Feedback

Feedback April 2003 (Vol. 44, No. 2)

EDITOR

Joe Misiewicz, Department of Telecommunications, Ball State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Angela Rapp, University Teleplex, Ball State University

Submission Guidelines

1. Submit an electronic version of the complete manuscript with references and charts in Microsoft Word along with graphs, audio/video and other graphic attachments to the editor. Retain a hard copy for reference.
2. Please double-space the manuscript. Use the 5th edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) style manual.
3. Articles are limited to 3,000 words or less, and essays to 1,500 words or less.
4. All authors must provide the following information: name, employer, professional rank and/or title, complete mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, email address, and whether the writing has been presented at a prior venue.
5. If editorial suggestions are made and the author(s) agree to the changes, such changes should be submitted by email as a Microsoft Word document to the editor.
6. The editor will acknowledge receipt of documents within 48 hours and provide a response within four weeks.

Review Guidelines

1. Potential instructional materials that can be reviewed include books, computer software, CD-ROMs, guides, manuals, video program, audio programs and websites.
2. Reviews may be submitted by email as a Microsoft Word document to the editor.
3. Reviews must be 350-500 words in length.
4. The review must provide a full APA citation of the reviewed work.
5. The review must provide the reviewer's name, employer, professional rank and/or title, email address and complete mailing address.

Submission Deadlines

Feedback is scheduled, depending on submissions and additional material, to be posted on the BEA website the last day of February, April, June, August, October and December. To be considered, submissions should be submitted 60 days prior to posting date for that issue.

Please email submissions to Joe Misiewicz at jmisiewicz@bsu.edu. If needed: Joe Misiewicz, *Feedback* Editor, Department of Telecommunications, Ball State University, Muncie, IN   47306, USA. Fax to 765- 285-1490.

CONTENTS

TRANSITIONS

By Ralph J. Begleiter, University of Delaware
ralph.begleiter@udel.edu

At about 8:50 on September 11, 2001, I took a call in my office from one of my best students, who has since graduated. He asked if I had my TV on. I didn't. His tone of voice was insistent and fearful as he virtually *ordered* me to turn on the TV. Of course, the set stayed on most of the day. And I began a videotape recording immediately. Soon, a small crowd of faculty and staff in our building gathered around TV sets in the Communication Department at the University of Delaware.

While watching the attacks unfold, I clearly remember having three distinct emotions.

First, having witnessed and reported on several previous incidents of terrorism since 1981, I felt the same flush of despair and horror most people around the world must have felt on September 11. The pit of my stomach ached with the pain of this incident, even as my journalist's mind began calculating potential likely casualties, likely suspects, and likely U.S. reaction. Instinctively, I began thinking of the "sources" I would be contacting if I were still at CNN, to help uncover the details and aftermath of this attack.

Second, I thought of my friends and colleagues at CNN, other networks, the New York Times, the Washington Post and other news organizations in New York and Washington. I knew many of them would be rushing to lower Manhattan and to the Pentagon to cover the story. And even before the towers fell, I know I imagined that some of my friends might be injured—or worse—in their attempts to get close to the unfolding story. As I watched the south tower collapse, that fear became almost palpable for me; the faces of my journalist colleagues in New York and Washington swam through my head amid the smoke and debris of the television scenes. I knew that although the world was seeing only distant shots of the Trade Center and Pentagon at first, there would be photographers, producers, reporters, crews and couriers literally rushing into the face of disaster. Journalists, after all, like firefighters, police and health care workers, are usually among the "first responders" to events like these. Furthermore, one of my closest broadcast news friends, a colleague with whom I have worked in Washington since the mid-1970's, was now CNN's Pentagon correspondent. I knew he was very likely in the Pentagon building when it was struck. Initially, I didn't know exactly where the plane had hit the building, but I knew exactly where my colleague's office is. And I thought immediately of his wife and two children who are also among my family's closest friends. It took several days before I satisfied myself that no one I knew among the journalism community of New York and Washington had suffered serious injury or death. But those were nightmare days.

