tr. to Grad.
11-13-00

DAVID L. PALETZ
and DENNIS LaFIURA

The Press and Authority: Portrayals of a Coach and a Mayor

DAVID L. PALETZ received his Ph.D. from UCLA in 1970 and is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Duke University. The author of numerous articles, his book, *Public Service Advertising,* is being published by Praeger.

DENNIS LaFIURA is a law student at Boston University. He was an undergraduate at Duke when this study was carried out.

THE CONTINUING concern with the news media of such politicians as erstwhile President Richard M. Nixon and his successors attests to the recognition by public figures of the role the media play in the maintenance and expansion of authority. Indeed, most of the information and impressions upon which the members of contemporary society base their feelings of satisfaction and security or dissatisfaction and insecurity are structured and delivered by the media of mass communication.

This report investigates the media-authority relationship. Specifically, the nature and possible effects of the Durham *Morning Herald*'s coverage of Duke University's former basketball coach, Raymond C. (Bucky) Waters, are compared to its treatment of a more conventional political figure—the City of Durham's former mayor, R. Wense Grabarek. This unconventional comparison reveals the advantages and disadvantages that media coverage holds for authority figures in the worlds of politics and sports.

At first glance, a college basketball coach may seem a curious subject for a study of authority. Yet there can be little question that authority exists within a college basketball team. A coach's relationships with assistant coaches, players, fans and others meet Harry Eckstein's criteria of occurring within social units which are asymmetric, hierarchical and directional.[1]

In addition to being political, the authority of a college basketball coach is manifest in naturally occurring small groups. A number of the advantages of small groups as tools for social scientific studies—relatively clear relationships, manageable bodies of data and a basis for logical extrapolations—are true of athletic teams.[2]

An additional advantage in using small groups for the study of authority and mass communications concerns audiences. A number of scholars have pointed out the critical role such factors as selective exposure, selective perception, audience segmentation, interpersonal dissemination and the like play in determining the

response to and the effects of mass communications.[3] By focusing on local figures, the possible audiences are greatly reduced, and the complex problem of the roles of audiences in mass communications is consequently more manageable.

It may appear that our data base is too narrow, our subject too specialized, to permit any generalizations about press-authority relations and effects in the local community. Before conducting our research, however, we undertook an extensive examination of sports coverage by the press across the United States. On the basis of this survey, we concluded that the Durham *Morning Herald* is representative of a host of newspapers published in medium-sized and small cities throughout this country and, more important, that its coverage of both local sports figures and local public officials is typical of that to be found in such newspapers elsewhere. Similarly, Durham's government consists of the mayor-council structure and formal non-partisanship characteristic of many communities. We therefore concluded that a comparative analysis of the *Herald*'s portrayals of the mayor and the coach would allow, even facilitate, some tentative generalizations.

Our research is focused around three questions. What content appeared in the Durham *Morning Herald* about these two public figures? How do we explain the nature of this content? And, to the extent they can be observed, what effects did such content have on their authority, if any? Animating our study is the assumption that one of the most productive ways of studying the press is in terms of its possible effects on the authority of its subjects, particularly because these effects are often inadvertent. We therefore begin with a brief discussion of the nature of the authority possessed by a college coach, then analyze how the coach was portrayed by his local newspaper. This coverage is then compared with that received by the local mayor. Finally, we advance explanations for the coverage each man received, discuss its effects and speculate on the implications of our research.

The Authority of a College Basketball Coach

Authority must originate from some source, be bound (affected by restraints and sanctions) within certain jurisdictions and undergo a degree of symbolization.[4] We shall consider each of these

dimensions in relation to the three groups we view as being in some sense subject to a college coach's authority: the players, the fans and the university administration.

In relation to players, a coach's authority stems from the positions he holds within three organizations—the university, the team and the occupation of coaching. Both a coach and his players are "members" of a university. By enrolling as a student, a player indicates his willingness to submit to the norms and regulations of the university. Through tradition and administrative acts, one of the authority statuses that has emerged in many universities is that of coach.

Of more significance to a coach's relationship with players is the authority stemming from the formalization of his position as team leader. For as long as a player remains a member of the team, he is subject to the coach's authority in all matters pertaining to basketball.

A third source of a coach's authority in dealing with players is his position as a member of the profession of coaching. As part of his overall socialization, an athlete from his earliest participation in organized sports learns to accept his coach's authority.

Rather than obedience, a coach's authority over fans is aimed at exacting such support as attending games, buying tickets, making donations and cheering enthusiastically. The importance of fan support to a coach is most clearly observable when it is absent. Sagging revenues and sparse, unenthusiastic crowds cause university administrators to begin reevaluating the position of a coach. A coach's authority with fans is not too unlike a politician's authority with voters. Politicians do not usually issue commands to voters, yet their support, as expressed mainly by votes, is essential to a politician's continuation in office.

In most instances it is the coach who is subject to the authority of the administrators. However, a coach can spread his authority to university administrators to the extent that they are also genuine basketball fans. For those administrators who are fans, the source of a coach's authority is roughly the same as that already discussed for fans in general.

The jurisdiction of the authority of a coach refers to those geographic areas, groups of people and aspects of life within which a particular figure's authority is viewed as legitimate and, to a

degree, powerful. These jurisdictions can be maintained and expanded through the use of available sanctions, or limited by restraints.

The distribution of playing time—starting with none—is a basketball coach's most useful sanction. The coach determines who plays, when he plays and how long he plays. A second sanction is a coach's influence over athletic scholarships, which places him in a position to affect the ability of players to continue their education.

In his relationships with players, a coach's most significant restraints are in the form of resources and expectations. If a university does not grant athletic scholarships, for example, the coach will find it more difficult to attract talented new players and to control the players he already has. Lack of money might make it impossible to provide players with properly fitting equipment, adequate physical facilities or the promise of summer jobs. The potential then exists for players to become restive and to question the "clout" of their coach. Excessively high expectations are engendered when, in order to attract players, coaches find it necessary to make explicit or implicit promises concerning amounts of playing time. If a player subsequently finds himself on the bench more than he would like or outshone by another individual, he may become disenchanted with the coach who built up his expectations.

The only major sanction at the disposal of a coach in his dealings with fans is control over the dissemination of information and over the personal appearances of himself and his players. A fan's interest in basketball leads to a desire for information concerning teams and players. That a coach controls the release of much of this information seems clear.[5] A coach can use such control to suppress or dissipate the effects of information potentially harmful to his relationship with fans.[6] A coach can also structure the dissemination of non-harmful information in ways that may serve to increase his authority over fans.

Two major restraints on a coach's attempts to gain fan support are excessively high expectations and unjustified responsibility. Fans' expectations about a team's performance can be raised by a high pre-season ranking. Defeats engender disappointment, which frequently results in a reduction of support for the coach.

The third element of authority is symbolization. Symbols, whether linguistic or non-linguistic, are usually referential or they are condensation symbols.[7] Referential symbols are essentially names. Condensation symbols have the ability to evoke emotions. Authority figures have the potential to become condensation symbols because they are viewed as important, powerful, visible and remote. They come to symbolize, in addition to themselves, institutions (or associations), offices, events (past or future), ideas or values. For such authority figures the problems of maintaining or in some cases expanding their jurisdictions are largely solved.

