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ABSTRACT

Universities and colleges in the U.S. are constantly mentioned in lists such as The Princeton Review’s Top Party School list or similar rankings that can potentially impact the institution, as well as local news coverage regarding the institution’s ranking and the drinking and partying habits of its student body. This study explores media coverage of party schools through a lens of framing and relationship management theories. Through a quantitative content analysis of news frames used in local news coverage of universities or colleges with noted “party school” reputations in the 2016 to 2017 academic school year, as well as frames represented in the official university responses, this study uncovers how universities with these noted reputations are framed by the local news media. In addition, the study explores the ways in which university responses to media coverage impact the potentially mutually-beneficial relationship between higher education institutions and its stakeholders, as it is a primary function of public relations (Kim et al., 2007). In order to examine the predominant frames used by local news media in college towns and “party school” university responses, frames of negative emotional appeal, morality, human interest and harm reduction were explored to determine their salience in written messages found in news headlines and university responses. The results of this study provide explanations to a phenomenon that largely impacts the reputation of a higher education institution in the U.S., as well as implications for the management of relationships between the media and universities.
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GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Universities and colleges in the U.S. are constantly mentioned in lists such as The Princeton Review’s Top Party School list or similar rankings that can potentially impact the institution, as well as local news coverage regarding the institution’s ranking and the drinking and partying habits of its student body. This study explores media coverage of party schools, pertaining to how they are portrayed in the media as well as how they manage relationships with stakeholders. This study analyzes news frames used in local news coverage of universities or colleges with noted “party school” reputations in the 2016 to 2017 academic school year, as well as frames represented in the official university responses, to uncover how universities with these noted reputations are portrayed by the local news media. In addition, the study explores the ways in which university responses to media coverage impact the potentially mutually-beneficial relationship between higher education institutions and its stakeholders, as it is a primary function of public relations (Kim et al., 2007). Frames were explored to determine their prevalence in messages found in news headlines and university responses. The results of this study provide explanations to a phenomenon that largely impacts the reputation of a higher education institution in the U.S., as well as implications for the management of relationships between the media and universities.
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Introduction

In August 2014, Coastal Carolina University (CCU) was visited by party tour company, “I’m Shmacked,” stirring up a sizable ruckus in the southern state’s local community of Conway, SC. “I’m Shmacked” earns money by travelling the country and hosting large events with the promise of music and alcohol to entice college students to attend (Kingkade, 2016). These parties are later chronicled on the company’s social media through web videos that have racked up over 400,000 views on its YouTube, Facebook and Twitter accounts. The videos typically contain images of college students engaging in party behavior; drinking, dancing and hanging out with peers.

While the parties may seem harmless and means of friendly competition to see which school has the most “fun”, “I’m Shmacked” has been criticized for the damaging effects it can have on the students and the university’s reputation, including the promotion of alcohol and rape cultures on college campuses (Engel & Smith, 2014). The party held for CCU students, which was recorded and posted on “I’m Shmacked’s” YouTube channel, resulted in the arrests of over 30 students, including cases for underage drinking, public urination and disorderly conduct (Perry, 2015). In addition to the numerous legal altercations that took place, the party-promotion group also faced backlash from the university due to the negative media attention the university received after the event. CCU is not the only university that has been exploited by “I’m Shmacked”; other universities have had their videos posted online, such as the University of Miami, West Virginia University and The University of Arizona, to name a few.

Unfortunately, “I’m Shmacked” is not the only problem facing the culture college students live in today. Universities and colleges in the U.S. are constantly met with lists such as The Princeton Review’s “Top Party School” list or similar online rankings that can potentially
impact the institutions on a higher scale. The party tour typically visits schools that have been mentioned on various lists that can be found on the Internet. According to a more recent list by Niche, rankings are typically based on self-reported student reviews as well as nightlife statistics from the U.S. Census (Niche, 2018). This poses a particular question: aside from self-reported statistics, what does it mean for a higher education institution to be classified as a “party school”?

It is well-documented and researched that alcohol and other drug use may contribute to a plethora of negative health effects for college-age students (Lindo et al., 2015; Hansen & Gunter, 2012; Quick & Bates, 2010; Ruddock, 2009). For many, alcohol use, particularly habits of binge-drinking and large-scale partying, are just part of the inevitable college experience. For others, while this may be true in some cases, it is also indicative of potentially dangerous consequences for the students, as well as a potentially negative portrayal and perception of universities or colleges with these rankings. Prior literature has also noted the importance of mutually beneficial relationships between organizations (Sung & Yang, 2009; Ledingham, 2003; Waters & Bortree, 2012) and explored the impacts of media coverage of university activities on the relationship between the two entities (Kim et al., 2007), but few studies have focused exclusively on the various ways of portraying higher education institutions by local news media and how that may contribute to the success of the relationship between them. In the field of public relations and higher education, filling a gap in the literature is necessary in order to provide real-world implications for the management of relationships between the media and universities/colleges, as well as to provide explanations to a phenomenon that largely impacts the reputation of a higher education institution in the United States.
Through a quantitative frame analysis of local news articles from university towns, as well as university responses, this study seeks to offer an answer to the previously asked question, what does it mean for a higher education institution to be classified as a party school, as well as implications for university response to alcohol and drug abuse and party culture on campuses. First, this study reviewed prior literature regarding alcohol use at universities and colleges within the United States, portrayals of higher education institutions in the media, what is considered a public relations crisis for U.S. universities and colleges, as well as a review of applicable theoretical frameworks that guide further research questions. Then, the study examined local news coverage as well as university coverage of partying among students through framing theory, to discern the ways in which “party schools” are being portrayed in news media. While a party school reputation can be a badge of honor for some, because of the negative connotations associated with heavy alcohol and drug use as well as young adults partying with lowered inhibitions, this may compromise a university’s primary function: to teach and inspire young, often impressionable individuals. In addition, the present study also explores the ways in which university responses to media coverage impact the potentially mutually-beneficial relationship between higher education institutions and local news media.

**Literature Review**

**Alcohol Use at U.S. Colleges and Universities**

The United States is home to some of the most prestigious higher education institutions in the world. Prominent universities such as Harvard and Princeton are known worldwide, creating an international allure for students, professors and researchers alike to attend in the hopes of higher education. Approximately 5,300 colleges and universities are in existence today, and in 2015, 4,627 institutions granted degrees to students in the United States (Selingo, 2015;
Chepkemoi, 2017). As higher education in the U.S. sees more enrollment, it is not uncommon to see numerous news stories in a year about prevalent alcohol use and abuse on college campuses (Mariwala, 2015). A large portion of American college students, both above and below the legal minimum drinking age, engage in binge-drinking (Mariwala, 2015; National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2015). Because of the prevalence of this behavior, it has often been negatively regarded and referred to as an “epidemic” by many public health professionals (Hoffman et al., 2017, p. 864). Additionally, parents of college students tend to frame alcohol and other drug use as “problematic,” citing drinking and driving as a major contributor (Menegatos et al., 2016).

Intentionally or not, this creates a drinking culture on college campuses, that can often result in negative consequences for the students who engage in binge-drinking or partying behaviors. Negative incidents include sexual assault, alcohol-related vehicle crashes, and other bodily harm. Approximately 1,825 college students between 18 and 24 years old die due to alcohol-related injuries, while about 97,000 students report an alcohol-related sexual assault or date rape from 1998 to 2001 (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2015). Regardless of these detrimental health and safety consequences, drinking has become a central part of the college experience (McMurtrie, 2014). In fact, some college students and college-age individuals may participate in risky drinking behaviors such as binge drinking or partying, without a full understanding of the risks they face (Ruddock, 2009). Attention to alcohol related crimes, and other incidents such as car and personal accidents, in addition to attention to alcohol use by health professionals, parents and other media, have been suggested to influence how consumers perceive the severity, prevalence and familiarity of the risks associated with alcohol consumption (Slater & Rasinski, 2005). While not every college student truly engages in these
activities, many researchers and authors have noted the existence of a party culture in American higher education institutions (Lindo et al., 2015; Wade, 2017). Alcohol and other drug use contribute to a variety of health risks, such as potential injury and/or addiction among college students, partying at colleges and universities, and it may also lead to incidents of sexual assault on college campuses (Lindo et al., 2015). Due to these negative health and safety consequences, it is increasingly important to examine the party culture in U.S. colleges and universities to better understand how it impacts the institution and the students who attend it.

High-risk drinking and other drug use on college campuses, coupled with other factors, lend to the concept of a “party school” in recent decades. An institution’s ranking as a “party school” has become such a popular notion, that dozens of lists are assembled on the Internet each academic year, including rankings by The Princeton Review, Niche and Playboy magazine (Kingkade, 2016; McCluskey, 2016; Niche, 2018). For example, The Princeton Review has compiled lists for the “20 top party schools” each year since 1993, based on surveys distributed to 143,000 students at 381 different institutions (Kingkade, 2016). The rankings are based on “a combination of low personal daily study hours (outside of class), high usages of alcohol and drugs on campus,” and high popularity of fraternities and sororities, or Greek life, on campus (The Princeton Review, 2018, 46). Additionally, the magazine Playboy releases a list of “top 10” party schools once every year since 2009 (Priyadarshine, 2017). More recently, Niche released its list for 2018, reporting the data was based on student reviews on the Niche website as well as nightlife statistics. Institutions on this list provide social opportunities both on and off campus. Students would rate their peers as “being fun, friendly and into partying” (Niche, 2018). While being characterized as “fun” or “friendly” may not contain an inherent negative connotation,
partying itself is often associated with dangerous, high risk activities that some might view as negative.

