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A NEWS GAME CALLED TRIO:
A Task for Reporting, Interviewing and Observing

by
Albert D. Talbott, William J. Zima and Ruth McCorkle
School of Journalism, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242

One of the long-time favorite tricks of teachers of reporting was to spring some kind of dramatic news situation on a class of unsuspecting journalism students: a fake shooting, for example, where people ran in and out of a classroom and someone fired blanks in a pistol and a number of things happened.

One of the ideas behind the antic was to inject a bit of excitement— and fun— into the sometimes drab business of teaching news gathering and writing techniques. The main idea, of course, was to promote some learning through a simulated news event.

The instructors had fun inventing and staging the event and the students got some fun and learning out of their attempts to sort out what they had observed so that they could write a coherent account of the event.

But news reporting is serious business and this sort of game-playing smacks of the frivolous and the superficial. Moreover, reporting teachers are pretty earnest about what their students should know and how they should behave and operate when they get into the field.

---

1The learning exercise described in this paper is one of a number of ideas that grew out of a practicum in simulation and gaming conducted by Talbott and Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr. MacLean died before this and other papers were completed. This effort is dedicated to his memory.

Other participants in the exercise included Douglas M. Howard, Ahaziah J. Umanah, Jin Hwan Oh, Paul D. Hightower and W. Scott Mylchreest, graduate students in mass communications.
Yet game-playing or simulating can be fun and serious when it's handled properly and the simulation is designed to get at certain important areas involving the reporting skills. Many journalism instructors use some form of simulation and gaming—without calling it that—to illustrate to their students that more goes on in a news situation than what the instructor can tell them will go on. The live or real reporting experience is another common way to get at the transactional process that is involved in a news situation. (Maybe a better label for the live experience is practical media experience, since obviously both simulation and media work deal with live situations.)

Some Advantages of Simulation-Games

Simulation or gaming has some advantages that the practical media experience doesn't have, although the latter is the ultimate focused learning device for a student aiming for a news job. The ideal arrangement is to dovetail the two, using simulation to prepare for the practical, on-the-job activity.

Among the advantages of simulation and gaming that we see are:

Structuring simulations to promote certain skills in or approaches to reporting, such as a stress on observing or interviewing or fact-gathering from printed or stored sources or some other facet that the instructor wants to emphasize.

Designing simulations to promote approaches different from those currently practiced, allowing students to invent their own ways of getting at news situations.

Linking or integrating theory with skills so that students can test strategies they have learned in other classes or try their own strategies based on theoretical inputs from other sources.

Promoting intensive group review and analysis of what has gone on in a simulation or game as well as some valuable self-reflection. Total involvement in a game tends to precipitate interesting feedback from students on such things as human relations and ethics.
Lessening the expense factor in that the activity is primarily intramural and resources such as classrooms, typewriters and other facilities are already available.

Reporting arrangements with newspapers and other media often are costly in time, staff and resources. Many media managers are reluctant, and rightfully so, to commit their staffs and newsrooms to the larger type of task force or group reporting effort. Also, many times students find it difficult to work with busy newsmen and women who have no time to be "instructors" or "resources." And feedback is at times difficult to obtain because of the highly systemized operations of a mass medium. Reader response is even harder to come by because it takes so much time to set up a proper survey.

A further advantage of the simulation-game technique is the breadth of experience it can offer the student-reporter in preparing him for media work. For instance, the busy student-reporter, like his on-the-job counterpart, tries to deal with news situations in the same way each time because it makes them easier to handle. This tends to routinize or stabilize his approach to stories, say, on his beat. But a simulation-game can force the student-reporter to try out new ideas or approaches as the news situation itself is changed and thus widen his experiences for future use.

Simulation-games can also broaden the kinds of stories the student-reporter can cover. For example, the on-the-job reporter of a small newspaper may not be exposed to covering a major plane crash. In the simulation, such a story can be set up and the reporter can be forced to deal with it.

There is one other advantage of simulation and gaming that is perhaps of more benefit to the teacher/researcher than the student. This is the use of a simulation to test theories for research purposes.
Whatever the reason, there is an obvious versatility of uses in simulation-gaming for the instructor.

We have found in our experiences here that simulations and games are highly motivating and stimulating for the students, which, of course, contributes to their desire to learn.

Simulation-games also offer help to teachers struggling to combine means-centered instruction with problem-centered work. Means-centering is to focus on the way things are done, the ways of performing or the ways of operating. Problem-centering, of course, is problem solving or decision making in an experiential frame, where the "rights" and "wrongs" are not highly specifiable.