Psychological distance between authority holder and the non-select is crucial to the process of symbolization. Psychological distance is both created and reinforced by depersonalization, ceremony, ritual and myth. Depersonalization refers to the tendency of authority figures to act or appear to act in the name of the positions they hold and the institutions of which they are a part rather than on their own behalf. Ceremony adds to psychological distance, and consequently to condensation symbol formation, by placing the authority figure on a pedestal. It keeps men at a respectful distance from political authority. Edelman defines ritual as "motor activity that involves its participants symbolically in a common enterprise, calling their attention to their relatedness and joint interests in a compelling way."[8] It is one means of modifying psychological distance without compromising prestige.

The symbolization of political authority figures is also advanced by myths. A myth may be understood to mean any widely circulated story concerning an authority figure which may have had its roots in fact but the truth of which can no longer be validated.

For a player, a coach can become a symbol of the office of coach. When this occurs, players are likely to grant him more respect and authority. In addition, a coach might serve as a symbol to his players of both the university and the team. In this case, a player will see himself as obeying not an individual but an institution and an association of some importance to him. A coach can symbolize for players the idea of success in life and basketball. Players often regard a coach as a symbol for particularly desirable past or future victories. A coach can symbolize values which players may consider significant—for example, confidence, competitiveness and dedication. A coach who either consciously or

unconsciously combines one or more of these symbols is in a position to enhance his authority and require greater efforts and stricter obedience from his players.

In his relationships with players, a coach has access to all the elements of symbolization starting with the ability to create psychological distance between himself and his players. Differences in dress, separate facilities, physical distance are all reinforced by the major depersonalizing element in a coach's relationship with his players: the traditional use of the term "coach" to address him.[9]

Some of a coach's game activities may be regarded as ceremonial from the players' point of view. A coach, when arguing with an official, helps reinforce players' images of him as knowledgeable and dedicated. A coach's halftime analyses and inspirational talks can become ceremonial during the course of a season in that they repeatedly emphasize the coach's superior knowledge.

Ritual is of even greater significance than ceremony to the symbolization of a coach's authority in relation to players. Practices and games in their entirety could be considered ritual. In addition, many of the discrete parts of each of these general activities possess the repetitive, stylized quality of rituals. These include the singing of the national anthem, the introduction of the team, the last-minute huddle and time outs.

In the relationship between players and the coach there are myths associated with the profession of coaching such as "coaches eat and sleep basketball" and "coaches love the game more than money." There are also myths associated with individual coaches.

By becoming a favorable condensation symbol, a coach can exact continuing and substantial support from fans. For different fans, a coach has the potential to symbolize different offices, institutions, ideas or values. For alumni, he may come to symbolize four past years of "good times." For members of the community, a coach may symbolize the overall contribution of the university to the city. To students and faculty members, he may represent the athletic programs of the university. For fans in general the coach has the potential to become a symbol of values they hold in high esteem.

The primary elements in the symbolization of a coach's authority over fans are psychological distance, ceremony and ritual.[10]

Distance is inherent and much easier to establish between a coach and fans than between a coach and players. To the average fan, a basketball coach lives in a world of glamor and excitement, he is a celebrity approached with a certain degree of awe. Every time a coach appears on television or in newspapers, his distinctiveness is emphasized. The lowly fan, after all, is never interviewed on the evening news nor does he have a weekly television show.[11]

Participation in ceremony and ritual is another element in the symbolization of a coach's authority over fans. Coaches usually allow some time to elapse before following the players into the stadium.[12] Many of a coach's game actions, such as arguing with officials, calling time outs and issuing instructions to players, are ceremonial from the perspective of the fans. Many coaches have regular pregame routines that also can become ceremonial.[13] Fans and coaches both engage in repetitive and stylized actions that serve to highlight their relatedness. The singing of the national anthem and the alma mater are ritual acts that reaffirm the common heritage and interests of the coach and the fans. Coaches do much to perpetuate this idea of fan participation through discussions of home court advantages and the inspiring effects of vocal support. By cheering, fans affirm that they, as well as the coach and players, have contributed to the team's efforts.

A coach's symbolic stature is most important in his dealings with administrators. His potential to symbolize the university is of particular significance. A coach has one sanction at his disposal in dealing with administrators that he does not have in dealing with fans. This is his authority over fans and players. Administrators might be reluctant to fire a coach with substantial fan and player support, since such an action could cause bad publicity for the university, a drop in financial contributions, a loss of revenue from ticket sales and a reduction in player morale.

The Coach's Authority and the Press

An analysis of the coverage of the Durham *Morning Herald* (hereafter *Herald*) of former Duke University basketball coach Bucky Waters reveals that, in its treatment of Duke basketball in general, the *Herald*'s structure and content, as well as its methods of reporting, reinforced the primary elements in the process of

Waters' symbolization; namely, psychological distance, depersonalization, ceremony and ritual, and myth. In addition, the *Herald* affected the substance of Waters' symbolic dimensions by portraying him in roles which supported the symbolic potentials he held for the players, fans and administrators within his jurisdiction.

One year of the *Herald*'s coverage of Duke basketball, from December, 1969, through November, 1970, was subjected to a content analysis.[14] Each sentence which dealt with Duke basketball was categorized on the basis of its subject and the type of article in which it was found.[15] The resulting distributions and frequencies provide a picture of the emphasis placed on Waters in the content of the *Herald*'s coverage of Duke basketball. This content, in addition to the structure of the *Herald*'s sports section and the method of its sports reporting, aided the process of Waters' symbolization.

The content analysis was ramified when the sentences with Waters as their subject were categorized a second time on the basis of the roles in which they portrayed him and the type of articles in which they appeared. The combination of these roles resulted in Waters emerging as a symbol for the ideal coach, the upholder of community values and Duke University.

In an effort to determine what roles may have been perceived by which groups within the jurisdiction of Bucky Waters, a questionnaire was administered to the members of the Duke University varsity basketball team and a selection of student and non-student fans.[16] Responses revealed that all the players, more than 60 percent of the non-student fans and over half of the student fans were exposed to at least some of the *Herald*'s sports content.

One would not really expect the *Herald* adversely to affect the university and team sources of Waters' authority. Duke University is a major contributor to the City of Durham's economy and culture and the *Herald* devotes some space to the activities of the University and those associated with it. This deference probably enhanced the authority of those associated with Duke, including Coach Waters. The *Herald* also clearly placed some importance on the Duke basketball team and, in covering it, never questioned the worth of the team as an association.

The *Herald* might be expected to have had more of an adverse effect on the profession of coaching as a source of Waters' authori-

ty. The *Herald* after all is not dependent on coaches in general as it is on Duke University or the Duke basketball team. In the year analyzed, however, the content of the *Herald* contained little that was either explicitly or implicitly critical of athletic coaches. The *Herald* published 18 articles on coaches. Of these, six pertained to the death of Vince Lombardi and three dealt with the appearance of University of Texas football coach Darrell Royal before a meeting of the Durham Sports Club. Since these articles serve to increase the stature of coaches in general, they could also have enhanced the authority of Waters over players, fans and administrators.

The effects of the *Herald* on Waters' use of sanctions and susceptibility to restraints can be dealt with quickly. Waters did on occasion use the *Herald* to structure his use of the sanction of reduced playing time in relation to certain players.[17] To the extent that the coach controlled the dissemination of information about his team and players, the *Herald* itself could be regarded as one of his sanctions in his dealings with fans and administrators. The *Herald* does not appear to have acted as a restraint on Waters' authority.