For the 2016-2017 academic school year, *The Princeton Review* list included universities such as University of Wisconsin-Madison, West Virginia University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Lehigh University, Bucknell University, University of Iowa, University of Mississippi, Syracuse University, Tulane University, and Colgate University, in the top 10 list (Kingkade, 2016). According to McMurtrie (2014), “a student’s death or an unwelcome party school ranking might prompt action” from the university (10), but it can also result in media and legal attention to alcohol-related issues (Jones, 2016). While universities may issue public responses to party school rankings, as UW-Madison released in 2017, it may also be brought to the public’s attention by way of local news outlets, like that by Syracuse.com in 2017 when the university appeared in the top five on the list (Herbert, 2017).

The prevalence of alcohol use and abuse by students on college campuses in the United States is often regarded by many publics as a negative, inevitable facet of the college experience. Many studies within communication have explored alcohol consumption among teenagers and young, college-age adults (Hansen & Gunter, 2012), binge drinking and alcohol awareness tactics for young drinkers (Ruddock, 2009), negative health behaviors, and excessive alcohol consumption among college students (Quick & Bates, 2010). Some perceived health risks are associated with attitudes regarding binge drinking, favorable source appraisal from those in a social group, and intentions to drink mass quantities. Because previous literature has revealed that those at and above the legal drinking age in the U.S. were more likely to think negatively about drinking than those under the age of 21 (Quick & Bates, 2010), a link can be found between excessive alcohol use by college students and negative thoughts about drinking. Risky
drinking and partying behaviors can lead to dangerous consequences to the students’ health as well as contributing to a reputation of the institution as a “party school.”

**Universities & the Media**

According to Kim et al. (2007), news media and universities have a symbiotic relationship. For many local news outlets, universities can be a vital news source while news media also keep community members informed about university activities (Kim et al., 2007, p. 233). In today’s world, media can play a large role in influencing public belief (Happer & Philo, 2013). Kim and colleagues (2007) found that unfavorable, negative perceptions of the university by individuals led to decreased support for the university overall. Media publicity for a university – positive or negative – may influence the image of the university. Negative publicity in particular shapes peoples’ opinions and can have various adverse effects on the institution. Their findings emphasized the “importance of a mutually-beneficial relationship between the organization and the media” (Kim et al., 2007, p. 235).

Universities in the media can be portrayed in a variety of ways. In popular culture, the excessive use of alcohol and other drugs at colleges and universities is often wildly exaggerated. Certain films (i.e. *Project X* and *Animal House*), television shows, social media and other popular media frequently portray college students engaging in unhealthy partying and drinking behaviors. This often leads to a debate about whether or not college students really engage in these activities, and, if they do, whether or not are they participating because they think that is what is expected of them (Govil, 2015).

Negative portrayals in the media are not limited to popular movies and television shows. Portrayals of alcohol consumption in media advertisements, particularly for a college demographic, is often attributed with having fun, relaxing and adventure; traits that can be very
“desirable” and persuasive to young people (Hansen & Gunter, 2012, p. 283). With regard to U.S. institutions and its positions as “party schools,” there are a variety of local news reports from universities about its rankings. For instance, the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel covered in 2017 UW-Madison’s decline on The Princeton Review’s list of top party schools (Herzog, 2017). Similarly, a newspaper in Iowa City, reported about schools on the rise of the top party school list such as Tulane University and the University of Iowa on the top party school list (“Tulane University,” 2013). While one institution may take pride in its ranking as a party school, the ranking may also re-emphasize the dangers of high-risk alcohol consumption and the steps administration is taking to create a safe environment for students. One such instance of this occurred in the statement issued by UW-Madison after receiving the ranking of the third top party school in the nation in 2016. In a statement issued for the 2016-17 cycle, UW-Madison commented: “Students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison have an incredible sense of pride in this institution and great camaraderie with their fellow Badgers that contributes to making our university an enjoyable place to attend school. But this is only half the story” (Kingkade, 2016, p. 13). Comments such as these suggest that there is a balance between acknowledging an institution’s ranking and shifting the focus towards the academic aspect of a university and college.

Large, partying events or a legal incident such as a student death, hazing in fraternities/sororities and/or sexual assault, may also call for local news coverage. For example, a fraternity pledge at Louisiana State University died of alcohol poisoning following a hazing ritual from his organization in 2017, as reported by The Advocate, the local Baton Rouge, AL newspaper (Allen, 2017). Because students involved in fraternities or sororities have reported higher rates of binge-drinking and other alcohol-related problems than students who are not
associated with Greek life, there is often a stereotype that the presence of Greek life on a college campus leads to a “party” atmosphere (Brown-Rice & Furr, 2015). On the other hand, schools can respond to news stories directly in press release statements or indirectly with various actions, such as policy changes. While schools may not be able to prevent risky behaviors from happening, or prevent them from being discussed by the media, colleges will sometimes adopt policies that encourage responsible drinking behaviors as opposed to abstinence (Mariwala, 2015). A different, more recent example of a university’s response to negative publicity, came in the light of the alleged rape of the University of Virginia (UVA) student in 2014 (Hartmann, 2015). When Rolling Stone published a story about a freshman female UVA student who was drinking at a college party and subsequently was allegedly sexually assaulted by members of a campus fraternity, the university president responded by suspending the activities of all fraternity organizations (DeBonis & Shapiro, 2014). The story, along with its questioned validity, sparked controversy in the UVA community and across the country, resulting in numerous lawsuits and conversations about drinking and sexual assault on college campuses in the U.S. (Hartmann, 2015).

Various forms of media, from entertainment to informative news media, have been shown to perpetuate a party culture in the U.S. that is often associated with binge drinking, potential injury or death to students, and rape culture on college campuses. Specifically, party promotion companies like ‘I’m Shmacked’ glamorize risky drinking and partying behaviors as part of the normative college experience. With the promise of music and alcohol, the parties may seem harmless and a means of friendly competition between universities across the United States. However, ‘I’m Shmacked’ has been criticized for the damaging effects it can have on the
students and the university’s reputation, including the promotion of alcohol and rape cultures on college campuses (Engel & Smith, 2014).

Online rankings of “party schools” in the U.S. also contribute to these ideas, using student perceptions and generalized ideals as justification for these ranks. While some students and even university administration see a “party school” ranking as a badge of honor, for others it means a negative reputation for the institution and its publics. Media portrayal of alcohol consumption and universities has been investigated from a variety of perspectives from health, advertising, and publicity (Lindo et al., 2015; Hansen & Gunter, 2012; Kim et al., 2007), however, due to the threat that alcohol abuse, underage drinking and risky drinking behaviors pose to our society, there are still opportunities for further research by communication scholars with regard to portrayals in the media (Zwarun, 2013, p. 317).

**University Public Relations (PR) Crises**

For universities, crises may come in many forms. In today’s media environment, there is often portrayal of incidents that may impact students’ safety or health. For the purposes of this study, a crisis is defined as “any threat to operations” of an organization that may lead to negative consequences for the organization itself or its stakeholders without proper handling of the situation (Institute for PR, 2007). For instance, following the alleged rape case involving Duke University lacrosse players and a female student at another North Carolina institution, there came a stir of national and international media coverage of the case, prompting public relations efforts by Duke University to “maintain its reputation as an elite academic institution and athletic powerhouse” (Barnett, 2008, p. 180). Duke was able to craft appropriate public relations responses protecting its own integrity, however Barnett (2008) found that Duke missed an opportunity to educate students and the surrounding community about the issue of sexual
assault on campus and partying safety. While sexual assault may differ from alcohol and party behaviors at a university, it is not too far removed from what previous literature considers factors that make up a “party school” (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2015; Lindo et al., 2015; Kingkade, 2016).

Another example of a crisis for modern universities and colleges is the rising popularity of companies behind party tours like “I’m Shmacked” or College Party Cruise, that generate income by perpetuating a culture of accepted binge drinking on college campuses that can be very detrimental to students’ health (Engel & Smith, 2014). In youth slang, “shmacked,” means to get intoxicated “to the point of not even being able to stand up, know what’s going on or correctly pronounce any word” (Malibu, 2017). With the use of video and social media to release these messages about excessive drinking, the presence of “I’m Shmacked” on college campuses has led to various arrests, suspensions of students, and riots, such as the one that took place following an “I’m Shmacked” event at the University of Delaware in 2013 (Engel & Smith, 2014; Malibu, 2017; Pan, 2013).