Third, as I stood in my UD office, absorbing the terrible scenes on TV, I thought

repeatedly—and sometimes even asked aloud of no one in particular around me— "What the hell am I doing *here*, at a university, as this event unfolds?" I should be rushing to help explain it to the world, I thought aloud, to cover the unfolding events and analyze them against the backdrop of previous terrorism for a television audience. I genuinely and seriously questioned, for the first and only time since joining the UD faculty, whether I had made a huge mistake forsaking my broadcast journalism career for an academic life.

My first class of the day began at 11am. A faculty colleague wondered whether we should go to class, but I had no doubt I would be there, my videotape in hand and decades of reporting on terrorism in my head. I invited her class to join mine. Quite a few students arrived without knowing much of what had been happening since 8:46am, when the first plane struck the World Trade Center. In class that day… and for many weeks throughout the semester… I attempted to help students understand the rich tapestry of terrorism, media issues and politics unfolding before them in real time.

And very quickly I realized that although I had questioned my decision to leave broadcast news for the classrooms of UD, I had a new audience with whom to work to understand the seemingly incomprehensible acts which had occurred on September 11, 2001. It was easy—and useful, I believe—to incorporate the lessons of 9/11 and the "War on Terrorism" into my "Politics and the Media" class for the rest of the semester.

Front-line to Classroom

My transition from the unpredictable, exhilarating and collaborative front-line world of global broadcast news to a completely predictable, backwater and decidedly non-collaborative environment of university life has been smooth and satisfying. The question I'm asked most often is "Do you miss the excitement of CNN?" The answer is: occasionally, but not achingly.

The concept of collaboration, virtually the backbone of television news, is almost completely absent in university life. The reward system of higher education is built on the premise that solo accomplishments are highly prized, while rich collaborative products are discouraged (because they are rarely supported). This is an important concept for broadcast professionals to understand before making the move to the ivy towers.

Everyone in television news knows that the best programs are produced by a small army of creative, talented people, each with different skills. From on-camera presenters to photographers and writers, to editors and producers, to studio and control room personnel—television news is a collective enterprise.

In the college industry (it is, in fact, an industry, in my view), collective accomplishments are rarely proposed or rewarded, and often detract from the career of a faculty member. In my first year at the University of Delaware, I team-taught a three-course sequence called "Road to the Presidency" with the chair of the Political Science department. We brought to our classroom the combined perspectives of a scholar who had been studying the presidency for 25 years and a journalist who had never studied it but had covered every presidential election and many political conventions since 1968. We took students for a week of full-time work at the GOP convention in Philadelphia in 2000, where each student worked in an internship either with the media or with the

party. It was a fabulous experience for both the students and for us.

The university enjoyed the publicity the course received, but I learned that team teaching is not encouraged, essentially because, administratively, it ties up two faculty members for a single class of students.

The same year, I was approached by a substantial Washington think tank about leading a scholarly analysis of journalism written about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. It would be well funded. I envisioned using a few students from each of the academic departments in which I had been appointed: English (journalism students), Political Science, and Communication (broadcast news students). Each of the department chairs made it clear they would not support such an interdisciplinary project, but would encourage me to undertake it with students from a single department. Cross-disciplinary collaboration simply is not a favored scenario on campus.

The rarity of collaboration has another strange side effect: professors around me have no idea what I'm teaching; nor do I know what others teach. This has had some humorous results. A professor of Geography whose office is a few doors down the hall from me decided to use a video camera in her course to record interviews with community members. Her students, none of them with any video or TV experience, had to learn whatever they could about videography and post-production. Meanwhile, in my class (and that of another Communication professor), students being trained in videography and TV production already had the skills the Geography class needed. But there was no collaboration. The Geography professor had to drum up money to buy the equipment and to pay an instructor in TV production, while my communication students had no opportunity to use the editing equipment in the Geography department just a few steps away in the same building. The Communication department lacked the equipment being used by the next-door Geography students.