The *Herald*'s effects were greatest on the symbolic dimensions of Waters' authority. The structure and content of its coverage of Duke basketball, as well as its methods of reporting, reinforced the five elements necessary to the process of the coach's symbolization. During the year studied, the *Herald* contained written information concerning Duke basketball in seven types of articles: Elton Casey's columns; game reports; post-game coaches' articles; game previews; stories dealing with banquets, award ceremonies and other honorary activities; articles dealing with the freshman team, and articles on recruiting.

The type of article containing the most information about Duke basketball was Elton Casey's column. Casey, the paper's sports editor, wrote a column that appeared five days a week, usually from Wednesday through Sunday. With the exception of Sundays, the column always occupied the three far left columns of the sports section's front page. Of the 3,742 sentences about Duke basketball contained in the seven types of articles, approximately 27 percent appeared in Casey's columns; and almost one-third of the space Casey devoted to Duke basketball was expended on

Waters. The frequency with which Waters was treated in Casey's column adds to his distance from both players and fans. In addition, the nature of Casey's stories frequently served to increase that distance. Thus Casey opened an article dealing with Waters' wife by stating that it was for people "interested in knowing something about the wife of a basketball coach."[18] Implicit throughout is the idea that no ordinary man's wife can be like a coach's wife. The regularity with which Casey's column appeared lent it an air of ritual—a ritual in which the coach frequently participated. Casey's column was the closest the *Herald*'s sports section came to an editorial. Yet in the entire year, not one comment either implicitly or explicitly critical of Waters appeared.

Game articles contained as many sentences (27 percent of 3,742) on Duke basketball as Casey's columns. They appeared each morning after each Duke game and were descriptive and statistical. The Duke players, Duke team, opposing teams and opposing players were the most frequent subjects of the sentences in game articles. The low amount of coverage of Waters in game articles was probably as effective in creating distance from players as the large amount of coverage contained in Casey's columns. The game articles were marked off as belonging to the players with whom the coach should not mix too closely. In the rare instances when Waters was mentioned, he was usually shown performing strategic functions. In one game article, for example, the reporter said, "Duke called time out, and the chat with Bucky Waters at courtside netted dividends."[19] Such sentences served to reinforce myths concerning the necessity and effectualness of coaches for both players and fans.

Fourteen percent of the *Herald*'s coverage of Duke basketball was contained in articles about coaches' reactions appearing after every Duke home game. They were separate from the game articles and frequently written by a different reporter. They concentrated solely on Waters' opinions, reactions and behavior following the game. No other type of article was dominated so completely by one subject as the coaches' articles were by Waters. The only other subject treated to a significant degree was opposing coaches. Since the articles are associated with the official capacity of coach, they served as a depersonalizing agent for Waters in his dealings with

players and fans. They allowed fans and players to observe the coach engaging in the ceremony of the postgame news conference. And they were a useful means of creating distance from players, since they provided a forum for the coach to criticise and evaluate the actions of players. More than any other single item, they helped create an impression of the uniqueness and importance of Waters' expertise.

On the whole, the content of preview articles (14 percent of the total) that dealt with Waters were usually designed to identify him as the coach of Duke University's basketball team. They aided the depersonalization of his authority. A number of these sentences also stressed his experience and success as the head coach of West Virginia. They were no doubt helpful in the formation of myths concerning Waters' past.

Contained within the banquet category are articles which announced and reported all honorary functions involving the Duke basketball team and its coach. While only a little over 11 percent of the *Herald*'s total coverage was contained in banquet articles, during the off-season (April through November), they accounted for approximately 33 percent of the *Herald*'s coverage. The three most frequent subjects of the sentences contained in banquet articles were the Duke players, Duke University officials (primarily the athletic director, the assistant athletic director and the president of the University), and Waters. These articles enhanced Waters' authority in relation to fans by associating him with significant University authority figures. In addition, they increased Waters' distance from players, since they often depicted him speaking to or about the players. In an appearance before the Durham Blue Devil Club (a Duke alumni group), Waters was quoted as saying " 'you will be able to see heads, ears, necks and backs from everyone on our squad ' He meant Duke would have no long hair."[20] Such a statement, in addition to supporting the opinions of the people present, emphasized Waters' control over the players. Banquet articles were also significant to the symbolic dimensions of the coach's authority since they showed him performing ritualistic and ceremonial acts.

Articles dealing with the freshman team (4 percent of the total) had an indirect effect beneficial to Waters. For the only time in Duke's history, the freshman team was undefeated that year and

he was the man who had recruited the players. Stories relating the triumphs of that team increased his mythic dimensions, particularly those associated with his ability to recruit and judge talent.

The least number of sentences dealing with Duke basketball were contained in articles about recruiting. These were generally of no more than five to ten sentences in length; they usually announced the signing of new players and listed the recruit's basketball and academic credentials. Waters' coverage in recruiting articles tended to reinforce the ceremonial and depersonalization aspects in the process of his symbolization. Recruiting is in many respects another of the ceremonies associated with college basketball. The announcement of recruits usually takes place in March and April of each year. The words used to describe them are frequently the same. The coach plays a central role in recruiting. When reading the announcement of a signing of a new recruit, players, student fans and non-student fans had Waters' ability and importance asserted in a compelling way. The recruiting articles aided the depersonalization of his authority in that he usually expressed the happiness and hopes of "Duke University" over the recruit's decision to enroll.

We next determined the percentage of each subject contained in each article type. Rather than subject the reader to an array of tables, we shall simply state that Bucky Waters was the most frequent subject of all sentences in the *Herald*'s coverage of Duke basketball (23 percent). The emphasis placed on the coach is even greater considering the fact that the second largest subject (Duke players) consists of sentences dealing with separate individuals.

In addition to its written content, the *Herald*'s pictorial content also enhanced the process of Waters' symbolization. During the year analyzed, 40 pictures of Waters appeared.[21] These pictures helped create distance between coach and fans and players. To the average fan, only important people get their pictures in the paper frequently. Probably no other Duke University employee or student, and certainly no fan, appears in the paper so often. Moreover, the nature of the pictures helped create distance between Waters and players. Players appear in action shots during the course of a season. By far the largest percentage of Waters' pictures, however, were head and shoulder shots. Such pictures, focused solely on the coach, served to emphasize his unique

contributions; players were usually shown as part of a group. In pictures other than head and shoulder shots, the coach was often shown performing ceremonial or ritualistic activities—at banquets and award presentations, issuing instructions to players, arguing with referees. The pictures also identified Waters with non-basketball rituals. Thus, on December 25, 1969, a picture shows Waters and his family around a Christmas tree; the caption reads, "The Bucky Waters Family Readies for Christmas Day."[22]

One aspect of the *Herald*'s methods particularly significant to Waters' authority was the tendency of its reporters to quote him frequently and at length. Approximately two-thirds of all the sentences specifically dealing with Waters were direct quotations. Only in game articles did he speak less often than he was spoken about. The picture that emerges is that the *Herald* was largely a transmission mechanism through which the coach could convey his thoughts, actions and feelings to players and fans. The *Herald*'s tendency to quote him made its coverage a particularly useful form of ritual in Waters' relations with fans. Through the *Herald*, Waters spoke to fans repeatedly but in a stylized and structured way, a way which did not compromise his distance.