In addition to combating harmful media portrayals of college students and their partying behaviors, U.S. universities and colleges are met with the challenges that come with maintaining a favorable reputation in the eyes of its key publics. As noted by Kim et al. (2007), negative, unfavorable perceptions of a higher education institution by individuals leads to decreased support for the university on the whole. On the other hand, Sung and Yang (2009) suggested a potential link between students’ communicative behaviors and perceptions of their university, and the reputation of the university. Results from this study explain that perceptions of university reputation impact intentions of supportive behavior, perhaps in the forms of alumni gift giving, continuing education beyond the undergraduate level, and the referral of the university to others.
A number of public relations and management scholars have noted the significance of reputation to an organization’s success (Kim et al., 2007; Sung & Yang, 2009), applying to universities as well (Kim & Sung, 2016). Prior literature on reputation has drawn from Bromley’s (1993) key attributes of reputation, noting the importance of establishing a good reputation, how easily it can be dismayed, and how reputations are determined by an organization or entity’s actions or lack thereof. Reputation has had many definitions, but essentially, it is the “expectation of value” stakeholders have of an organization is relation to other organizations of a similar stature (Schreiber, 2010). It stands to reason that an organization’s, or in this case, a university’s reputation may be at risk following a public relations crisis.

While a higher education institution may reactively provide a response or an apology following a crisis incident, it does not necessarily mean the public will have little or no negative response of their own (Lwin et al., 2016). There is also opportunity for the crisis to be covered by the local, regional, and national media, as frames of organizational crises can be different within various news markets (Meer et al., 2014). In the past, there have been a number of instances of crises for higher education institutions such as riots and rapes. In previous sections, it was argued that binge drinking and partying culture on college campuses can often lead to dangerous repercussions for students, including the increased likelihood for the objectification of women and sexual assault. How the news media portrays these crises and how the institution responds to a crisis of this caliber can have serious implications on the university’s reputation as well as the relationship between the media and university, and between the university and its publics. There are a variety of instances of media coverage of universities, and its students’
alcohol consumption and partying behaviors, however, this study seeks to explore the ways stories such as those aforementioned are framed by the news media.

**Framing Theory**

For generations following the dawn of mass media, communication scholars have been interested in how much information and what kinds of information is disseminated to the viewing audience. Many researchers were concerned with the information that comes “‘second’ or ‘third’ hand from the mass media or from other people” and how it might impact them (McCombs & Shaw, 1972, p. 176). According to Ardèvol-Abreu (2015), since its inception in the mid-1960s, framing theory has undergone extensive development in a variety of fields such as communication, psychology and sociology (p. 423). Rising from agenda-setting theory (McCombs & Shaw, 1972), framing as a theoretical approach is primarily used to understand media effects. Developed initially by Goffman (1974), framing involves the selection of an aspect of reality and making “them more salient” than other issues in order to meet a desired end (Entman, 1993, p. 52). According to Godefroidt and colleagues (2016), “reporters can select and omit features, and make them more salient by means of key words, stock phrases, adjectives, repetition, visuals and/or association with culturally familiar symbols,” (p. 780) much like the symbol of a red cup may be familiar to college students due to the common use of red cup to hold alcoholic beverages.

Because media play an integral role in the salience of issues and information presented, the concept of framing as a whole is a “tool” designed to influence public opinion. In order to make sense of information around them, people apply various primary frameworks, lenses through which to view the world and categorize experiences, to interpret information (Goffman, 1974, p. 24). This new idea of frames presented by Goffman (1974) allowed for the expansion of
framing research into the study of journalism as mass media became more prominent in the world (Ardévol-Abreu, 2015, p. 428). From the 1990s to today, further research has identified various media frames and how they are built by the media (Ardévol-Abreu, 2015, p. 431).

According to Scheufele and Tewksbury (2006), framing is “based on the assumption that how an issue is characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences” (p. 11). Framing is used in the construction of one’s social reality (Hallahan, 1999). It is a process by which people develop specific ideas about an issue (Chong & Druckman, 2007; Schuefele, 1999). To understand framing as a theory, one must first understand the process. Communicators often make “conscious or unconscious” decisions when crafting messages, either verbally or textually. The person who receives the message is guided towards an interpretation of the message based on the presence of frames within the message, usually manifested through keywords, stereotypes, cultural aspects and other information (Entman, 1993, p. 52-53). In this process, a source such as a news story in print or television, “defines the essential problem” involved with typically a political or social issue (Nelson et al., 1997, p. 222).

Drawing on previous research, Nelson et al. (1997) noted that in order for an attitude change to occur, the message receivers must first understand and believe the persuasive message (p. 225). Usually these messages are political in nature and are constructed by the news source in such a way to depict “good or bad” attributes (Nelson et al., 1997, p. 225). According to Muhamad and Yang (2017), “the process of framing certain ideas emphasizes salience of certain points while omitting others” (p. 190).

Goffman (1974) made note of two types of primary frameworks known as natural and social. Natural frameworks occur as a result of “unguided events,” meaning there is no external factor intentionally attempting to influence the message receiver or audience member. From
natural frameworks come social frameworks, that “incorporate the will, aim and controlling effort” of another person or persons, such as the media (p. 22). A frame “limits or defines the message’s meaning by shaping the inferences that individuals make about the message,” (Hallahan, 1999, p. 207). Frames can put information in a positive or negative light, such as valence framing, or framing can “involve the simple alternative phrasing of terms” known as semantic framing (Hallahan, 1999, p. 207). Additionally, framing can be considered both a macroconstruct and a microconstruct. With regard to news coverage and journalism, framing is a macroconstruct, referring to the ways in which journalists and larger media present information to the public (Scheufele & Tewksburg, 2007, p. 12). The microconstruct of framing is classified as the individual response. Within the macroconstruct or macro-attribute perspective of framing, the media create its own frames through written or verbal communication, images and sounds in order to promote a specific problem or issue (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015, p. 431). The media then interprets the causes of the issue, incorporates a moral assessment and follows with a recommended form of treatment that can influence the attitudes and behaviors of recipients (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015, p. 431; Entman, 1993).

Because framing can encompass broad bodies of research, according to Scheufele (2004), framing can be classified into three branches: the communicator approach, the public discourse or social movement approach, and the media effects approach (p. 403). Various communication scholars (Nelson et al., 1997; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000) often utilize the media effects approach in order to study how media framing impacts media recipients’ “attitudes, emotions and decisions” (Scheufele, 2004, p. 403). Because this study is interested in what frames are utilized in specific messages regarding universities’ party school reputations, the present study approaches framing from the communicator perspective (Scheufele, 2004).
**Media Frames.** In this sense, Schuiefele (1999) suggests that there can be media frames as well as individual frames, in which individual frames are the ideas or schemas that guide information processing for individuals. When analyzing frames used in the media, framing is considered a macroconstruct in which social frameworks can be seen (Goffman, 1974; Schuiefele & Tewksburg, 2007). Media frames also describe the news itself, according to Entman (1991), who stated that “news frames are constructed from and embodied in the keywords, metaphors, concepts, symbols and visual images emphasized in a news narrative” (p. 7). In framing, the media or the “framers” include, exclude and place emphasis on specific messages to meet a certain end (Hallahan, 1999, p. 207). Within common media frames, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) posed the difference between generic news frames and issue-specific news frames; issue-specific frames pertain to a particular topic or problem while generic frames can be applied to a multitude of features of news that can be identified across a variety of news contexts and topics (Godefroidt et al., 2016). Some of these generic frames posited by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) and utilized by Godefroidt and colleagues (2016) among others, include the frames of conflict, human interest, responsibility, economic impact, responsibility and nationalization.

While mostly used with regard to public policy or political issues, many of the generic news frames may also apply to news coverage of universities and colleges and its students’ partying behaviors. Others have built upon and branched out from literature regarding generic news frames towards more specific frames that can be identified in media, such as crisis news frames. An and Gower (2009) noted the usefulness of framing in analyzing crises. Peoples’ interpretation of a crisis is shaped by the media coverage of that crisis. In order to further investigate this, An and Gower (2009) sought to identify the types of news frames used in the coverage of crises (p. 107). Building on previous research by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) as
well as Neuman et al. (1992), An and Gower (2009) defined five news frames that most commonly occur in the media: human interest, conflict, morality, economic and attribution of responsibility (p. 108). Since a party school ranking and/or risky alcohol and party behaviors can be considered a crisis for some higher education institutions in the U.S., as discussed in previous sections, this study focuses on the five crisis news frames as utilized by An and Gower (2009).

Because news frames “set the parameters in which citizens discuss public events,” various studies have shown the impact of frames on public perceptions and opinions (Tuchman, 1978; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). According Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), framing analyses focus on the “relationship between public policy issues in the news and the public perceptions of these issues” (p. 93). Through a frame analysis, researchers can examine the prevalence of frames present in the media as well as its effects (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Schuefele, 1999; Neuman et al., 1992; Kim et al., 2007; Abraham & Appiah, 2006; Muhamad & Yang, 2017). Unit of analyses can consist of local and national news coverage of a particular subject (Muhamad & Yang, 2017, p. 193); content in magazines, television and the web (Coleman & Major, 2014, p. 97); or, headlines in print or television (Echeverria & Gonzalez, 2018). For example, in examining the differences between local and national news coverage of autism, like Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), Muhamad and Yang (2017) chose to look specifically at the complete news item, including but not limited to, the article, letters to the editor, obituaries, social announcements, and book reviews (p. 193).