The usual procedure in education involves an instructor in front of a class dispensing "wisdom." The instructor decides what the students need to know when they walk into his class. He designs the readings, lectures, exercises, assignments, discussion questions and tests for the students. Typically, the instructor's own purposes and intents are strongly favored in the scheme of such classes.

However, when it comes to teaching in the "subjective" areas, where "rights" and "wrongs" are not highly specifiable, instructors have problems or they ignore the problems. Implanting in the student the notions of the

---

five-W's, the inverted pyramid story, the types of sources and the other specifiable bits of information is fairly easy. So are some of the "tried and true" approaches to fact-gathering, interviewing and observing. But there are many aspects of news reporting that cannot be specified fully in advance or, if specifiable, may or may not work in a given situation. The problem then is to design learning situations which take the unspecifiable situations into account. We suggest the more open simulation-gaming approach as one way. That is the type we will describe in this paper.

**Purpose in Creating TRIO**

Our purpose in creating TRIO: Task for Reporting, Interviewing, Observing as an instructional tool was to make selective perception and metaphoric transformation come alive for students in ways which such processes cannot be made to come alive when we merely talk about them. Students go through these processes in an environment where the whole experience can be critically evaluated by all involved. This enables them to think and talk more clearly about the phenomena experienced and the concepts learned.

The starting point in creating this tool was the assumption that the most important element in the learning process was the individual learner.

---

3The closed simulation-game is more means-centered than the open game and useful in teaching specifiable skills or approaches. The participants are confronted with a situation or phenomenon which they must relate to in the preconceived right ways. In the open simulation-game, the participants find or name their own problems and define their own solutions to these problems.
A student must be involved in his own learning. Learning is accomplished by a transactional process between two or more human beings and the environment.

The assumption that knowledge must be actively acquired also implies that learners cannot be separated from what is learned and neither learners nor what is learned can be separated from the conditions under which learning takes place. Taken together, then, we assume that there is a transactional relationship between and among learners, what is learned, and the total situation.4

In TRIO we operationalized this concept by putting the learner in a problem-solving situation.5 Jerome Bruner, whose ideas and concepts about the learning process have found their way into the so-called newer approaches to education, wrote:

It is my hunch that it is only through the exercise of problem-solving and the effort of discovery (that we can get at this thing), and the more one has practice in this the more likely is one to generalize what one has learned into a style of problem-solving or inquiry that serves for any kind of task one may encounter.6

TRIO began with the creation of an event in which people played various roles in reporting, being reported on, as well as news report reading. In a

---


5The literature on simulation and games and their uses in various areas of education and research is fairly extensive, but we've included a selective bibliographic portion at the end of this paper.

previous simulation game, which we called RIOT, the journalism students took all the roles, including the creation of the event. In TRIO we included a group of senior nursing students from the University of Iowa College of Nursing. They were the experts, the sources and the creators of the event and presented in a panel discussion the pros and cons of the abortion issue as it related to them and their profession. The audience was made up of other nurses.

The presentation of the issue was covered by reporters (journalism students), who then prepared typewritten news reports for an audience composed of other journalism students and nursing students. Also among the reporters were nursing students who had no journalism training.

The lay audience of nurses, the experts or nurses who prepared and presented their views on the abortion issue and the journalism student-reporters later evaluated the coverage. The following schema (Figure 1) represented the major roles:

![Figure 1: Major Roles](image)

TRIO was preceded by a number of simulation-games developed for various needs in the General Journalism Program at Iowa. RIOT, an acronym for Reporting, Interviewing, Observing Task, was conducted in 1972 and 1973. Work on simulation and gaming has been under way for about five years at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Simulation and gaming is one of the basic learning strategies in the General Journalism sequence and is also used in the News-Editorial sequence, where the instruction is more prescriptive of news work.
These roles involved people as part of an event, people observing the event, people reporting on the event, people who learned of the event only by talking to people who were on hand, and people who learned of the event through videotape and written news reports.

Our goal was to enrich students' understanding of the problems in observing, interviewing and news reporting.

Boiled down, these were the objectives of the TRIO learning experience:

1. To give nursing and journalism students an opportunity to participate in various roles involving news gathering and reporting.

2. To sharpen nursing and journalism students' skills in reporting, in writing news reports and in critically analyzing what had been written.

3. To give nursing and journalism students an opportunity to become aware of the difficulties that non-medically trained reporters may have in reporting for a lay audience the events that occur during a presentation by medically-trained people (nurses).

4. To give all participants a chance to understand the communication process involved when reporters must play a linking and transforming role between experts and lay persons.

The Design of TRIO

The nursing students not directly involved in the presentation and the journalism students were divided into the following role categories:

**BLUE REPORTERS:** Nurse reporters: Observed the presentation and took part in the discussion that followed. Wrote reports based on the presentation and the discussion.