In addition to enhancing the process of the coach's symbolization, the *Herald* affected the substance of the symbolic dimensions of his authority. In its 860 sentences dealing explicitly with Waters, the *Herald* portrayed him as fulfilling eleven recurring roles. In turn, these roles led to Waters becoming a symbol for the ideal coach, the upholder of community values, and Duke University. The following analysis explicates how the *Herald*'s portrayal of Waters led to the formation of each of these symbols.

The *Herald* placed the most emphasis on the ideal basketball coach symbol in its portrayal of Waters. The six recurring roles which constitute the coach symbol account for over 70 percent of all the *Herald*'s sentences dealing with him. The nature of each role is discussed below.

Waters was most frequently portrayed as a master of strategy. The strategy sentences were usually descriptions by Waters or the reporters of the tactics used in the game. There was seldom any indication that the coach might have made a wrong decision. Assistant coaches and players were never portrayed as having contributed to strategic moves. Those sentences which were not

descriptive also cast a favorable light on Waters' tactical abilities. Following an overtime victory, for example, he stated, " 'It was a great chess game' " and implied that he was the chess master.[23]

Waters filled the team analyst role in two ways. In those sentences appearing in coaches' articles, he usually analyzed the team's performance in the preceding game. In Casey's columns and the banquet articles, Waters usually analyzed the Duke team's season performance. Two examples of the team analyst role are: " 'If we don't lose our hunger, we're going to have a fine team' "[24] and " 'I feel we are making progress and we should continue if we don't run out of gas.' "[25]

When in the player analyst role, Waters was usually commenting on the performances of individual players in a game. In a significant number of sentences, however, he combined such evaluations of basketball talents with an appraisal of players' personal characteristics. In fact, he is portrayed in the *Herald* as seeking to build character while improving basketball skills.

Waters was most frequently cast in the role of a winner in the coaches' articles. The sentences dealing with his post-game interviews revealed to players and fans how much he abhorred defeat and enjoyed victory. In one coaches' article, the reporter stated "the wins get juicier for Duke's Waters."[26] In another instance Waters is quoted as stating, " 'that is what it is all about—winning and losing.' "[27]

Bucky Waters' roles as an experienced coach and an analyst of basketball events received their greatest emphasis in Casey's columns. Casey was particularly fond of discussing Waters' experience as the successful coach of the Duke freshman team. Casey also pointed out past successes with lines such as "three of his [Waters'] past five teams have competed in post-season tournaments."[28] The primary type of basketball event upon which Waters commented (other than matters about Duke) was recruiting. He frequently analyzed the capabilities of players signed by other schools.

In an effort to determine the possible effects of the *Herald*'s portrait of Waters as a coach symbol, players and fans were asked to rate the necessity of these six roles to their image of the ideal college basketball coach. Those people who found these roles essential to the ideal coach were likely to perceive congruence

between the roles and the *Herald*'s coverage of Waters. For those people, Waters' status as a symbol for a coach could be reinforced. His authority could be enhanced over players and fans for whom he was a symbol of the ideal coach. The responses revealed the overwhelming importance placed on these six roles by players, student fans and non-student fans alike. Only in the analyst of basketball events role was the "unimportant" figure in excess of 10 percent.

An authority figure can symbolize values as well as offices, institutions, ideas or events. In fact, widely held and highly esteemed community values might be the most advantageous items an authority holder can symbolize. Values tend to be enduring and, in many cases, unquestioned. As depicted by the *Herald*, Waters emerged as an upholder of numerous community values. In particular, he was identified with confidence, dedication and an exemplary family life. Of the *Herald*'s sentences dealing with Waters, 21 percent served to enhance his status as an upholder of community values. Waters was most clearly identified with confidence in the pages of the *Herald*. He repeatedly expressed his confidence in himself and his players. In the sentences appearing in coaches' articles, Waters usually expressed his confidence in the team's success in upcoming games. After a loss, Waters as quoted as stating, " 'We just have to keep working, keep our heads up and not destroy our confidence in the process.' "[29]

Waters was identified with dedication mainly by his frequent references to the concept of "total effort." After games, he was pleased only if his team had dedicated itself totally to the game. Thus on occasion, he praised the Duke team for having given "a tremendous effort" or he expressed his pride over "the effort we gave."[30]

The majority of the sentences dealing with Waters' home life appeared in one Elton Casey column devoted to Waters' wife and children.[31] The article showed Mrs. Waters as totally immersed in her husband, her children and Duke basketball. Casey also occasionally referred to such family functions as the Waters' birthday parties and wedding anniversaries.

Casey's columns, banquet articles and coaches' articles contained numerous other sentences identifying Waters with values such as pride, hope, frankness, courage, democracy and "the

American Way." These values were treated too infrequently to aid Waters' symbolic status by themselves. Taken together, however, they added to the aura of the coach as the upholder of community values. Perhaps more importantly, the *Herald*'s coverage never identified him with cynicism or sarcasm, which might have been offensive to any groups within his authority.

The players, student fans and non-student fans included in the survey felt that confidence and dedication are essential to a college basketball coach. Presumably, the *Herald*'s portrayal of Waters as confident and dedicated was perceived by and reassuring to the members of all three groups. In relation to family life, however, the three groups differ greatly. The players were the only group receptive to the *Herald*'s portrayal of Waters as the leader of an exemplary family life. The significance placed on the family life value may result from players' personal acquaintance with the coach's wife and children. Players might have seen the question in more tangible terms—such as, would they want to see the break-up of their coach's home—or viewed him as a father figure.

Waters was cast in the representative of Duke University role in two types of sentences. In banquet, preview and recruiting articles he usually acted as the spokesman for Duke University. Thus in a banquet article, he was shown walking down an aisle while a band played the Duke University fight song.[32] In sentences of the second type, usually appearing in Casey's columns, Waters was identified with Duke in such a way as to praise the University. Thus Casey wrote that Waters was "aware that to be head coach at a school of Duke's stature at such an early age, he is fortunate."[33]

The Mayor's Authority and the Press

The Durham *Morning Herald*'s coverage of the Mayor of Durham was analyzed for the same period and in the same way as its depiction of the coach.[34] The analysis revealed significant differences in the amount of coverage, type of portrayal and method of reporting offered by the *Herald.*

The authority of mayors, unlike that of college basketball coaches, has been studied.[35] Hence no attempt is made here to provide an in-depth, theoretical analysis of a mayor's authority. It is necessary, however briefly, to suggest the points at which

mayors intersect the framework of political authority previously established. The primary groups of people within the jurisdiction of a mayor are the members of the city government (city council members and administrators) and the voters. The members of the city government are comparable to players in their relationship with a college basketball coach. The voters appear to combine the roles of fans and university administrators. The source of a mayor's authority over these two groups stems from the formal statuses he or she occupies within the association of the community and the institution of city government. A mayor's geographical jurisdiction is bound by the limits of the city. A mayor has jurisdiction only over those aspects of people's lives that pertain to municipal government. Influence over the resources of the city and a claim to the "mandate of the people" are major sanctions at the disposal of a mayor. The restraints on a mayor's authority include a shortage of tax revenue, the mutually exclusive demands of citizens, the mayor's political ambitions and the threat of media exposure. The elements of the process of symbolization surround the mayor who has the potential for symbolizing the office of mayor, the city, and community values. These are analogous to the coach's potential for symbolizing the office of coach, the university, and community values.