Frames within the news “are constructed from and embodied in” the use of keywords, metaphors, concepts, symbols and visual images (Entman, 1991, p. 7). According to Entman (1991), frames are difficult to detect due to the framing devices that “can appear as ‘natural,’ unremarkable choices of words or images” (p. 6). By looking at the news narrative, it is possible
to see that news frame can be considered as principles for processing information as well as news text characteristics. Frames help to “encourage those perceiving and thinking about events to develop particular understandings of them,” (Entman, 1991, p. 7). Various frames have been examined in previous literature that have been reported to occur most often in the news, such as the morality frame (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Muhamad & Yang, 2017), the conflict frame (Neuman et al., 1992; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000), individual or attribution of responsibility (An & Gower, 2009; Coleman & Major, 2014; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Neuman et al., 1992), the economic frame (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; An & Gower, 2009), and also, the human interest frame (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Godefroidt et al., 2016).

According to Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), the human interest frame appeals to emotions by “bringing a human face” to the forefront of an issue (p. 95; An & Gower, 2009, p. 107). This means that people may identify more with those portrayed in this kind of news story, thus feeling more negatively about the crisis (An & Gower, 2009). The conflict frame, as originally proposed by Neuman et al. (1992) and Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), is used to “reflect conflict and disagreement” between people (An & Gower, 2009, p. 107). The morality frame draws into question the morality and socially appropriate behavior with regard to a particular issue or crisis. The economic frame is used to portray a crisis with regard to the economic or financial toll it may take on those involved. The attribution of responsibility frame places responsibility for either a “cause or solution” to an issue on a specific individual or group (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; An & Gower, 2009).

With regard to frames and portrayals of universities as “party schools,” how these institutions are characterized in the news narrative may mean the difference between a positive or negative perception by the audience. Depending on how partying and “party schools” are
depicted in the news media, the audience may then be influenced to think of the university in a similar vein. In order to address this notion, the following research question was explored:

**RQ1:** What frames are most salient in local news media coverage of higher education institutions that have party school rankings?

**Relationship Management Theory**

In addition to crisis management, a primary function of public relations is the management of relationships between two entities. Ledingham (2003) proposed relationship management theory as a means of developing an understanding between an organization and its publics. He noted that, in this perspective, communication between two entities allow for the establishing and maintaining of mutually beneficial relationships, and that organization-public relationships (OPR) that are considered effective result in “mutual understanding and benefit” (Ledingham, 2003, p. 188-195). While some public relations scholars might argue for a focus on the enactment of programs and campaigns, Ferguson (2018) sought answers to questions about the “most effective message and media strategies to use to reach a particular goal” (p. 6).

Based on an idea posed by Ferguson (1984), relationship management theory gained footing in communication research as a suggestion for emphasis by public relations scholars to study the relationships between organizations and their publics. From there, further communication scholars explored the concept of organization’s relationships in both theory and practice for public relations (Broom et al., 1997). According to Ledingham and colleagues (1998), drawing from theories of interpersonal communication, the field of relationship management emerged as “the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends” (p. 56). When viewing public relations and relationships as a management function,
public relations scholars and practitioners can design and employ various communication strategies to meet specifiable goals (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998). Before explicating a theoretical lens, a definition for relationships was necessary. Broom and colleagues (1997) suggested a definition in which “relationships consist of patterns of linkages through which the parties in relationships pursue and service their interdependent needs” (p. 95). Relationship management as a theory asserts the importance of a focus on the relationship between an organization and its publics instead of the organization or group of publics themselves (Ferguson, 1984).

The core principles of relationship management theory place an emphasis on notions of loyalty, satisfaction and trust had between an organization and its publics. In order for a relationship to be considered mutually beneficial, there needs to be an understanding between both entities about “what must be done in order to initiate, develop and maintain that relationship” (Ledingham, 2003, p. 185). It is the relationship, not the communication, that should be considered when organizations participate in activities or programs, develop customer satisfaction initiatives, or interact with their key publics. However, in order to maintain a mutually beneficial relationship, the theory posits that the needs and interests of both organizations and publics are taken into consideration. For a successful relationship, it is not solely the responsibility of the organization, nor are just the concerns of the publics represented; here, the two entities maintain a relationship in which the agendas of both are addressed (Ledingham, 2003). According to Hon and Grunig (1999), there are six important elements of relationships that can help measure the success of an organization’s relationships with its key constituents: control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship, and communal relationship. Elements of commitment, trust and satisfaction are frequently studied
with regard to relationships between organizations and its key publics (Waters, 2008; Waters & Bortree, 2012; Cheng, 2018).

Through work by previous scholars (Ferguson, 1984; Waters & Bortree, 2012; Hon & Grunig, 1999), a paradigm shift has occurred in which public relations researchers not only examine how relationships between organizations and publics are fostered, but also how they are managed. In the context of the relationship between university and student, students place their trust in their university, as they would any other interpersonal relationship, to resolve university-related issue with the best interest of the students in mind (Kim & Sung, 2016). By understanding what relationship management theory is, communication researchers can look specifically at the relationship between an organization and its various publics.

**Organization-Public Relationships (OPR).** There are a variety of types of OPRs, such as personal, professional and community. Perceptions of how much publics are satisfied and trust the organization predict the relationship to be high in quality (Waters & Bortree, 2012). A multitude of studies have emphasized the importance of qualities such as openness and honesty to encourage trust among the organization and the public (Waters & Bortree, 2012; Kim & Sung, 2016; Cheng, 2018). While there are a variety of organization types – for profit, non-profit, political and others – prior literature has emphasized the importance of quality OPRs for each. For example, non-profit organizations are often found to have a high-level quality OPR because of the sense of community volunteer publics have with the organization, in addition to feelings of trust and satisfaction (Waters & Bortree, 2012). In another study, Waters (2008) measured the organization-donor relationships that exist within non-profit organizations, in which he noted it is “vital to understand how relationships can benefit different organizations” (p. 84). In addition to understanding how these relationships operate, research on OPRs has defined a continuum that
dictates seven various relationship types (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Hung, 2005; Waters & Bortree, 2012).

One such relationship known as communal/mutually communal relationships was found by Waters & Bortree (2012) as they argued, “one party works for the good of the other even if it receives nothing in return,” to suggest that communality plays a part in the perceived quality of OPRs (p. 127). While communality is only one of many relationship types that have been produced through OPR research, understanding the type of relationship can contribute to whether or not an organization can be deemed trustworthy. American universities and colleges often provide goods or services in the form of education and opportunity for its students are sometimes seen as a business in which the students are often the customer (Posner, 2002). Because of this, higher education institutions may be perceived as having an exchange or contractual/symbiotic relationship whose success is dependent upon the success of the exchange (Waters & Bortree, 2012, p. 124).

While there have been a number of studies examining corporations’ relationship management and non-profit organizations-public relationship management (Pressgrove & Mckeever, 2016; Waters & Bortree, 2012; Cheng, 2018), there have been few studies regarding the organization-public relationship between higher education institutions and its publics. Because it is so important to have good OPR between an institution and its publics, if a university has a negative reputation in the public eye as a party school, this would impact its relationships with its key publics, such as students, parents of students, employees, donors and other various local community members (Kim & Sung, 2016). Additionally, studies into elements of relationships (Hon & Grunig, 1999) have highlighted the importance of satisfaction in building relationships (Bruning & Hatfield, 2002). The dimension of satisfaction is the “extent
to which each party feels favorably toward the other because positive expectations about the relationship are reinforced” (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). In other words, each party involved in a relationship feels as though the benefits of the relationship outweigh the cost (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Waters, 2008). Criteria for the dimension of satisfaction, as described by Hon and Grunig (1999), involve an individual or an organization to feel contented with the other entity, happy in their interactions, and “enjoy dealing” with the other organization (p. 4).

**University Stakeholders.** One of the key facets of organization-public relationships is the entity of the stakeholder. Most organizations, corporations or other group entities often have stakeholders, being “any individual or group of individuals either impacted upon” by the organization and the successes or downfalls of the organization (Mainardes et al., 2010, p. 77). With regard to universities and colleges, there are a number of stakeholders that go beyond students and employees; stakeholders are an encompassment of university communities. Higher education institutions, according to Jongbloed (2008) and colleagues, are “expected to deliver excellent education and research,” but are also responsible for social outreach that may benefit the surrounding community (p. 306). While students are the most relevant and significant stakeholders of the schools they attend, higher education benefits from relationships with both internal and external stakeholders that share things in common, such as a “sense of belonging” or “common culture or location” (Jongbloed et al., 2008, p. 305).

Internal stakeholders for higher education institutions consist of students, faculty and staff, administration and other employees. Outside of the organization, external stakeholders include the various communities and businesses in or around the physical campus location, research communities, alumni, and local and state government associations (Jongbloed et al., 2008). Previous studies have looked primarily at university-student relationships and student
perceptions of those relationships (Hon & Brunner, 2002; Jo et al., 2004; Kim & Sung, 2016) and various measures in line with propositions by Hon and Grunig (1999) for examining OPR. However specific, university stakeholders consist of so much more than students alone.

