Asked	A	10
10/24/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC Regents Hear of Pending Growth	A	13
11/10/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Brown Calls For Improved High. . .	C	1
11/11/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Brown Asks Master Plan for Colleges. . .	A	9
11/14/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	State College Coordination Talks Begin	A	6
11/19/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Tougher UC Entrance Requirement. . .	III	7
11/22/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Colleges, UC Urged to Get Tough	A	28
11/30/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Committee Will Weigh College	I	20
12/2/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Unit Opposes State College. . .	A	12
12/3/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Delay Asked on 2 State Colleges. . .	A	16
12/6/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	A Master Plan for Higher Education	3	8
12/7/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Three More UC Campuses Are. . .	A	8
12/7/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	State College, UC Blueprint Revealed	A	1,8
12/7/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Reports to Decide Future Role	I	1, 7
12/8/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	State Plans Huge College Expansion	A	1,6
12/8/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	State College Board Idea Wins Praise	A	12
12/8/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Junior College Future Role Called Vital	I	1, 22
12/8/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC State Colleges Rift Flares Anew	A	1
12/9/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Bigger State College Role is Proposed	A	1,8
12/9/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Tripling of UC College Costs By '75 Seen	A	14
12/9/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Billion State College Expenditure. . .	I	1, 23
12/9/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	State College Spending to Hit \$1 Billion. . .	A	6
12/10/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Parley to Resolve Row of UC, Colleges. . .	C	1
12/10/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Solutions to Doctorate Issue Told	I	1, 13
12/10/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Regent Plan for State Colleges	A	2
12/10/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Master Plan Calls. . .	D	16
12/11/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Okeh Is Foreseen For University Colleges	A	7
12/12/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Joint Doctorate Plan Offers Good. . .	B	20
12/13/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Climax Nears on Ph.D. Battle	I	16
12/14/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Which Way for State Colleges?	A	46
12/15/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	No Chance Seen for State College Regents	A	6
12/16/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	State, UC Aids Will Seek Final. . .	A	6
12/17/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Plan Sought for Higher. . .	I	5
12/17/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Simpson for State College Regent Plan	A	20
12/17/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Pact Would End UC, College Row	A	1
12/17/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Educators Fear Political Blight. . .	C	1
12/18/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Solons Predict Approval of the Education	A	1,8
12/18/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Plan for Colleges Recommended. . .	I	1, 24
12/18/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Top College Group OKs Master Plan	A	1,5
12/19/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Brown, Regents Okay College Plan	A	2

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Part	Page
12/19/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC, State Boards Oked Higher. . .	A	1,4
12/19/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	State Regents Approve Master	I	1, 9
12/25/59	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	B' Average Still Admits You to UC. . .	A	1,11
12/26/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Straight A Requirement To Enter UC. . .	A	4
12/26/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	A Blueprint for Academic Growth	III	4
12/27/59	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	More Funds for Scholars Urged	II	3
12/28/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Public Has A Place in Education. . .	D	10
12/29/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Legislators Set Hearing on UC. . .	B	1
12/30/59	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Spell Out Public's Right	B	16
1/6/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Plan to Cope With College Enrollment. . .	III	1,28
1/9/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Plan for Education Gets Support	III	1
1/11/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Searching Examination	D	8
1/30/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Brown Has Doubts On Education Plan	A	7
2/9/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC Chief's Aide Boosts College. . .	A	10
2/12/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	New Higher Education Plan Blasted	A	4
2/12/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Legislator Raps Master Plan for. . .	A	14
2/13/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Plan for Colleges Defended. . .	I	4
2/26/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Governor Urges Okeh of Master Ed...	A	2
2/27/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Plan for Colleges As...	I	5
2/27/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	McPhee Labels Master Plan for	A	11
3/1/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Plan Amendment Proposal. . .	A	8
3/2/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Legislature Gets State College Bills	A	10
3/3/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Richards Asks State College By. . .	III	2
3/4/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education MP First Hearings are. . .	A	11
3/4/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Master Education Plan is Attacked. . .	C	1
3/8/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Legislature Joint Budget Committee. . .	A	6
3/9/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Miller Will Offer Own College Plan	A	6
3/9/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Legislation on Education Plan is Prepared	A	5
3/10/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	New Colleges Plan Enters Legislature	A	11
3/10/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Fourth Master Plan Proposed On...	I	16
3/12/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Special Conference Is Set on Ed Plan. . .	A	5
3/12/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	6 Named to Aid Plan on Higher	I	3
3/15/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Amendment to Education MP Plan. . .	A	8
3/15/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Junior Colleges Would Get Aid. . .	A	9
3/16/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Master Plan For Colleges Mutilated	A	16
3/16/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Proposal Loses Key Features	A	6
3/17/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Senators Strip College Plan	A	13
3/18/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	College Head Calls for Approval of. . .	A	23
3/21/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC President Calls Education Master Plan	A	6
3/23/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	UC, College Board Plans Advances. . .	A	1
3/23/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Master Plan Changed by Senate Unit	A	10
3/24/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Brown Endorses Key Education Plan	A	8
3/26/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Leaders Would Take 2 nd . . .	A	6
3/27/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Don't Wait On Education Master Plan	A	14

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Part	Page
3/27/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Education Leaders Ask Master	I	3
3/28/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	The New Master Plan For State Education	A	11
3/28/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Key Measure In Master Plan for. . .	A	10
3/29/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	College Master Plan Can Work	A	24
3/29/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	State Senate Gets Colleges' Master Plan	A	8
3/30/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Education Plan to be Discussed	A	11
3/30/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Senate OKs Master Plan for Colleges	A	1
3/30/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Higher Education Master Plan	A	1,4
3/30/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	UC-State College Master Plan OK'd	I	2
4/2/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Senate Ed Plan Is Good Yeoman. . .	B	24
4/5/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Kern County Lawmaker Dorothy. . .	III	1, 2
4/5/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Changes OK'd for Colleges Master Plan	I	16
4/5/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Assemblywoman Donahoe Dies at 49	A	10
4/5/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Dorothy Donahoe Dies. . .	A	1
4/5/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Master College Plan Gets OK of Assembly	A	10
4/6/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	College Plan Nears Final Passage	A	1, 10
4/6/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Rites for Miss Donahoe of Assembly. . .	I	29
4/6/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master Education Plan Passe...	I	23
4/6/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Education Master Plan Is Advanced...	A	1, 10
4/7/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Master State College Plan Sent to Brown	I	2
4/7/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Miss Donahoe Paid Tribute by Assembly	I	26
4/7/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	Legislature Snags One School Bonds. . .	A	1,6
4/7/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Solon Lauds State College Design Plan	A	14
4/7/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Legislature Passes Master Plan. . .	A	14
4/10/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Education Plan New Milestone	II	7
4/15/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Solons Student Junior Colleges'. . .	A	3
4/27/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Governor Signs Education Plan	A	1, 6
4/27/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Brown OKs Master Plan for Schools	I	10
4/30/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Plan to be Watched	B	20
5/8/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Student Boom Brings Crisis	VII	p. 3
5/16/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	UC Alumni Group Told of New	III	1
5/21/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	UC Gets More Details on Site	I	3
6/15/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	Tighter Rules on Eligibility Will Have. . .	C	3
6/18/60	<i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	UC Has Plan for 214,000 in 2000	A	3
6/23/60	<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Dr. McHenry Gets New Post at UCLA	I	25
6/24/60	<i>Sacramento Bee</i>	State Maps Way to Handle 600,000. . .	C	3