Just as in the case of a college basketball coach, newspapers appear to be the medium of mass communication of greatest significance to the authority of a mayor. A study based on a survey of city managers concluded that newspapers are the most involved and the most influential form of mass communications in relation to city governments.[36] The authors suggest three reasons: that local news is the base of a newspaper's operation, television and radio being more concerned with "entertainment" and national and international news; that newspapers indulge in "in depth" treatment of local news and they "regularly" report the activities of local government. In another study, Paletz, *et al.*, found that newspapers tend to support the authority of local governments because the "professionalism" of reporters leads to coverage which fosters psychological distance, reduces community anxiety and creates symbolic reassurance.[37] A mayor's position as the highest elected official of local government should mean that newspaper coverage is most significant to his personal authority as well.[38]

The most readily observable difference in the *Herald*'s treatment of the coach and the mayor in the year analyzed was the amount of coverage given to each man. Compared to Waters' 860 sentences, Grabarek was the subject of only 268 sentences. Grabarek's picture appeared in the *Herald* only ten times, that of Waters 40 times. In both written and pictorial content, the coach received nearly four times the amount of coverage devoted to the mayor. This difference in coverage is not a function of the *Herald*'s expending more sentences on Duke basketball than on Durham government, for the *Herald* spends considerably more than four times the amount of space on local government than it does on Duke basketball. Grabarek received both less total coverage and a smaller percentage of that coverage devoted to the area he most directly associated with.

In addition to the amount of coverage, the *Herald*'s treatment differed with respect to one role portrayal. Like the sentences dealing with Waters, Grabarek's coverage was contained in specific article types, in this case five. The mayor, like the coach, was portrayed in these sentences as filling specific roles. Six of the roles aided the substance of Grabarek's symbolic dimensions since they emphasized three of his symbolic potentials, namely, the office of mayor, widely held community values, and the City of Durham. The seventh role in which the mayor was portrayed—the subject of criticism role—was nowhere to be found in the *Herald*'s treatment of the coach. We shall now describe the article types and role portrayals found in the *Herald*'s treatment of Grabarek.

Sentences with Grabarek as their subject appeared in five types of articles: controversial issues, non-controversial issues, editorials, reports of the activities of the city council and articles involving ritualistic activities. Sentences were placed under the controversial issue category if they appeared in an article on a subject about which there was the slightest difference of opinion. Grabarek sentences appeared in nine articles. They concerned such subjects as the resignation of prominent black community leaders from the Mayor's Youth Council and the Human Relations Committee, opposition to a proposed merger of the police and fire departments, the grievances of black policemen, and a Republican charge that Grabarek's appointments were not non-partisan.

Non-controversial issues were ones on which there was no disagreement among the members of the city government or the residents of Durham. Sixteen such articles appeared containing Grabarek sentences. Examples were the City's right to urban renewal money, Durham's disbelief that the 1970 census kept it under the magic 100,000 population figure, and the City's demand to insure that a new interstate highway served local needs.

During the year analyzed, the *Herald* contained three editorials which had sentences with Grabarek as their subject. One dealt with a speech he made before a sociology class at predominantly black North Carolina Central University. The other two editorials discussed Durham's relations with its college student population.

Most of the *Herald*'s coverage of local government occurred in articles reporting the activities of the city council. Of the fifty city council articles, the mayor was mentioned in sixteen (32 percent). During the year, he appeared in twelve articles that showed him performing ritualistic activities (attending the opening of a restaurant and a bank, proclaiming Crime Prevention Week and Y.M.C.A. Week, speaking at the inauguration of Duke University's new president).

Of the seven role portrayals contained in these five kinds of articles, six emphasize symbolic potentials of the mayor analogous to those emphasized in the *Herald*'s treatment of the basketball coach. Four of these six roles relate to the office of mayor. Just as coach Waters emerged as a symbol for the position of coach, Grabarek's role portrayals as an analyst of municipal events, an initiator of policy, the leader of the city council and an experienced public servant, which accounted for more than half of the total coverage, served to enhance his status as a symbol for the office of mayor. The man who is able to become such a symbol is in a position to demand greater obedience from the members of city government and to extract greater support from the voters.

The most interesting of these four components of the office-of-mayor symbol is the *Herald*'s portrayal of Grabarek as an initiator of policy. Few voters or members of city government would object to a mayor analyzing municipal events, leading the city council or having experience in public service. Substantial blocks of both groups, however, might react unfavorably to the policy proposals of a mayor and thus harm his symbolic status and his

chances for re-election. Significantly, in the pages of the *Herald* Grabarek emerged as an initiator of policy most frequently in response to non-controversial issues. For example, the *Herald* reported Grabarek's reaction to the "great census crisis" in the following manner: "Durham Mayor R. Wense Grabarek Wednesday said he will ask the city council committee-of-the-whole today 'to pursue the problem posed by the recent census to see if we can't somehow reconcile the disparity between the official count and our pre-census estimates.' "[39] Clearly, such "actions" were not likely to breed much dissension among voters or members of government. If, however, Grabarek has proposed a policy alternative in relation to the police and fire department merger issue and if the *Herald* had reported that proposal, the mayor would have risked alienating either the supporters of the policemen and firemen or the supporters of "fiscal responsibility."

The mayor's role as the upholder of community values fostered his transformation into a symbol for those values. Unlike the coach, who was most clearly identified with confidence, dedication and an exemplary family life, the mayor was most often associated with "democracy" and due process. Thus, the *Herald* stated that a speech of the mayor's had as its major point "that the people of the United States live under the premise that man is capable of governing himself. "[40] In September of 1970, Grabarek is quoted as stating " 'We have always honored the judicial process in Durham.' "[41] He was also occasionally identified with other values such as individuality, independence and gratitude. Grabarek filled the upholder-of-community-values role most frequently in articles dealing with controversial issues. It seems that when faced with issues potentially dangerous to his authority the mayor was content to make, and the *Herald* happy to transmit, rather vacuous, inoffensive value statements.

Just as the coach had the potential to symbolize Duke University, so too did the mayor occupy a position that could have led voters and the members of the city government to regard him as a symbol for Durham. Hopefully, from the mayor's point of view, becoming a symbol for Durham would have enhanced his authority by making him the object of civic pride and hometown sentiment. Approximately 12 percent of the *Herald*'s coverage of the mayor tended to enhance his status as a symbol for Durham by

casting him in the role of the representative of the city in its dealings with the bewildering maze of the federal bureaucracy. For example, he is pictured as saving Durham from the folly of losing its Housing and Urban Development funds.[42] In articles dealing with ritualistic activities, he is usually shown speaking for the people of Durham. Thus, in an article dealing with Duke President Terry Sanford's inauguration, the mayor is quoted as having stated that the people of Durham did not expect the new president to "walk on water."[43]

A seventh role in which the mayor was cast by the reporters and editors of the *Herald* was as the subject of criticism. Unlike its treatment of the coach, the *Herald*'s coverage of the mayor contained a number of sentences (6 percent) which were explicitly critical of his actions. The vast majority of these sentences appeared in controversial issue articles. Virtually all of the critical sentences are in the form of direct quotations attributed by the reporter to an individual on the opposite side of an issue from the mayor. No critical content was contained in the *Herald*'s editorials. Clearly, the reporters and editors of the *Herald* were not themselves critical of the mayor; rather, they transmitted the criticisms of other people. Two examples illustrate the *Herald*'s passivity. In one article, the chairman of the Durham County Republican Party accused Grabarek of subverting the non-partisan character of Durham's government by appointing only Democrats to city posts.[44] In another, a leader of Durham's black community is quoted as saying that the Mayor's Youth Council, a body established by Grabarek in 1968, " 'is a fraud and exists only for the mayor to point to as a good thing.' "[45]

Explanations, Effects and Implications

The *Herald*'s treatment of former Durham Mayor R. Wense Grabarek differed significantly from its coverage of Coach Waters. In particular, the mayor was covered less, quoted less and criticized more, than the coach. The reasons for and the effects of each of these differences deserve analysis.