In order to establish and maintain successful relationships with stakeholders, organizations like higher education institutions must practice open, honest communication with said stakeholders in order to build trust (Saxton & Waters, 2014). One such study regarding racial incidents at the University of Missouri, noted that one requirement in order to maintain mutually beneficial relationships with internal and external stakeholder groups is competent leadership, as both the organization and public stakeholders influence one another (Fortunato et al., 2017). According to Fortunato (2017) and colleagues, “stakeholder relationships are tested during times of crisis” (p. 207). Because stakeholders internally and externally provide funding, service, and income (Gross & Goodwin, 2011; Jongbloed et al., 2008), Kim and Sung (2016) note that a “genuine relationship” between a higher education institution and its various stakeholders can help organizations navigate difficult situations more easily, as well as develop publics who would be more understanding about problems facing the institution (p. 99).

Relationship management is a key function in public relations, and this is only reinforced by the plethora of literature on the topic. With regard to higher education institutions and the media, because of the abundance of universities and colleges in the U.S. today, it is increasingly important for institutions to be reflected positively in the news media. Positive or negative portrayal by local news outlets of higher education institutions that have been nationally ranked as “party schools” could mean the difference in a successful relationship between the institution and the news outlet. The importance of successful, satisfying relationships between higher education institutions and key publics like students and other benefactors have been examined
before (Kim & Sung, 2016). In order to further contribute in relationship management literature regarding universities and its stakeholders, the following research question was addressed:

**RQ2**: What frames do the university utilize in its responses to local media coverage about a party school ranking to communicate to its stakeholders its stance on a party school reputation?

**Method**

This study employed a quantitative content analysis of news frames used in local news coverage of universities or colleges with noted “party school” reputations in the 2016 to 2017 academic school year, as well as frames represented in the university responses both in official university statements. Quantitative content analysis was chosen over qualitative content analysis in order to reduce chances for unintentional interpretation bias by the primary researcher as they have personal experience with a higher education institution that has been ranked as a “party school” in previous years.

Following work by Echeverria and Gonzalez (2018) and Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), the units of analyses were the headline for the local news outlet coverage and the news item or article released by the university in response, as “the headline represents the most evident factor of the frame and could also influence the reading of the text as a whole” (Echeverria & Gonzalez, 2018, p. 62). The researcher randomly compiled and examined online news articles from local news outlets from August 2016 to May 2017, to align with “party school” rankings that have recently been released. Afterwards, the researcher examined ten university responses in the form of both press release statements and official social media interactions, in order to identify feelings of satisfaction between the institution and the local media outlet, as posed by Hon and Grunig (1999). The items were selected based on a search with of local news outlets
that are within an approximate 40-mile radius of the main campus, as these are close enough to be still considered local. As opposed to many relationship management theory studies that utilize surveys as the chosen methodology, the present study utilizes further content analysis in accordance with criteria for measuring satisfaction as described by Hon and Grunig (1999).

In order to accurately and representatively select a sample of ten universities with party school rankings from the 2016-2017 school year, the top ten mentioned institutions from the 2017 Princeton Review list of top 20 schools was chosen. The 2016-2017 academic year was chosen over more recent lists available, as in this year more universities had an opportunity to issue a response as well as news outlets an opportunity to issue coverage about the universities and their rankings. The universities in the sample were: University of Wisconsin-Madison, West Virginia University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Lehigh University, Bucknell University, University of Iowa, University of Mississippi, Syracuse University, Tulane University and Colgate University (Kingkade, 2016). These institutions are located in a variety of states in the U.S. and include a combination of public and private universities. All universities mentioned have social media accounts on Facebook and/or Twitter in addition to official university websites. As previously stated, The Princeton Review compiles its lists based on students’ self-reported answers to survey questions regarding the use of alcohol and other drugs at school, number of hours used to study each day outside of regular class time, and the popularity of fraternities/sororities at their school (“The Princeton Review’s,” 2018).

For local news coverage, the researcher referred to online news outlets within the college towns of each of the ten universities selected. Local news coverage provides a more intimate glimpse into the immediate community than national news and may also have deeper connections with the university that makes up a large portion of the local community. This study
relies on the definition of “local” as within the town in which the university is located, as the “entire set of news topics (government, crime, school, sports, obituaries, etc.) originating in the local area, with the geographic boundary for what is local set in terms of a city or county boundary or the limits of a metropolitan area” (McCombs & Winter, 1981, p. 16).

Sample

This sample consisted of two to four different news outlets that produce electronic news stories from each of the towns or cities (Appendix C). In a preliminary search, the new outlets that were chosen were based on the close proximity to the universities’ campuses, and the outlets each covered the university in a large capacity. The news outlets provide a combination of daily and weekly newspapers in order to get a more comprehensive yet narrowed view for each town. None of the aforementioned news outlets are university-sanctioned student newspapers papers produced at or near the university, as this may lend to unintentional bias in coverage of partying behaviors on campus. Each of the news outlets mentioned have previously released information about the university, the alcohol or drug use on university’s campus, the prevalence of Greek life on campus, or providing commentary on the university’s ranking as a “party school.”

Frame Analysis

In order to examine the predominant frames used by local news media in college towns and “party school” university responses, this study investigates the following frames as utilized in previous literature: morality frame, human interest frame, negative emotional appeals and harm reduction frame. The units of analyses included the headline for the local news outlet coverage and the news item or article released by the university in response

**Negative emotional appeals.** As noted by Coleman and Major (2014), this frame consists of message types that include shock and fear appeals. These news messages try to induce
negative emotions, such as disdain felt by those outside of the university community, such as locals or local government officials, and guilt or shame felt by those inside the university community, such as student body, faculty, staff and administration.

**Morality frame.** News stories or messages contained in this frame involve a moral message or implication regarding socially acceptable behavior. Problems within this frame are placed in the “context of religious doctrines or moral ideologies” (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; An & Gower, 2009; Muhamad & Yang, 2017).

**Human interest frame.** Messages in this frame provide a level of humanity, or a “human face,” to an issue. Here, there is an emphasis on how individuals or groups are impacted by a specific issue, like a “party school” reputation, for instance (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Godefroidt et al., 2016).

**Harm reduction frame.** In investigating the most prominent and ethical frames in health public service announcements (PSAs), Coleman & Major (2014) also discussed the harm reduction frame, drawing from harm reduction theory (p. 95). They proposed that PSA frames falling under this category would place an emphasis on reducing a harmful or risky behavior as opposed to eliminating the behavior altogether (Coleman & Major, 2014, p. 95). Because partying and alcohol use on college campuses are classified as “risky behaviors,” (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2015), there may be local news stories or university responses that utilize the harm reduction frame as well.

**Unrelated.** Finally, the last coding category for coding classified items that mentioned the university in some capacity, however the content was unrelated to the school’s ranking on the list or the students’ partying behaviors. For example, items that contained information about a
university sports team winning against another or guest lecturers coming to campus for an unrelated event.

There are few existing studies that investigate the frames used by news media involving the framing of universities, as a whole, and even fewer that examine the framing of student partying on campus and use of alcohol. Overall, each of the items were coded for the aforementioned categories.

Coding Categories

Each news headline and university response was coded for each of the four frames from the literature: negative emotional appeals, morality, human interest, and harm reduction. Written messages found in the news headlines and university responses were coded under these frames as well. As noted by Coleman and Major (2014), dialogue, text, and logos are to be coded as written messages, whereas visual information includes information that can be seen (p. 98). Each of the frames are operationally defined as the following:

Negative emotional appeals, or negative emotion frames, in media are used to induce feelings of anger, sadness, anxiety, fear, shame or guilt (Coleman & Major, 2014, p. 99). Examples include speaking about partying and drinking as a negative or harmful behavior, stories about backlash a university faces due to an incident or a party school ranking, coverage of a large party or event with drugs or alcohol, graphic or disturbing stories about an alcohol-related occurrence on a college campus or arrests, and the classification of a “party school” as a title to be ashamed of or implies a level of degradation to the institution.

Morality frames put events or issues “in the context of morals, social prescriptions and religious tenets” (An & Gower, 2009, p. 108). News messages that include statements about the moral ambiguity of drinking or the impropriety of students engaging in binge-drinking or
partying behaviors would fall under this category. However, in some instances, messages may imply these ideals instead of directly stating them due to a journalist’s obligation to stay objective (Neuman et al., 1992; An & Gower, 2009). Muhamad and Yang (2017) suggest that local news outlets may be more likely to include a morality frame than national news outlets.

*Human interest* frames include one’s personal story or testimony in the presence of a particular issue, such as a party school reputation or high alcohol consumption on college campuses, in this study. According to Muhamad and Yang (2017), news in this frame is often “highly dramatized and emotional.” Examples may include stories of students dying of alcohol poisoning or in other alcohol-related accidents, arrests for alcohol-related incidents, stories of sexual assault related to alcohol consumption, and other first-hand accounts from students or other members of the university community.

*Harm reduction* frames include messages regarding the risky behaviors or consequences associated with “partying,” binge-drinking or drug use. As opposed to work done by Coleman and Major (2014), in which harm reduction frames were used as a means to justify some level of harm to prevent “perceived greater harm,” here harm reduction frames include steps outside public entities like the media or inside entities such as school administration take to reduce risk to students and partying behaviors. Harm reduction frames acknowledge risky behaviors take place but seeks to mitigate it.