**RED REPORTERS:** Journalism reporters: Observed the presentation, took part in the discussion and interviewed anybody in the room at the time of the presentation. Wrote reports on the event.

**WHITE REPORTERS:** Journalism reporters: Observed only the presentation. Wrote reports based only on the presentation.

---

8 Figure 2 on the next page illustrates the working model of the various roles for the task.
Figure 2: The Working Model for the Task
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YELLOW REPORTERS: Journalism reporters: Came in for the discussion after the presentation ended. Interviewed anyone who was in the room at the time of the presentation. Wrote reports based on the discussion and interviews.

GREEN REPORTERS: Journalism reporters: Watched a videotape of the presentation in the Journalism School the following day. Wrote reports based only on the videotape.

Half of the reporters in each color category received a copy of the background paper prepared by the nurses for their presentation. (Specific instructions given to the nurse panel members and all the reporters are in Appendix A.)

Nursing and journalism students who took part in the exercise but had no reporting assignment were designated as follows:

LAY READERS ONLY: Journalism students: Enrolled in other classes in the School of Journalism, but not involved in TRIO.

EXPERT READERS ONLY: Senior nursing students: Enrolled in a required course "Nursing and the Social Order." Class was divided into three groups and each week current issues were presented by all three groups. This particular week the issues were abortion, euthanasia and organ transplant. Abortion was chosen as the event for TRIO because the five panel members wanted to participate. The 75 students in the other two groups thus could respond as readers because they were not involved in the abortion panel event.

Both groups of readers learned about the presentation only by reading the nurse and journalism student news reports. Their job was to read a selected number of reports and then evaluate them. (Instructions for the evaluation are in Appendix B.)

Trial Run of TRIO

A week before TRIO was run, the coordinators of the exercise explained to the participants what was to take place, answered whatever questions the participants had and handed out the instruction sheets (Appendix A). This activity was held in the individual classrooms of the various participants.
The explanation went like this:

The event for this reporting exercise is a presentation by five senior nursing students in the College of Nursing. They have chosen to cover the topic of abortion. The pros and cons of the abortion issue will be dealt with in order to make the presentation as informative and interesting as possible for all participants. Each member of the presentation team will provide a position paper on abortion for half of the reporters before the event takes place.

All those who cover the presentation according to the instructions for their specific group are expected to have their news reports ready by 8:30 a.m. the day after the presentation. Nurse reporters turn in their reports to Professor Freel of the College of Nursing and journalism students turn in their reports to Professor Zima of the School of Journalism.

Those who will evaluate the news reports will receive a selected set of the reports on Monday after the presentation. The nurses' evaluations will be returned to Professor Freel and the journalism students' evaluations to Room 300 in the Communications Center. A discussion session will take place one week after the presentation. At that time, awards will be made for the reports evaluated as best and the learning experience as a whole will be evaluated. For an exact rundown of when everything takes place, and what is due when, the following schedule is given:

November 26 (Monday) - Position paper from the nurses giving the abortion presentation. This paper is to be given to Professor Freel by 8:30 a.m.

November 28 (Wednesday) - The position paper is distributed to those selected to receive it. Ruth McCorkle will distribute it to the nurses involved and Professor Zima will distribute it to the journalism students involved.

November 29 (Thursday) - The presentation takes place.

TIME . . . : 12:30 p.m.
LOCATION . . : Room 233, College of Nursing (on the second floor)
PROGRAM . . : 12:30 - Introduction by Professor Talbott, School of Journalism.

12:40 - Nurses' presentation.

1:30 - Ten minute break
1:40 - Discussion on the presentation topic. This includes questions from the audience. It is at this point that the WHITE REPORTERS leave and the YELLOW REPORTERS join the program.

2:30 - Formal session ends. RED and YELLOW REPORTERS may question anyone in the room at the time of the presentation. The BLUE REPORTERS may do so as well.

November 30 - News reports are turned into coordinators of the exercise.

Nurses leave reports at Professor Freel's office.

Journalism students leave reports at Professor Zima's office.

The following are expected to turn in reports:
ALL THOSE DESIGNATED AS REPORTERS

The reports are due at 8:30 a.m.

At 3:30 p.m., sets of reports on the presentation will be distributed by Professor Talbott to General Journalism students.

Professor Zima's students not at the presentation will view the videotape at 8:30 a.m. and write reports immediately following and these will be given to Professor Zima. This will be done in 301 CC.

December 3
(Monday) - Sets of selected news reports are distributed to those involved in the evaluation. General Journalism students will already have sets of the news reports (see Friday, November 30). Those involved in the evaluation are READERS.