The reasons for the disparity in the volume of coverage may be found partly in the idiosyncrasies of the period studied. There was no mayoralty election in 1970. During election years, the *Herald*

increases, to some degree, the number of sentences devoted to the mayor. In addition, no major crisis, such as the disturbances which followed the death of Martin Luther King in 1968, struck Durham during the year analyzed. In crisis situations the mayor tends to become a more central figure in the *Herald*'s treatment of local government.

A more important explanation for the increased coverage devoted to the coach relates to the nature of public responses to the two authority positions of coach and mayor. It is doubtful if even an election or a crisis would increase the mayor's coverage fourfold. The greater coverage given to the coach by the *Herald* is primarily due to the fact that its readers, reporters and editors are more interested in Duke University's basketball coach than they are in the city of Durham's mayor.

The relative lack of coverage given the mayor by the newspaper both hindered and enhanced his authority. It made the mayor's identity less well known to the voters within his jurisdiction. Indeed, in our survey, 100 percent of the students (excluding players) and 83 percent of the non-students identified the Duke coach correctly (as would be expected), but only 43 percent of the students (including players) and 53 percent of the non-students could identify the Mayor of Durham. The *Herald* is obviously not the only factor influencing the public's awareness of public figures, but it is a significant, contributing factor. The mayor's relative lack of visibility, therefore, rendered the symbolic potential he held for voters and members of the city government less obvious. In terms of enhancing his authority, however, the mayor was granted a substantial amount of freedom of action by the *Herald*'s lack of coverage. Indeed, the *Herald* would appear to be relatively ineffectual as a restraint on the mayor's authority, particularly since the actions of a mayor, unlike those of a basketball coach, frequently have obscure and delayed effects. The mayor's comparative invisibility while making decisions allowed him to accept or shun responsibility for certain outcomes at election time.

The data revealed that 68 percent of the sentences appearing in the *Herald* with the coach as their subject were direct quotations from him. The newspaper therefore emerged as a podium from which the coach could address the groups within his jurisdiction.

The equivalent figure for the mayor was 41 percent. Why was the coach quoted substantially more than the mayor? First, the coach's position gave him more control over the information of greatest interest to the *Herald*'s sports reporters, or so it would appear. Secondly, the *Herald*'s sports reporters' tendency to shun analysis led them to act as more of a transmission belt for the coach's views, not their own.

In contrast, by preventing the mayor from always speaking directly to the groups within his jurisdiction, the reporters stopped the paper from becoming as useful a form of ritual as it was for the coach. The mayor could not use the paper, at least not to the same extent as the coach, to increase his personal association with voters in a way that would not compromise the psychological distance needed for the maintenance of his authority. The potential effects of this reduction in the rate of quotation may, however, have been partly offset by the distribution of those quotations that did occur. The only two article types in which the mayor spoke more often than he was spoken about were controversial issues and editorials. Controversial issue articles were also where 81 percent of the criticism aimed at the mayor took place. It seems that the mayor was given the opportunity, because of the tendency of reporters to ask public officials to respond to criticism, to dampen the effects of criticism by emphasizing his ritualistic ties to the community (by speaking directly to the people) in the very articles where the criticism usually occurred.

The crucial question is this: why did the *Herald* contain content expressly critical of Grabarek while at the same time it contained no such criticism of an equally prominent authority holder in the Durham community, coach Waters? The discrepancy would appear to be more than just a function of the difference between the *Herald*'s sports editor and reporters and its city editor and reporters. After all, the *Herald*'s city editor and reporters were personally no more critical of Grabarek than the sports editor and his reporters were of Waters. The fact that the mayor's adversaries are local news sources whereas the coach's adversaries are not can account for some, but not all, of the difference.

An explanation for the different portrayals of coach and mayor may be adduced through the use of "play" as an analytical tool. Although defining what is meant by play is a thankless task

because of the various connotations of the word, listing the common elements of play is somewhat easier. The following seven elements seem to be common in most manifestations of play: play is fun, voluntary, superfluous, limited in time and space, uncertain, governed by rules and secretive.[46] Two of these elements help explain the differences between the *Herald*'s attitude to the basketball coach and its attitude to the mayor. These are the limitations of play by time and space and the governance of play by rules.

Play takes place in a world set apart from the ordinary. In terms of space, play proceeds within physical or mental playgrounds. People play on a basketball court, in a pool, on a card table, on a stage, in a crib, and so on. Within the playground, special acts are performed. Huizinga has pointed out that such playgrounds are, in many respects, equivalent to consecrated spots. Both the playground and the consecrated spot are "forbidden spots, isolated, hedged round, hallowed, within which special rules obtain."[47] Indeed, the tendency of fans, players and coaches to cut down basketball nets, pull up pieces of turf from baseball infields and tear down football goal posts at the conclusion of spiritually uplifting games can be interpreted as an attempt to preserve the magic of the playground by the possession of a piece of it.

Play is limited in time. Once over, however, play experiences are frequently retained as memories—which may grow into traditions transmitted from generation to generation. A college football rivalry is one example of a transmitted play-memory.

The beginning and end of play periods are often marked by ritual and ceremony. Indeed, the special quality of the play world is reinforced by such ritual and ceremony. Obvious examples are the singing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and a school alma mater at the beginning and end of a college athletic event. Some of the most elaborate ceremonies accompanying any play world surround the modern Olympic games.

The limitations of space and time often create feelings of being "apart together" among players. Their mutual withdrawals from the ordinary world may lead to a continuation of this community of feeling outside the confines of the play world. "Athletic" dormitories and the training table on some college campuses may be manifestations of a continuation of players' community of feelings.

Sports writers often become part of this community of feelings. This is partly because college athletics somehow seem purer, less sullied by commercialism, than professional competition; and college athletes are relatively more faithful to the tradition of pure play on which amateurism is based. Contributing to such feelings on the part of sports journalists is the treatment they receive by and at the schools. Journalists are often wined and dined. They travel with the team, become familiar with the players' and coaches' hopes and dreams, come to share the participants' delight at victory and despair in defeat. The only direct parallel in politics occurs during presidential primaries and general elections when reporters accompany campaigning candidates across the country. Editors rotate their reporters to prevent them from becoming part of a community of feelings with particular candidates. Sports journalists are rarely rotated and they consequently tend to accept the special play world of college athletics and to abide by its rules.

Rules determine what happens within the play world. These rules may be enduring and elaborate as with a baseball game, or minimal and temporary as in a daydream; but whatever the nature of the rules, transgressing them often results in the destruction of the play world. Huizinga points out that societies tend to treat "spoil sports" (people who break rules) more harshly than "cheats" (people who subvert rules). The "spoil sport" shatters the illusion of play while the "cheat" seeks to use the illusion for his own benefit.[48]

The play world of Bucky Waters was college basketball and one of the unwritten rules of that world has been that the coach is not criticized in the media. Reporters do not criticize coaches. Other coaches do not criticize coaches. Until recently, players did not criticize coaches. Fans, although some may have always wanted to criticize coaches, have rarely had access to the media. Even if a sports reporter did want to criticize the techniques or strategy of a coach, he has not had the forum in which to do it. To a very real extent, open criticism of a coach is carried on only by "spoil-sports" who have shattered the rules of the college basketball play world.