**Coding Scheme**

Following in the coding scheme as laid out by Semetko and Valkenburg, and An and Gower, the research used an instrument comprising a series of questions for the coders, consisting of *yes* (1) or *no* (0) questions (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000, p. 98; An & Gower, 2009, p. 109). Here, the use of 1 and 0 measures indicate a frame is present or a frame is not
present, respectively (Muhamad & Yang, 2017). Each question in the coding instrument was designed to address and measure each of the four news frames of, human interest, negative emotional appeals, morality and harm reduction. These questions were used to help guide the coder to the proper coding criteria for each news frame as they analyzed each news item in the sample. The use of yes or no questions is in correlation with work by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) to simply and accurately measure each one of the four news frames selected.

Questions included items such as, “Does the news article or headline place an emphasis on individuals or groups impacted by the event or problem? Does it feature a person or group of peoples’ stories?” (human interest frame), “Does the news item invoke feelings of anger, shock or fear?” (negative emotional appeals), “Does the news item include a moral message?” (morality frame), “Does the news item highlight the reduction of harmful health behaviors, such as binge drinking? Does it acknowledge that risky behaviors occur and try to reduce them?” (harm reduction frame). These questions were inspired by or in direct reference to items created by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000). To measure “occurrence of frames in the news,” the researcher chose to employ scales as designed by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000). As they noted in their study, each frame may have a minimum of 4 questions assigned to it, in order to ensure proper measurements of news frames as well as intercoder reliability, to an extent (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000, p. 98 – 99).

**Procedures**

To complete this study and code for the four prevalent news frames, it was necessary to have at least two coders to analyze the news headlines and news articles, similar to An and Gower’s (2009) study. While past studies such as those by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) have used four coders to complete analyses, studies such as those by An and Gower (2009), Xie
(2015) and Muhamad and Yang (2017), have shown varied success in the use of two, trained, native-English speaking coders. In this study, the use of two well-trained coders may reduce the chance for coder error, as they practiced coding with a number of news items not included in the final sample, prior to beginning coding. The first coder was the primary author of this thesis, with a second coder with brief knowledge on the topic to enhance reliability. Additionally, by using two coders, there was also be an increased chance of higher intercoder reliability as opposed to a greater number of coders. Semetko and Valkenburg’s (2000) study demonstrated a satisfactory intercoder reliability, with other studies having shown similar consistency (An & Gower, 2009; Muhamad & Yang, 2017). The coders then manually coded each item in the sample for the various categories, harm reduction frame (HR), negative emotional appeals (N), human interest frame (HI) and morality (M) frame, by answering the questions appropriate for each category (Muhamad & Yang, 2017).

News items, ranging from articles to editorials to headlines from August 2016 to May 2017, were used not only as part of the official sample, but also as training materials for coders. Items and posts were selected from various news sites accounts of the selected sample of universities. Key words such as ‘party school,’ ‘alcohol,’ ‘party,’ ‘drug use,’ ‘arrests,’ ‘students,’ as well as the name of the university were used to narrow the initial search for items.

In order to determine intercoder reliability, many previous studies such as that by Muhamad and Yang (2017) have employed Cohen’s Kappa (Κ) reliability test (p. 194). Xie (2015) and Godefroidt et al. (2016) also used Cohen’s Kappa to test intercoder reliability conducted on a randomly sample of news articles. In alignment with previous studies, the researcher also used Cohen’s Kappa, in addition to percentage agreement, to determine
intercoder reliability for this study based on a randomly selected sample of roughly 15% of news items, in order to be representative.

Coding and Reliability

Two trained graduate students served as coders for a 250-item sample. The coders reviewed coding procedures by practicing with randomly selected articles and university responses that were not included in the final sample in a pilot coding session. For the final sample (N=250) for intercoder reliability assessment, the author acted as primary coder, with a trained secondary coder reviewing 15% of the headlines and responses randomly assigned. Intercoder reliability for all coded variables was assessed using Cohen’s Kappa (K). Average Kappa values taken from the pair of coders showed .23 for negative emotional appeals, .69 for human interest frame, .37 for harm reduction frame, -.03 for morality frame and .76 for unrelated. Due to these values, reliability was low to fairly acceptable for morality frame, negative emotional appeals, and harm reduction frame, and acceptable to high for human interest frame and unrelated (McHugh, 2012). Because some frames occurred rarely, such as the morality frame, percentage agreements for each of the categories were reported as well. Percentage agreement among the coders were 67% for negative emotional appeals, 96% for human interest frame, 80% for harm reduction frame, 1.04% for morality frame and 98% for unrelated. The following section details the results of the study and discuss the analyses and implications of the outcomes.

Results

After coding and data collection, using JMP statistical analysis software, the researcher analyzed the data through a distribution analysis. In this type of analysis, the percentage of news
items that contained negative emotional appeals, harm reduction frame, morality frame, human interest frame and unrelated, was able to be determined.

Out of 250 headlines from local news outlets covering the ten universities on *The Princeton Review* list, 74% \( (n=185) \) were coded as being unrelated to the university’s party school reputation or its placement on the list. Other frames that were found to occur included 8.8% \( (n=22) \) negative emotional appeals, 20.8% \( (n=52) \) human interest frame, 11.2% \( (n=28) \) harm reduction frame, and 1.6% \( (n=4) \) morality frame. Because the morality frame was the least prevalent, this may explain the rarity and lower chances of reliable coding between the two coders. While the majority of items were classified as unrelated, the results lead to answer RQ1, as, based on these results, the human interest frame being the most salient of the designated frames.

Additionally, 12 responses from an array of the top ten universities were collected and coded during data analysis, in which it was determined that the most salient frames with regard to university responses to coverage concerning a school’s ranking on the list were equally human interest frame (50%, \( n=6 \)) and harm reduction frame (50%, \( n=6 \)). In university responses, the morality frame occurred 0% \( (n=0) \) while 16.6% \( (n=2) \) were found to be unrelated and 16.6% \( (n=2) \) were found to have negative emotional appeals. These results indicate an answer to RQ2, as they determine which frame(s) were most salient in university responses as they communicate with their stakeholders. Results suggest that messages released by university officials are concerned with reducing the harm to their students and keeping the internal and external publics up-to-date with university activities.

**Discussion**
The goal of this study was to determine some of the most prominent ways in which American universities that have been reputed as party schools are framed by local news media, in addition to how those universities frame responses to such classifications. While this study contributes to a sparse body of literature on the framing of universities by news media and university responses, it also highlights the functions of local news media and the relationship between the media and universities. By looking at the framing of these “party schools,” results can begin to determine the ways in which these universities and their reputations are displayed as well as how the university communicates with its stakeholders its positions, values and policies. In addition, results can also begin to reveal how universities that have been ranked as party schools are framed in the media to determine if it characterizes other coverage about the university for the rest of the school year.

Local news coverage proved to be a primary medium through which university and student activities and university-related issues are communicated to the public. Following the initial release of The Princeton Review list from mid- to late-August and early September 2016, few local news outlets from a variety of university towns seemed to linger on the topic of party school rankings. Coverage of the higher education institutions then shifted towards college football, guest speakers visiting campuses, policy and other changes to be made on campus like the construction of new dorms, to name a few. As framing theory postulates, the exclusion of details is as significant as the inclusion of emphasis of details within a message as well (Cornelissen, 2014). Evidence suggests that the party school ranking by The Princeton Review was newsworthy after its initial release but seemed to taper off as other university activities became more relevant. It is worth noting that coverage lessened after the start of the fall semester of 2016. Because of this, the tapering off of coverage of the list would not necessarily mean
something negative for the university or for the local news outlets, considering the negative
connotation often associated with a party school reputation and the activities that coincide with it
(Hoffman et al., 2017; Menegatos et al., 2016).

Apart from relevancy, another factor that may have influenced coverage of the university’s party school ranking or partying behaviors could have been the previously
impending presidential election in the fall of 2016. Much of the local news coverage during that semester (August to December 2016) covered political discussions, ranging from projected
election results, guest lecturers attending the university to hold forums regarding the election,
and, following the results of the election, student/faculty reactions, and the indoctrination of
“safe spaces” on college campuses. This perhaps lends to an explanation as to why so much
coverage fell within the unrelated category.

The frame, however, that was found to be most salient in local news coverage of schools that had been ranked as party schools was the human interest frame. Many of the headlines of
coverage that fell within this category were emotional in nature, providing a face to an issue at
hand (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Godefroidt et al., 2016). This type of coverage showcased
the impact a party school reputation could have on the student body, university officials, faculty
and staff, among other key university constituents. Some even contained opinion-based pieces
that, within the headline alone, condemned the party school atmosphere of the institution,
highlighted a death of a particular university’s student due to partying and binge drinking
behaviors, while other strictly news-based items covered students’ urge for a change in their
school party culture. It is worth mentioning that with opinion pieces there is an assumed
contribution of personal bias by the author. While some could argue that this may have been one
individual’s account of a situation, with regard to the macroconstruct of framing, the media are
still creating its own frames to promote a specific problem; in this case, that of a problematic partying culture on a college campus that was of interest to those consuming the media (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015).