Nurses get sets of reports for evaluation from Professor Freel's office.

Journalism students get selected sets of reports for evaluation from Professor Zima.

The selected sets of reports will be available at 8:30 a.m.

December 4
(Tuesday) - Evaluations are due by 4:00 p.m.

Nurses turn in evaluations to Professor Freel.

Journalism students turn in evaluations to 300 CC.
December 6—Discussion session and awards for the best reports. Those expected to be in attendance are the BLUE, RED, WHITE, and YELLOW reporting groups plus the READERS ONLY group. However, it is open to anyone who wants to participate.

TIME: 10:30 - 11:45 a.m.

LOCATION: Room 233, College of Nursing (second floor).

PROGRAM: Discussion directed by coordinators of the exercise.

All the reporters understood that the nurses belonged to an expert community concerned with an issue that had social as well as technical consequences. They were aware that the social consequences (or impact) of the issue made it necessary for members of the lay community (that is, all in the non-medical community) to understand what was presented and discussed in comprehensible form.

The reporters were told to write stories in journalistic style (in simple non-technical language) that would be read by those in the lay community and that would be suitable for publication in the Daily Iowan, the university's daily. Each news report was to be no more than four pages long, typewritten and double-spaced.

The number of reporters in each category who completed their stories by the deadline is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter Classification</th>
<th>With Paper</th>
<th>Without Paper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue (Nurses)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9The initial reporting group numbered about 70. But about half didn't attempt or complete their stories or were too late to make the deadline. Most of these were among the 30 nurses who were designated as reporters.
Thirty-five news stories were written. This was too many for one reader to evaluate so six packets of 12 stories each were compiled. It was necessary to use some of the stories more than once. Each packet had at least one story written under each of 10 different ways the reporter roles were defined. These packets were distributed three days after the event, evaluated and returned the fourth day after the event.

This is the way the random assignment of stories by groups was made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>Packet of Stories</th>
<th>Reporter Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluators included all categories of participants: panel members, reporters, readers and faculty. Each story was rated on a scale from terrible (rating of 1) to terrific (rating of 7) using a semantic differential scale. In addition, each evaluator Q-sorted the stories from best to worst using this forced distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Very Best Story</th>
<th>Very Worst Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final part of the evaluation asked the readers to comment on the criteria they used in evaluating the stories: specifically, what were the reasons for choosing the best stories as best and the worst as worst? And when comparing the best and worst stories, what were the important differences? It took each evaluator between an hour and an hour and a half to complete the total evaluation. (See Appendix B for instructions to evaluators.)

Eighty-four persons evaluated the stories.

Since the follow-up discussion session for the exercise was scheduled for a couple of days after the stories were distributed for evaluation, the only evaluation data reported back to the participants were from the rating scale (terrible to terrific) and the open-ended questions concerning the reasons for the stories being evaluated as best and worst. The O-sort data was analyzed later. (A report is not included in this paper because of lack of time and space.)

Average scores on the ratings scale were computed for each of the 35 stories used. Ribbons were awarded to the reporters whose stories got the highest ratings (first place) and next highest ratings for each of three evaluator groups.

Separate competitions were held for the nurse or Blue Reporters and for the journalism reporters. Twelve ribbons were awarded: six to nurse reporters and six to journalism reporters. Grand prize ribbons were awarded to the nurse reporter and the journalism reporter who had the highest rating across

---

10. The scores rated by evaluators for the same story were added together and divided by the number of evaluators to obtain the mean.

11. There were three classifications of evaluators: nurse -- consisting of blue reporters and expert readers; journalism -- consisting of red, white, yellow, and green reporters; and audience -- consisting of journalism lay readers.
all three audience segments. The ribbons were very inexpensive, but at the same time quite nice looking. Incentives of this type may contribute materially to the success of these simulation exercises. We recommend their use.

The whole exercise was topped off with a special session where the news writers, the evaluators and the panel participants got together to discuss what went on. The session gave the nurses an opportunity to respond to the way they felt they had been covered by the news reporters and it gave the reporters and the other participants an appreciation, perhaps some insights, into the difficulties involved in preparing a story based on the information available in a news situation. A general summary of the exercise was presented by the creators of TRIO and additional comments and feedback were stimulated by this summary.

Results of the Trial Run of TRIO

There were five experimental conditions under which the reporters were asked to write their news stories of the abortion issue. (See Appendix A for the conditions.) These five conditions were further divided into two principal conditions: reporters who had the background papers prepared by the nurses' panel and those who did not have the background papers.

Table 1 lists the nurse-reporter winners and their means. Both of the nurse winners observed the panel presentation and participated in the discussion session afterward. But the first-place winner (Story #30) also had the background papers and the second-place winner (Story #31) did not.