In the mayor's play world, the public drama of city politics, no rule exists which forbids criticism in the media. The mayor's political opponents are not regarded as "spoil sports" for leveling criticism at his actions or policies. Indeed criticism is often manda-

tory. What is more, newspaper editors, through editorials, have a forum within which to engage in criticism of mayors themselves, although the editors of the *Herald* did not avail themselves of the opportunity during the year analyzed.

The existence of critical content in the *Herald*'s portrayal of the mayor could have adversely affected the maintenance or expansion of his authority over the members of city government and the voters. The specific criticism probably mattered less than the fact that it took place at all. Indeed, charges such as those leveled by the Republican leader and the black leader might well have served to enhance the mayor's authority over some Democrats and whites for a time. Even within these two groups, however, the mayor's symbolic qualities would be hampered by the knowledge that people did openly object to some of his actions.

In contrast, the coach encountered not a hint of criticism in the *Herald*. Indeed, the *Herald*'s coverage should have enhanced the process and substance of the symbolic dimensions of his authority, and thus aided his transformation into a condensation symbol.

The members of the basketball team should have been most susceptible to the *Herald*'s depiction of their coach. They read the paper's sports section most frequently. Consequently, they were most often exposed to the *Herald*'s fostering of the coach's psychological distance, depersonalization, ceremony and ritual, and myth. In addition, the players found the components of the *Herald*'s coach symbol and upholder-of-community-values symbol essential to their image of the ideal coach.

We might assume that the *Herald* enhanced the coach's symbolic status in relation to non-student fans second most. The non-student fans surveyed read the *Herald*'s sports section more than student fans but less than players. They probably found the coach symbol and the upholder-of-community-values symbol only slightly less appealing than the players. The Duke University symbol should have appealed to the non-student fans the most. Of the eleven roles discovered in the *Herald*'s treatment of the coach, only one—the coach as the leader of an exemplary family life—seems likely to have appealed to less than two-thirds of the non-student fans within his jurisdiction.

In relation to student fans, the *Herald* seems to have been somewhat less useful for establishing the coach as a condensation

symbol. Fewer than half of the student fans were frequently exposed to the *Herald*'s treatment of Waters. Thus for student fans the *Herald* may not have greatly aided the process of Waters' symbolization. Student fans appear also to be the group least likely to have perceived Waters as a symbol for a coach, an upholder of community values and Duke University on the basis of the *Herald*'s portrayal.

This effort to explain the reasons for the differences in the Durham *Morning Herald*'s coverage of Mayor Grabarek and Coach Waters is admittedly speculative. In considering the possible effects of the coverage it is suggested that it had a greater potential for aiding the coach than the mayor in the maintenance of authority. Although the lesser amount of coverage he received gave the mayor more freedom of action, it also presumably made him less well-known. While the role portrayals of the mayor pointed out many of his symbolic potentials, they also showed him as fallible and subject to criticism. While the *Herald*'s reporters allowed the mayor personally to rebut specific criticisms, they did not permit him to use the paper as a personal forum in which to address the groups within his jurisdiction. Yet it was the coach, not the mayor, who eventually lost his authority, apparently unwillingly, when he resigned, shortly before the start of a new season, with one year remaining on his contract, to accept a post as assistant to Duke's Vice-President for Health Affairs. The mayor was able to win re-election four times and left office when he chose.

An increase in a coach's symbolic stature usually eases the problems of maintaining or expanding his authority. If the *Herald*'s treatment of Waters was effective in enhancing the symbolic dimensions of his authority most in relation to players, they should have been the last group to question his authority. Any eroding of the coach's authority should have begun with the student fans, spread to non-student fans and lastly to the players. The demise of the coach's authority, however, was touched off by the departure of disgruntled players, not the protests of student fans. When enough key players had departed to result in recruiting difficulties and increased losses, the coach's student and non-student support began to wane.

A reading of the *Herald*'s coverage of seasons after the content analysis period reveals that its treatment of the coach did not change drastically. The departure of players was mentioned but the coach was not held responsible. Instead the blame was placed on the players' academic problems, desire to be closer to their families or their own prima donna attitudes. When losses began to outnumber victories during the 1972-73 season, the *Herald* criticized the conduct of students, not the coach. The *Herald*'s appointment of a new sports editor resulted in no increase in critical or analytical content. The paper's coverage of Duke basketball was such that it should have continued to aid the process and substance of the coach's symbolization.

Why then was the *Herald* such an ineffectual tool in helping the coach to maintain his authority over players, non-student fans and student fans?[49]

We speculate that the reasons may be found in the concepts of time, image and visibility. Perhaps there hadn't been enough time. In most cases a coach needs a considerable amount of time to become a favorable condensation symbol for large numbers of people within his jurisdiction. Media coverage might heighten the potency of a coach who is already a condensation symbol or shorten the time required for him to become a condensation symbol, but it cannot work the trick instantly. The *Herald*'s coverage brought the date of the coach's symbolization closer, but perhaps not close enough. Before the start of his second season at Duke, the coach had already lost two of his best players.

Perhaps the *Herald* contributed directly to the erosion of the coach's authority over players by creating an ideal image impossible for Waters to achieve. The disparity between the *Herald*'s portrayal of the coach and the reality of the players' encounters with him may have helped generate discontent.

A third factor working against the symbolization of the coach's authority may have been the clarity with which the results of his actions could be read. The actions of political authority figures usually have delayed and indirect effects.[50] The media can help them avoid taking responsibility for any adverse effects their actions might bring. But in sports the effects are immediate and tangible—wins and losses. The *Herald* could shield the coach from responsibility for player departures but it could not disguise defeats.

Although the coach resigned before the end of his term and the mayor retired voluntarily after eight years in office, the newspaper nevertheless treated the mayor less favorably than the coach. Two points may help illuminate this apparent paradox. First, while the *Herald*'s authority enhancing potential for the mayor may seem small in comparison to its support for the coach, it was still considerable on an absolute scale. The *Herald* never adversely affected the source of the mayor's authority. The *Herald*, after all, is as closely associated with the Durham community and city government as the mayor. The restraining effect of the *Herald*'s infrequent portrayal of criticism was probably greatly overshadowed by the *Herald*'s usefulness as a tool for muddling lines of responsibility. The *Herald* also clearly aided the substance, and quite probably the process, of the mayor's symbolization.

The second point which helps explain the paradox is that there is more to the maintenance of a mayor's authority than media treatment alone. Just as the lack of time and the clarity of effects served to reduce the *Herald*'s authority-maintaining capabilities for the coach, so too did political elements enhance the *Herald*'s authority-maintaining capabilities for the mayor. Chief among these political elements was the well documented advantages of incumbency—an advantage increased by the non-partisan nature of Durham's elections.

The implications of this study may be of greater significance for local political figures than for athletic coaches. Favorable press, television and radio coverage do not necessarily enable a public figure to retain authority. Favorable treatment can actually be counter-productive. Nevertheless a local public official successful in obtaining media coverage similar to that granted athletic coaches would gain the benefit of increased coverage, less criticism and greater personal contact with the people in his or her jurisdiction. Such media treatment could further cloud the lines of responsibility, increase the official's freedom of action and enhance his or her authority.