The fact that the information was included at all and framed in such a distinct way to appeal to human interest suggests a level of significance of the issues that are being covered, allowing readers to identify with the subjects being covered in the news item, which, in this case, would be the students and others associated with a “party school” university (An & Gower, 2009). As Entman (1991) noted, framing devices can seem as though they are an “unremarkable” choice of words or the inclusion or exclusion of certain messages, yet still reveal specifically intended ways of processing information (p. 6). These findings are supported by previous research in that the frames utilized by local news outlets helped to tell a specific story about the universities and develop a certain understanding of them, be it negative, emotional in nature, addressing the danger of partying or promoting certain morals or values (Entman, 1991; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; An & Gower, 2009). Depending on the framing utilized by the news outlet, the news media may seek for information about a “party school” to be regarded by message consumers as negative, harmful, immoral or moral, or able to identify with those directly impacted. While not enough research has been done in order to support or refute the specific ways in which institutions with party school reputations have been framed in the past, the findings of this study support research on the framing of crises that note the human interest frame to occur often in crisis news coverage (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Godefroidt et al., 2016). One could argue that a party school reputation may be considered a crisis for some higher education institutions, it may not be for all. Regardless, the human interest frame has been
reported to occur often in the news, and these findings reaffirm this view (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; An & Gower, 2009; Godefroidt et al., 2016).

In addition to the framing utilized in local news coverage, this study also examined the framing used in university responses, in order to determine how the university framed its communication with its internal and external publics. To begin, not every university out of the top 10 on *The Princeton Review* list issued an official university response, be it through their website, a press release or in conversations with the media. Of the ten universities, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Iowa and Bucknell University were the only institutions that released official university responses to the party school ranking. In addition to these, institutions like University of Illinois, Lehigh University and West Virginia University had university officials and/or administrators speak to media regarding the ranking on the list of top party schools, with plans to mitigate or address the ranking internally, be it through harm reduction campaigns, or updating, or inventing in some universities’ cases, alcohol policies for the university community.

Before explaining the frames that were utilized, there are a few potential projected reasons as to why this might be, such as a university’s placement on the top 10 list. Because the University of Wisconsin-Madison was ranked number one on the list for the 2016-2017 year, there seemed to be more outside and local coverage of the ranking with statements by university officials. The school’s positioning at the top of the list for that academic year may have led university officials and administrators to feel compelled to address it and what plans were in place to reduce high risk drinking and partying for its student body. Not only does this suggest that a party school reputation is informed by high risk drinking involving students, but it emphasizes a prevention on greater harm to students, a key facet of the harm reduction frame
(Coleman & Major, 2014). Other higher education institutions that were placed lower on the ranking might not have felt as compelled to address it as those higher on the list. West Virginia University, for example, had been ranked higher in previous years, yet released a statement, perhaps in an attempt to combat the party school reputation still being assigned to it. This suggests that the lower on the list the university was ranked, perhaps the less significant the ranking is to the outside public, or more in-line with framing theory, less significant to local news outlets. Because framing is drawn from agenda-setting theory, it stands to reason that the local news media through their framing is suggesting what information the audience should or should not be thinking about (Cornelissen, 2014). For universities lower on the list, it appears that if the coverage of the ranking or the partying behaviors at that university is limited, the local news media as well as university officials do not place it at the forefront of the minds of the media consumer. Or, more accurately, in the minds of the local community in which the university is located.

Additionally, because of a lack of official responses by some universities – be them higher or lower in the ranking – it is possible that university officials did not want to draw attention to the ranking. Some university officials have degraded The Princeton Review lists in their responses, stating that the results of the lists are not congruent with the values and practices of the student body of that institution and that The Princeton Review’s research is not grounded in reality. It stands to reason that because of this impression that many may have wanted to avoid the party school narrative altogether and therefore did not release any sort of response. This lends to a concept in public relations known as strategic silence, as there might be various reasons as to why a university is not responding.
According to Maor and Gilad (2015), “silence has many task-related benefits for regulators” (p. 585). They acknowledge that a response to a certain situation or issue may be received as admission or acknowledgement of guilt, but through strategic silence it can be understood by an organization’s (or “regulator’s”) publics that their silence is due to their confidence in their position and patience (Maor & Gilad, 2015, p. 585). They also note that silence entails that the organization is working on the issue and will not be “sidetracked into merely talking about it” (Maor & Gilad, 2015, p. 586). Overall, much of the university responses were limited to universities ranked within the top 5. Through strategic silence, perhaps universities that did not issue a response in order to mitigate the concerns of a party school reputation internally for their students before alerting the general public, or to assert a position that the ranking was a non-issue for them, or even that they were confident in their students’ abilities to practice safe habits. It is also worth noting that, depending on the university, responses to the issue of a party school reputation could be different. Even though the morality frame was utilized rarely by local news outlets and university officials alike, morality frame could be more prevalent if the institution has very clear-cut values, perhaps if the institution is religious in nature.

Contrary to initial expectations, in both university responses and in local news coverage, there was a lack of frames involving negative emotional appeals. Previous literature suggested that a party school culture arising from high risk drinking, drug use and other partying behaviors can be considered by many to be innately negative due to the health and safety risks it poses to students (Lindo et al., 2015; Wade, 2017), which can also lead to unwanted media attention to partying and alcohol-related issues (Jones, 2016). Because of this and other issues that collegiate party culture perpetuates (i.e. sexual assault, fraternity/sorority hazing, and party tours), an
escalation to these issues may transform into crises for U.S. universities. While there was still a prevalent use of negative emotional appeals to frame the universities ranked as party schools, the emphasis still appeared to fall on harm reduction strategies and human interest stories. This suggests that a party school ranking itself is not necessarily seen as a “crisis” based on framing by local news and by university officials. Many stories that were framed negatively had to do with a disdain for a university’s party culture on campus by university stakeholders such as students, alumni or parents as well as use of language within a headline to induce feelings of shock, anger or disgust (Coleman & Major, 2014). Results suggest that a party school ranking or reputation may not always be inherently negative. With respect to the universities, coverage of the ranking or the existence of the ranking in general perhaps provides an opportunity for harm reduction implementations in order to keep the students safe. In doing so, the results of this study suggest practical implications for public relations practitioners, particularly in higher education, as well as news media in order to maintain mutually beneficial relationships with their key publics (Ledingham et al., 1998).

Practical Implications

Whether the university utilized strategic silence as a tactic or if its administrators released an official response, the ways in which the responses were framed and communicated demonstrate how the relationship between the university and its publics are maintained. With regard to OPR, the aspects that make up a mutually beneficial relationship between an organization and its publics are loyalty, satisfaction and trust (Ledingham, 2003). By framing their responses through a lens of human interest, the university is engaging in a type of transparency, letting the audience know the information that is most significant. Additionally, by framing responses with regard to harm reduction, the university is communicating to its publics
the function that is most important to them, expressing their commitment to the students and their safety. In this way, the university is fostering a relationship built on trust, as they should, according to relationship management theory (Hon & Grunig, 1999). Ledingham (2003) mentions that developing programs or initiatives that further customer satisfaction helps to maintain a successful OPR. In the event of a party school ranking or a crisis related to partying behaviors on a college campus, such as widespread partying, excessive alcohol and drug use, sexual assault and hazing, it is important for PR professionals within the university to acknowledge the issue and put into place harm reduction strategies or campaigns (Coleman & Major, 2014), in order to demonstrate that student well-being is their top priority.

In this type of event, it is not only the university employees and current students who are affected. There are a number of individuals in and around the immediate university community that have stake in the organization, its activities and its reputation (Jongbloed, 2008). There is much to be said about open, honest communication with stakeholders to build trust (Saxton & Waters, 2014), but, in some cases, strategic silence may also be best.

In the event a university that has been ranked as a party school or has a noted party school reputation also experiences a partying or alcohol-related event that causes harm to students, it may be necessary for universities to engage in messaging that utilizes the harm reduction and human interest frame. In doing so, the university has not only proposed a plan to manage the issue but also humanized it in a way that is necessary for a trusting relationship while acknowledging the members of their community as real people. For stakeholders like parents of students, current students and future students, knowing that they can trust the school to protect and help their students as much as possible can lead to a strong relationship between the institution and these publics. For them, trust can mean that the publics will perceive the
university in a more positive light and therefore provide more admission, funding and service to the university, thus maintaining that mutually beneficial relationship (Gross & Goodwin, 2011; Jongbloed et al., 2008).

On the other hand, in not responding and utilizing strategic silence, the university is communicating to both internal stakeholders like the immediate university community and external stakeholders like the media, its stance on the issue. Especially in the event of a party school ranking – something outside of university administrators’ control – the lack of emphasis and response communicates to stakeholders that they are either working on correcting the reputation or do not feel as though it aligns with their best interests to address it (Cornelissen, 2014; Maor & Gilad, 2015). For university PR practitioners and administrators who are still constructing a harm reduction plan or issue management strategy, silence may be the most suitable tactic as issuing a premature response or “no comment” might negatively impact the relationship between the university and its constituents (Maor & Gilad, 2015). Strategic silence may then lead to a response framed through harm reduction, if proved necessary for the university to update or create such strategies.