Table 2 lists the journalism reporter winners and their means. The grand prize winner, a Yellow Reporter (Story #20), did not observe the formal presentation, but came in for the discussion afterward and interviewed the panel members and anyone else who was present during the formal panel presentation, including other reporters. He also had the background papers.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Evaluators</th>
<th>1st place story/mean score</th>
<th>2nd place story/mean score</th>
<th>Grand prize story/mean score</th>
<th>Classification of Reporters</th>
<th>Background paper used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse reporters and readers</td>
<td>30/5.35</td>
<td>31/5.29</td>
<td>30/4.51</td>
<td>30=Blue</td>
<td>30=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism reporters</td>
<td>31/3.50</td>
<td>30/3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism readers</td>
<td>30/4.11</td>
<td>31/3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mean Scores, Reporter Classification and Use of Background Papers of the Winners in the Nurse Reporter Category.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Evaluators</th>
<th>1st place story/mean score</th>
<th>2nd place story/mean score</th>
<th>Grand prize story/mean score</th>
<th>Classification of Reporters</th>
<th>Background paper used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse reporters and readers</td>
<td>35/5.47</td>
<td>9/5.40</td>
<td>20/5.13</td>
<td>35=Green</td>
<td>35=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism reporters</td>
<td>20/7.00</td>
<td>22/6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism readers</td>
<td>7/5.25</td>
<td>20/5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mean Scores, Reporter Classification and Use of Background Papers of the Winners in the Journalism Reporter Category.
The others who were listed in the first or second place categories operated under varying conditions according to their color classifications, but all had the background papers. The fact that all of the reporters with the highest means—except one nurse reporter—had the background papers prior to the panel presentations suggests that the crucial determinant in writing the best news stories was not the degree to which the participants were involved but rather whether they had an advance written report of what was formally presented during the panel session.

Overall, the nurses rated the stories higher than the two types of journalism evaluators. The major criteria the nurses used was whether the stories conveyed an accurate, clear and complete account of what was presented. They rated stories low if the stories misquoted the panel, gave incorrect information or were sensational or dramatic in style. The nurse raters felt the stories should include the essential information presented by the panel and should include information on the resolution the panel proposed for their nurses' association. The resolution dealt with nurses' rights in deciding whether to handle or not to handle abortion cases.

In contrast, the journalism evaluators were more concerned with stylistic form, length of paragraphs and organization of the material rather than a concern for correctness of content. The journalism evaluators wanted the stories to be appealing and informative. Also, they rated a story higher if it had a good lead and smooth transitions between paragraphs.

In order to assist in the interpretation of the Q-analysis, a content analysis was done of the 35 stories. Graduate students of the School of Journalism were given packets of the 12 stories in order to analyze the content
in systematic fashion. There were at least two graduate students independently evaluating each packet of stories for style, presentation and tone, format, content, and themes of the stories. These results were used in interpreting the Q-analysis and although the Q-study is not included in this paper, the characterizations are helpful in comparing the work of the journalism and nurse reporters. The structure of the content analysis was taken from the comments on the criteria used in evaluating the stories.

Even though all the stories were not included in the story packets, each reporter classification was represented in the best and worst ranked stories. There were some stories consistently ranked better than others and some consistently ranked worst.

The white reporters with the background paper were ranked consistently higher by all reporters. The white reporters were journalism students who had observed the presentation. However, they did not take part in the discussion afterward and they did not interview anyone about the presentation.

These stories tended to be redundant, with short, appropriate leads and short paragraphs. The nurse's role in the hospital, the role conflicts and other problems associated with the nurse's position were presented. The reporters used quotes and an interpretative reporting style. Emotional and sensational words were used. The stories were interesting, well synthesized and presented a main point. One evaluator said Story 12 actually "showed the reader the conflict the nurses feel."

All classifications of reporters without the background paper were ranked first and second best at least once. Story 29 was ranked first or second several times. This story was well organized, logical and presented in a straight reporting style. The tone of the story was passive and the lead and paragraphs were long. The nurse's role in the community and the recommended resolution on abortion was included. The evaluators felt one of the reporter's strongest points was the accuracy of facts presented even though the reporter did not have a background paper.
Stories written by nurses consistently ranked low. The nurse's stories had no journalistic style; the stories were written with long leads, sentences, and words in a passive voice. The purpose of the event and an anti-abortion bias of the reporters was apparent. This may explain why these nurses chose to write stories; they may have felt they had something to say since the news story writing was not a requirement of their course.