NOTES

1. Harry Eckstein, "Authority Patterns: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry," *American Political Science Review*, 67:1149-53 (December 1973). In one sense, a coach's authority is not political: it does not necessarily serve public purposes.

2. For a discussion of the uses of athletic teams as subjects of small group studies, see Gunther Luschen, "Small Group Research and the Group in Sport," in *Aspects of Contemporary Sport Sociology*, Gerald S. Kenyon, ed. (Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1969), pp. 57-66. Many of the articles contained in Eric Dunning, ed., *Sport: Readings From a Sociological Perspective* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972) approach team sports from the perspective of small group studies.

3. For summaries and analyses of the findings concerning the audiences of mass communications, see Joseph T. Klapper, *The Effects of Mass Communication* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 15-52.

4. On authority see Robert Bierstedt, "The Problem of Authority," in Morroe Berger, ed., *Freedom and Control in Modern Society* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1954), pp. 67-81. Also useful are Carl J. Friedrich, *Tradition and Authority* (New York: Praeger, 1972); Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), and Harry Eckstein, "Authority Patterns: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry," *American Political Science Review*, 67:142-61 (December 1973).

5. See Karl W. Klages, *Sportscasting* (Logan, Utah: published by the author, 1963), pp. 11, 49. From limitless examples, the following is just one of a coach actually exercising his control over the dissemination of information. After the University of Detroit basketball players returned to the team in 1970, the coach would not allow them to be interviewed: " 'Anything that was said was strictly a team matter and I don't intend to discuss it.' " See Durham *Morning Herald*, Nov. 10, 1970, p. 2B.

6. For example, in May, 1970, Duke coach Bucky Waters announced the departure of one player (Don Blackman) and the signing of another (Sam May) on consecutive days, even though the events were separated by weeks. Durham *Morning Herald*, May 12, 1970, p. 2B and May 13, 1970, p. 2B.

7. See Murray Edelman, *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), p. 6.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

9. Observation of Waters during a game gave evidence of such physical distance. While watching the freshman game on January 23, 1972, Waters sat in the same section of the bleachers as the varsity players but always on a different row. During the varsity game there appeared to be a significant space between him and the closest player on the bench. When Waters stood, an action seldom performed by players, the separation was maintained. Even when he had an arm on a player, Waters seemed to be issuing fatherly advice.

10. Depersonalization, myth and control over authority symbols are not dealt with in detail here since their role in the symbolic relationship between coaches and fans is nearly identical to their role in the relationship between coaches and players.

11. During the 1975-76 season, fans in the Raleigh-Durham area of North Carolina could see three such half hour "coaches' " shows a week. The deference of the sportscasters towards the coaches on such shows helps reinforce the distance between fans and coaches.

12. Perhaps the most extreme example of such a ceremony may be found at the University of Maryland. After his team has begun its warmup drills, Coach "Lefty" Driesell struts onto the court while the Maryland pep band plays "Hail to the Chief."

13. Former Duke coach Bucky Waters seemed to follow a pregame routine that depended heavily on disappearance and reappearance. Before one game (Duke *vs.* N.C. State, Feb. 23, 1972), Waters disappeared and reappeared four times. This emergence routine helped create the feeling that either Waters was still making vital changes in strategy or that he was so emotionally tense he needed the solitude of his inner office.

14. December was chosen as the starting point because it is the beginning of the college season. The season ends by mid-March. The off-season stretches from April through November. The year 1969-70 was chosen in an effort to obtain a sample typical of the *Herald*'s coverage of Duke coaches. The team's record of 19 wins and 7 losses was in line with the performances of other Duke teams in the recent past.

15. The sentence was used as the unit of analysis, since it supposedly has a subject and contains one thought. In addition, sentences are probably close to the readers' units of perception. The usual methods of ensuring coding reliability were followed and to conserve space will not be detailed here.

16. The questionnaire was given to the players at an afternoon practice session and returned at the following practice. Thirteen questionnaires were distributed; ten were returned. The questionnaire was filled out by 81 fans (34 students, 47 non-students) before a Duke home game.

17. For example, in an article following a game in which he had benched his star center, Waters said the move had been prompted by the center's lack of effort. *Herald*, Feb. 22, 1970, p. 3C.

18. *Herald,* May 12, 1970, p. 2B.

19. Dec. 7, 1969, p. 1B.

20. *Herald*, Nov. 9, 1970, p. 3B.

21. Twenty-one of the 40 pictures were part of advertisements for the coach's television show and summer basketball camp. Thirty appeared during the basketball season and ten from April through November. Waters was visible all year round.

22. Dec. 25, 1969, p. 1B.

23. *Herald*, Jan. 8, 1970, 3B.

24. Dec. 24, 1969, 2B.

25. Feb. 22, 1970, 3C.

26. *Herald*, Dec. 20, 1969, 2B.
27. May 2, 1970, 2B.
28. Nov. 25, 1970, 2C.
29. Feb. 1, 1970, 2C.
30. Jan. 24, 1970, 2B; Dec. 21, 1969, 2C.
31. Dec. 12, 1969, 1D.
32. *Herald*, Nov. 25, 1970, 2B.
33. Dec. 18, 1969, 1D.
34. R. Wense Grabarek was elected Mayor in 1963 and re-elected every two years until he decided not to seek re-election in 1971. Grabarek is a partner in a Durham accounting firm.
35. E.g. Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1953), Robert Dahl, *Who Governs?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), Terry Clark, ed., *Community Structure and Decision Making* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968) and Theodore J. Lowi, *At the Pleasure of the Mayor* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1964).
36. Robert P. Boynton and Deil L. Wright, "The Media, the Masses and Urban Management," *Journalism Quarterly*, 47:12-19 (Spring 1970).
37. David L. Paletz, Peggy Reichert and Barbara McIntyre, "How the Media Support Local Governmental Authority," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 35:80-92 (Spring 1971).
38. As part of the questionnaire described earlier, non-students and students (both players and student fans) were asked to indicate where they preferred to obtain news concerning municipal government. For both groups, newspapers were the source preferred by the largest number of people. The respondents were also asked to indicate how frequently they read the *Herald* to obtain news concerning municipal government. Almost 60 percent of the non-students and 55 percent of the students were exposed to the *Herald*'s treatment of local government (and the mayor) at least occasionally.
39. July 2, 1970, 1B.
40. July 10, 1970, 1A.
41. Sept. 20, 1970, 10D.
42. See *Herald*, June 26, 1970, 1B; July 21, 1970, 1B; July 23, 1970, 1C; Sept. 12, 1970, 1A.
43. *Herald*, Oct. 18, 1970, 1A.
44. Dec. 22, 1969, 1B.
45. Jan. 1, 1970, 1C.
46. This list is our distillation or, more accurately, transmogrification, of the discussions of the characteristics of play found in Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1950), pp. 3-13; William Stephenson, *The Play Theory of Mass Communication* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp.45-47, and David W. Plath, *The After Hours: Modern Japan and the Search for Enjoyment* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964), pp. 7-12 and 198-99. We have benefitted from their ideas and freely absolve them of any responsibility for our use of them.

47. Huizinga, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

49. The extent to which Waters' authority over University administrators was destroyed is difficult to determine. It is not clear whether he retired of his own free will or under the prodding of the administration. The administration did, however, give him a new University position and indeed used that appointment to justify creating the coaching vacancy.

50. See Edelman, *op. cit.*, pp. 73, 94.