This study also contributes to literature that emphasizes the importance of reputation for a university or college. The framing of these universities by local news media as well as how the universities themselves respond can impact how the university operates and maintains relationships with stakeholders (Kim et al., 2007; Kim & Sung, 2016). Because so much of the news coverage of the universities was unrelated to topics of party school rankings and partying behaviors by students, it illustrates that other university activities were not characterized by their party school ranking. For the universities within the top ten, coverage in the academic year of 2016-2017 was positioned separately from coverage regarding its ranking, even in the event of a
partying or alcohol-related crisis. In this sense, problems at the university or successes were not attributed to its ranking as a party school. While it may be necessary to look at framing of schools with these rankings over the course of a few years as opposed to one, by and large, the coverage for the rest of the academic year was not colored by a one-time event. For university PR professionals, this is ideal as they would not feel as though this is an issue they must combat the rest of the year, based on results. And, because events and activities at universities in the U.S. occur at a rapid rate, it is safe to assume more issues may arise that may have a wider impact on the university community than a party school ranking. However, PR professionals within higher education should still be prepared for and monitor activities that may contribute to a party school reputation, especially once they pose a safety threat to students, such as high-risk drug use and drinking, hazing and sexual harassment and assault.

**Limitations & Future Research**

While the present study provided interesting results and real-world, practical implications for PR practitioners in the higher education sector, there were some limitations that may have hindered it. First, the intercoder reliability was low for certain frames, most notably that of morality, though rare. While training was involved with both coders, more training and more outlining questions in the codebook may have been useful for greater accuracy. Future research might consider using more than two coders, in line with previous studies, to ensure the highest levels of validity and reliability for results.

The study may also have been limited by the narrowed scope as the sample only encompassing items and responses released during one academic year. For complete accuracy, it may have been difficult to track a theme among universities repeatedly on the list or a specific frame utilized prevalently by local news outlets in a single academic year from August 2016 to
May 2017. As mentioned previously, coverage especially tapered off after the fall semester, moving into January-May of 2017. This could be due to the separation of time and relevance to the ranking, as a new list would come out in August 2017. However, it is worth noting that the following academic year, a few universities within the top 10 that were sampled in this study, would have issues arise related to students’ partying and alcohol behaviors. For example, in 2018 a 19-year-old University of Illinois student died due to a hazing incident with a fraternity on campus that involved excessive drinking, which led to a lawsuit against the fraternity for the student’s wrongful death (AP News, 2018). Future research might consider a more longitudinal study in order to determine the salience of frames that have been ranked as party schools over the span of a few years.

Additionally, this study focused solely on higher education institutions specifically within the U.S. Further research would need to be conducted in order to determine if a similar party school phenomenon exists outside of the U.S., but it may yield different, interesting results. Some language and emotional appeals can differ depending on geographic location, and what may be deemed as a negative emotion or behavior in the U.S. may not be depicted similarly in other countries. For example, the United Kingdom has a lower legal drinking age than the U.S., begging to question the different attitudes and values regarding alcohol consumption. Frames such as harm reduction, negative emotional appeals and morality may be utilized in a different way in European and Eastern countries than in America. Future researchers may be interested in seeing if any differences are present between the framing of higher education institutions in the U.S. versus other nations.

While this study examined the framing of party schools from a quantitative perspective, future researchers may be interested in employing a qualitative perspective in order to build off
results. Surveys or interviews of individuals who are current or past students, or current university administration, may shed light on why universities communicate in the way they do to an issue such as this, or what effects do a party school reputation have on students who experienced it.

**Conclusion**

The study at hand identified the need for research into local news media, universities and party school reputations, explored previous literature regarding the ways universities can be portrayed by the media and itself as well as theories to inform practice, and discussed results of the analysis, providing real-world applications and significance to the topic. It is no secret that partying at universities across the U.S. can lead to a number of detrimental health and safety effects for students, as it is no secret that partying happens on college campuses to begin with. Party culture and party school reputations are more common and more ubiquitous as they gain more attention in the media, potentially leading to a largely negative view of the university on the whole. Because news media plays such a significant role in peoples’ lives and perceptions, the ways in which the frame certain messages can have serious implications for the university and those who have stake in its operations. However, results from this study indicated that local news outlets frame news items primarily through human interest, showcasing the people and the ways impacted by the ranking of their university as a party school, associated with binge-drinking, high usages of drugs, and other rampant risky behaviors. Universities with these reputations try to mitigate this by doing the same, and also framing their messages with regard to upholding the sanctity of its organization as well as the safety and well-being of the student body.
It is clear, however, that this does not always spell disaster for a universities’ overall reputation. Because so much of local news coverage had to do with other university activities, policies and organizations, separate from its ranking as a party school, it demonstrates that this potentially one-time ranking does not color the university’s reputation or its overall success. For PR practitioners in higher education, this can mean good news, but there is still a necessity for managing mutually beneficial relationships with university stakeholders based on trust and commitment to the students, employees and community it serves. Higher education institutions are often left out of the conversation regarding framing and relationship management. This study demonstrates that not only should the relationship between universities and local news media be investigated further, but that these are issues that impact real communities of people. The college students of today will one day become the leaders of our country, and the reputable universities they attend provide a foundation for them, in more ways than one.
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Appendix A

**Coding Protocol for Frames:** Code each news headline and university response according to the following frames.

The following steps should be taken in frame analysis coding as described below: (0) Frame is not present and (1) Frame is present.

V1: Negative emotional appeals: induce feelings of anger, sadness, anxiety, fear, shame or guilt. Examples include speaking about partying and drinking as a negative or harmful behavior, stories about backlash a university faces due to an incident or a party school ranking, coverage of a large party or event with drugs or alcohol, graphic or disturbing stories about an alcohol-related occurrence on a college campus or arrests, and the classification of a “party school” as a title to be ashamed of or implies a level of degradation to the institution.

V2: Morality frame: presented in the context of morals or social prescriptions. News messages that include statements about the moral ambiguity of drinking or the impropriety of students engaging in binge-drinking or partying behaviors would fall under this category.

V3: Human interest frame: includes one’s personal story or testimony in the presence of a particular issue. Often dramatized or emotional. Examples may include stories of students dying of alcohol poisoning or in other alcohol-related accidents, arrests for alcohol-related incidents, stories of sexual assault related to alcohol consumption, and other first-hand accounts from students or other members of the university community.

V4: Harm reduction frame: messages regarding risky behaviors or consequences associated with partying, binge-drinking or drug use. Includes steps outside public entities like the media or inside entities such as school administration take to reduce risk to students and partying behaviors. Harm reduction frames acknowledge risky behaviors take place but seeks to mitigate it.
Questions for Coders

(0) No or (1) Yes

Negative emotional appeals (N): *Does the news item invoke feelings of anger, shock or fear?*

Morality frame (M): *Does the news item include a moral message?*

Human interest frame (HI): *Does the news article or headline place an emphasis on individuals or groups impacted by the event or problem? Does it feature a person or group of peoples’ stories?*

Harm reduction frame (HR): *Does the news item highlight the reduction of harmful health behaviors, such as binge drinking? Does it acknowledge that risky behaviors occur and try to reduce them?*
## Appendix B

Codebook for Frames of News Headlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>Unique Case ID</th>
<th>Case number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN B</td>
<td>News outlet, local (&lt;40 mi radius)</td>
<td>Name of outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN C</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Ex. University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN D</td>
<td>Date of Publication</td>
<td>(M/DD/YY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN E</td>
<td>Is it a news item?</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN F</td>
<td>Is it an opinion piece?</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN G</td>
<td>Is it an editorial?</td>
<td>Y or N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN H</td>
<td>Text of Headline</td>
<td>Ex. U. of I. dethroned as top party school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN I</td>
<td>Is it coverage of the university or a university sanctioned response? Does the item contain both?</td>
<td>Coverage, University response, Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN J</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Link to item online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN K</td>
<td>Negative emotional appeals frame</td>
<td>1 (Present) or 0 (Not Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN L</td>
<td>Human interest frame</td>
<td>1 (Present) or 0 (Not Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN M</td>
<td>Harm reduction frame</td>
<td>1 (Present) or 0 (Not Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN N</td>
<td>Morality frame</td>
<td>1 (Present) or 0 (Not Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN O</td>
<td>Unrelated (Content is unrelated to subjects related to partying, party school ranking)</td>
<td>1 (Present) or 0 (Not Present) Ex. Stories about sporting event scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Local news outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td><em>Tulane Hullabaloo, The New Orleans Advocate, nola.com</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Syracuse.com, <em>The Daily Orange, LocalSYR</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td><em>The Register Herald, WDTV, The Dominion Post, The DA Online</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>*Sun Herald, Ole Miss University of Mississippi News, HottyToddy Online, <em>The Oxford Eagle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td><em>The Bethlehem Press, The Morning Call, The Brown and White</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td><em>Iowa City Press-Citizen, Iowa Now, The Gazette, Daily Iowan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td><em>The Standard-Journal, WNEP 16, The Daily Item</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td><em>The News Gazette, Chicago Tribune, The Public i</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate University</td>
<td><em>The Oneida Daily Dispatch, Syracuse.com, The Madison County Courier</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Sample of local news outlets by university
### Appendix D

#### Table 2

**Local news coverage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotional</td>
<td>( n = 22 ) (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>( n = 4 ) (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interest</td>
<td>( n = 52 ) (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm reduction</td>
<td>( n = 28 ) (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>( n = 185 ) (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>( n = 250 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3

**University responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotional</td>
<td>( n = 2 ) (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>( n = 0 ) (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interest</td>
<td>( n = 6 ) (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm reduction</td>
<td>( n = 6 ) (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>( n = 2 ) (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>( n = 12 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>