Follow-up Discussion and Some Conclusions

The follow-up discussion or evaluation session gave the participants a chance to discuss their experiences and to share some of their thoughts on the various roles, challenges, rewards and frustrations involved in this reporting exercise.

For instance, one of the nurse panelists stated, "There were many stories that we saw as not being really concise or not being really clear or accurate."

Another nurse panelist, who was quoted in one of the stories that appeared in the Daily Iowan, which had been written by one of the journalism student participants, said, "I felt the emphasis was wrong. And also, by the way, you got my status in the College of Nursing wrong. The article was bad. It was bad because it emphasized the wrong thing. It seemed to me that the whole article emphasized the legal aspect, which was what I spoke on, and which was accurate from (that standpoint). But the point was that there were four other panel members who spoke and mine was probably the most basic part since I gave the legal and historical background, but it wasn't even close to being where the emphasis of the panel was.

"There was no emphasis on the resolution at all, except that we did present one. And it didn't talk about the roles of nurses, which was what we were discussing. And it really made me feel like we came across as really
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A resolution to the nurses' association dealing with nurses' rights in handling or not handling abortion cases.
right-to-lifers and anti-abortionists and I don't feel that way. There are two panel members that absolutely don't feel that way. They're very pro-abortionist...."

"I just really felt that the total emphasis was wrong and the whole feeling and idea behind the panel was missed." "

"I feel that anybody who would read (your) article would not really know what we were really talking about. They would have a fairly good idea of what the Supreme Court came up with, but they would not really know what the panel came up with."

One journalism student tried to answer her criticism. He said, "All journalism, as I have been taught, is that we have to make a subjective opinion—what our opinion of the panel was and what we think that our readers will find most important. The article I wrote was similar to the one in the Daily Iowan. In fact, I felt it was more important that nurses have a right to a choice in assisting with abortions and patient care...and the whole bit (the whole coverage of the panel) was second."

Another nurse chimed in. "I feel your responsibility is reporting what we say and not what the public will be interested in. Taking things out of context, emphasizing one little point of what was said when that's not what we were really emphasizing. I don't feel that you can take what we say and kind of change the mood of it to present it to the public."

In responding to this statement, some of the journalism students said that they were handicapped in their reporting work because they were not allowed equal conditions under which to cover the event. Some said that it was unfair that they did not have a background paper.

One of the nurses replied, "If anybody's disadvantaged, it's the reader because he wasn't there at all. He doesn't know anything about it. He doesn't
know what went on or anything. I think if you're going to stress a primary area, let the reader know what you have in mind and say a lot more went on but that you're not handling that (in your story)."

Both groups of students discussed the frustrations involved in covering the event and the better understanding they now had of the difficulties of reporting the news both from the sources' point of view and the reporter's attempt to write a fair and accurate account of what he conceived as the important part of the event.

An appreciation of the communication process involved when reporters must play a linking and transforming role between experts and lay persons was also indicated.

There was general agreement that more of this kind of learning experience was needed for all concerned, source, reporter and reader.

One of the difficulties in putting together the simulation-game was in insuring that there was a sufficient corps of reporters in each classification to cover the event. Since this was tried experimentally with a News Reporting class as a sideline to the regular course work, portions of the class were unable to participate because they were handling other required work. The task has to be built in as a basic part of the class program.

Also, since some of the classifications were not fully manned, it was not possible to determine which experimental condition--on the scene at the presentation or not on the scene but interviewing afterward, and so on--gave the reporter adequate information to write the best story. But, as pointed out under "Results," all of the winning reporters, except one, had background papers to work from.

One other area needing some work is the criteria for evaluating the stories. When the evaluators were given the stories to read and rank according
to best to worst, there were no other specific criteria included in the instructions (refer to Appendix B). Each evaluator was asked to include his own criteria as an open-ended question at the end of the evaluation packet.

When this News Game is repeated, another approach to evaluation might be to give the evaluators a list of criteria and have them rate how each story best exhibits that quality; for example, interesting, accurate, good lead, etc.

The implications of TRIO appear to be many. The inherent appreciation and understanding of the roles assumed by both nursing and journalism students were demonstrated by the exchange of comments and feedback in the follow-up session.

The nurses involved apparently have developed a new awareness of news reporting which may affect their future involvement in being reported upon and their daily consumption of the news.

The journalism students became aware of the implications of what they write and an understanding of the need to develop a sensitivity to public reactions to their work both from the expert or source audience and the lay-reader audience.

The entire task gave all the participants an opportunity to share and exchange ideas as individuals involved and concerned about learning and enriching their experience.

Besides some further replication, with modification, of TRIO, we hope to involve more source or expert groups in a similar type of simulation-game. One group we are working on is law enforcement people.

We believe from our experiences that the simulation-gaming approach is a valuable companion to the means-centered or prescriptive strategies used in journalism education and an important preparer of journalism students for work in their chosen news medium.
APPENDIX A

Specific Instructions to Various Participant Roles

Instructions were prepared on separate sheets of paper and the paper was color-coded for the designated reporters.

Specific Instructions to Panel Members

Panel Member

As panel members, you should consider that the more interesting, the more thought provoking and the better organized your presentation, the better it may be understood and appreciated. You must also remember that your presentation is to the nursing and not to the lay community.

Your presentation and the session form the event to be reported. We will be especially interested in your evaluation of the stories. You should read the stories carefully and consider the following kinds of questions:

a) How does each report jibe with the presentation and discussion?

b) Do the report writers' personal opinions stand in the way of the facts as we present them, not as they are often or generally talked about?

c) How successful are the reports in presenting expert opinions or facts to a lay community without reducing the authenticity and directions of such facts and opinions, or without noticeable distortions?

General Instructions to All Reporters

All reporters should have the following basic understanding:

1) The nurses belong to an expert community concerned with an issue that has social as well as technical consequences.

2) The social consequences or impact of the issue make it necessary for members of the lay community (i.e., all in the non-medical community) to understand what is being presented, and discussed in understandable form.

3) To achieve this end, reports must be made in simple and non-technical language, meant for reading by those in the lay community, and suitable for publication in the Daily Iowan.

All reports must be handed in on Friday, November 30, 1973 by 9 a.m.

Reports from nursing students should be handed in to Professor Free1, while those from journalism students should be handed in to Professor Zima.
All reports should be submitted in a readable form. Pencil corrections are allowed. These reports will be retyped and put in booklet form for distribution and audience evaluation.

We will be especially interested in your evaluation of a sample of the stories that we shall provide you with.

Specific Instructions For
The Blue Reporter--Nurse Report Writers

You attend the presentation on abortion, take part in the discussion, ask questions if you want, and interview anybody you wish in the auditorium after the close of the discussion. The presentation starts at 12:30 p.m. in Room 233 of the College of Nursing Building.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Specific Instructions For
The Blue Reporter--Nurse Report Writer
(provided with background paper)

You attend the presentation on abortion, take part in the discussion, ask questions if you want, and interview anybody you wish in the auditorium after the close of the discussion. The presentation starts at 12:30 p.m. in Room 233 of the College of Nursing Building.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Attached is a copy of a background paper prepared by the nurses responsible for the presentation. You may use this paper in preparing your report. For purposes of the exercise, the background paper is intended for your exclusive personal use. It should not be shared with other participants until after you have handed in your news report.

Specific Instructions For
The Yellow Reporter

You do not attend the formal presentation on abortion. Instead, you attend a presentation (starts at 12:30 p.m., Room 311, College of Nursing Building) on another topic about which you do not report. Then, after this presentation, you attend the discussion period (starts approximately at 1:30 p.m., Room 233, College of Nursing Building) following the presentation on abortion. This is the session about which you write your news report. You may take part in the discussion, ask questions if you want, and interview anybody you wish in the auditorium after the close of the
discussion period.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Specific Instructions For
The Yellow Reporter
(provided with background paper)

You do not attend the formal presentation on abortion. Instead, you attend a presentation (starts at 12:30 p.m., Room 311, College of Nursing Building) on another topic about which you do not report. Then, after this presentation, you attend the discussion period (starts approximately at 1:30 p.m., Room 233, College of Nursing Building) following the presentation on abortion. This is the session about which you write your news report. You may take part in the discussion, ask questions if you want, and interview anybody you wish in the auditorium after the close of the discussion period.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Attached is a copy of a background paper prepared by the nurses responsible for the presentation. You may use this paper in preparing your report. For purposes of the exercise, the background paper is intended for your exclusive personal use. It should not be shared with other participants until after you have handed in your news report.

Specific Instructions For
The Green Reporter

You do not participate directly in the presentation or discussion on abortion. You watch a videotape recording of the formal presentation. The time of the showing of the videotape will be announced in class. It will be shown during a regular class session.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.
Specific Instructions For
The Green Reporter
(provided with background paper)

You do not participate directly in the presentation or discussion on abortion. You watch a videotape recording of the formal presentation. The time of the showing of the videotape will be announced in class. It will be shown during a regular class session.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Attached is a copy of a background paper prepared by the nurses responsible for the presentation. You may use this paper in preparing your report. For purposes of the exercise, the background paper is intended for your exclusive personal use. It should not be shared with other participants until after you have handed in your news report.

Specific Instructions For
The Red Reporter
(provided with background paper)

You attend the presentation on abortion, take part in the discussion, ask questions if you want, and interview anybody you wish in the auditorium after the close of the discussion. The presentation starts at 12:30 p.m. in Room 233 of the College of Nursing Building.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Attached is a copy of a background paper prepared by the nurses responsible for the presentation. You may use this paper in preparing your report. For purposes of the exercise, the background paper is intended for
Specific Instructions For
The White Reporter

You attend the presentation on abortion, but you do not take part in the discussion and questioning following it. You leave the auditorium after the formal presentation. The presentation starts at 12:30 p.m. in Room 233 of the College of Nursing Building.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help your readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Specific Instructions For
The White Reporter
(provided with background paper)

You attend the presentation on abortion, but you do not take part in the discussion and questioning following it. You leave the auditorium after the formal presentation. The presentation starts at 12:30 p.m. in Room 233 of the College of Nursing Building.

Then, you are to write a news report for readers with no medical training. This news report should be clearly and concisely written. It should help our readers understand as well as possible what went on during the presentation, and what might be important to them.

Attached is a copy of a background paper prepared by the nurses responsible for the presentation. You may use this paper in preparing your report. For purposes of the exercise, the background paper is intended for your exclusive personal use. It should not be shared with other participants until after you have handed in your news report.
APPENDIX B

Specific Instructions for Evaluation of the Various Reporters' News Stories

Evaluation of News Stories

Attached to this sheet are forms for evaluating news stories along with a set of news stories which we would like you to evaluate. The stories concern a recent presentation made in the University of Iowa College of Nursing. The topic was abortion. Besides a general discussion about abortion both the pro and con side of the issue were presented. Following the formal presentation by five nursing students those in the audience were able to take part in a give and take session with the five nursing students. Included in the audience were nurses, reporters, professors and general observers. The entire session was also videotaped.

Following the session, members of the audience along with people who learned of what happened only by watching the videotape were asked to write a news story on the session. It was to be written as suitable for publication in the Daily Iowan.

From all the news stories turned in we developed sets of news reports on the session. One such set is attached. There are 12 stories in all. Some have been written by nurses, some by reporters, some by those who watched the videotape and some by people who only sat-in on the discussion part of the session. However, the only identification mark on each story is a number.

Please do the following:

1. Read the stories.
2. Fill out the News Story Rating Sheet and the News Story Ranking Sheet.
3. Keep the stories for our discussion on December 6th but return the completed forms by 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 4th. Nurses turn the forms into Professor Freel and Journalism students to 300 CC. Please return this sheet with the two evaluation forms and comment sheets.
News Story Rating Sheet

Your Name: ______________________________________

Your Role in the Exercise: ___ Blue Reporter
       ___ Red Reporter
       ___ White Reporter
       ___ Yellow Reporter
       ___ Green Reporter
       ___ Reader Only - Nurse
       ___ Reader Only - Journalism
       ___ Reader Only - Other

Check One:

After you have read each of the news stories, please rate each on
the following scale from terrible! (rating of 1) to terrific! (rating of 7).
Use the scale positions in between (ratings of 2 through 6) for more moder-
ate responses between these extremes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story 1</th>
<th>terrible!</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>terrific!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story 2</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 4</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 5</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 6</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 7</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 8</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 9</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 10</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 11</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 12</td>
<td>terrible!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>terrific!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
News Story Ranking Sheet

Rank the attached news stories from best to worst using the following scheme:

- Put the number of the story you consider to be the best in the box to the right. □
- Put the numbers of the two next best stories in the boxes to the right. □ □
- Put the number of the three next best stories in the boxes to the right. □ □ □
- Put the numbers of the three next best stories in the boxes to the right. □ □ □ □
- Put the numbers of the two next best stories in the boxes to the right. □ □
- Put the number of the story you consider the worst in the box to the right. □

Open-end Question Asked:

What were the criteria you used in evaluating the stories? That is, what were your reasons for choosing the best stories as best and the worst as worst? As you compare the best and the worst, what were the important differences to you?
We have included four types of bibliographies in the following pages bearing upon the use of simulation and games in mass communication education.

Bibliography I deals with a general listing of publications covering various uses in many areas of education and research.

Bibliography II deals with publications growing out of the use of simulations and games in the undergraduate program at the University of Iowa School of Journalism.

Bibliography III deals with sources documenting uses of simulation and games for communication, mass communication and journalism.

Bibliography IV deals with other bibliographies, indexes, newsletters, reviews, descriptions and compilations concerning games and simulations.
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Murphy, Sharon F., "We're All Participants in the Game Called Human Communication." Communication: Journalism Education Today, 6:9-12 (Fall, 1972).
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