Entrepreneurship Lacking

A sidebar aspect of this phenomenon is that universities are apparently unaccustomed to faculty with entrepreneurial and management abilities. Most faculty devise and teach their classes and conduct scholarly research with little interest in extending those experiences to university-wide audiences or beyond. A broadcaster with an appetite for broad audiences seems an aberration on campus, and there is widespread wonderment about how I've managed to attract audiences of up to 700 for a speaker series on international terrorism.

Professional broadcasters considering sharing their experience on a college campus may discover that students take a long time to appreciate the resource available in their classroom. In general, the students I teach are interested in doing whatever's necessary to achieve their desired grade in my class; most are not geared to milking their time with me for whatever my hands-on experience might be worth.

There are exceptions, of course, and *they* are what makes teaching so rewarding.

For a journalist like me, accustomed to the fast-paced world of television news, academia is a dramatic downshift. Decisions needed and made "right away" in the TV news business are almost unheard of at the university. "Soon" might mean in a year or two. "Right away" often means sometime during the current semester. And decisions in academia seem always to be made by consensus. Scholars don't like being told what to do; I think it's part of the "tenure" system, a cradle-to-grave concept under which

university teachers struggle mightily for about six years to impress their colleagues, who conduct peer reviews. Once favorably reviewed (a cumbersome process involving the collection of a sort of scrapbook of one's writing and other activities), faculty are granted job security for life. This system has strong similarities to communist China's "iron rice bowl" or the Soviet economic system of job security. Scholars defend the tenure system as an important protection of independent thinking and creativity on campus, which it surely is. But tenure also shares the Chinese and Soviet drawbacks of paying employees regardless of whether they continue to perform at the level they achieved when they were seeking tenure, and regardless of whether they successfully engage students in one of the central functions of a university: teaching.

I'm not on the "tenure track," which means my job security is more heavily dependent upon my classroom teaching, my service to the university, and my evaluation by university administrators. That's a familiar situation for broadcasters like me, since I spent all of my broadcast journalism career working under a series of three-year contracts with no guarantee of job security.

Tenure is Scholarship not Teaching
Interestingly, the ability for college professors to actually pass on knowledge to students through teaching is not especially highly valued. I have been told that excellent teaching is not enough to win tenure, while publishing "scholarly" articles is the primary criterion and will win tenure even if a scholar is not a good teacher.

Something of a disappointment among students is their nearly-complete focus on the grades they earn in class. As I made the transition to academia, I dreamed of engaging students in discussion about international political issues and about journalism. I imagined late-night bar scenes in which groups of students would hotly debate current affairs and media problems. I thought my classrooms would be filled with chatter about how the media affect politics and about how global problems are dealt with through negotiations or war.

But the reality is that most students don't engage in debate in class. Most don't attend after-hours discussions like the ones in my imagination. And most students, like most Americans, neither know nor care very much about international politics.

At first, I attributed this to my inexperience as a teacher. But I've come to believe it's not that. I think students are merely skillful at determining exactly what will improve their grade-point average, and focusing on those aspects of college, leaving extracurricular time for non-substantive activities.

Among the wonders of academia for me is the extent to which I'm able to determine my own schedule and life. Gone are the days when beepers, cell phones, digital messaging devices and computers tethered me to an assignment desk populated by assistants who didn't even know what time zone I was in when I called. Gone are the arbitrary directives from a newsroom focused on a single news story, even if it's not very important (O.J. Simpson comes to mind immediately). Gone is the daily sense of looming deadline, and gone is the high-intensity tension which accompanies the unplannable and uncontrollable life of a TV news correspondent. (Don't get me wrong; I enjoyed that life for a long time. But it has its drawbacks.)

Instead, I discovered that if I travel off campus, for a speech or a foreign trip, there really isn't anyone who wants (or needs) to know where and how to contact me. I'd

been accustomed to leaving my "whereabouts" information in the CNN computer system whenever I was out of pocket. Now, providing that information to the university is considered unnecessary and a bit egocentric.

Likewise, email and computer access to the university's internet system is extremely limited from off campus. The institution apparently considers it unnecessary to have its employees remain reachable and accessible to the internet for business purposes when traveling, perhaps because few members of the faculty travel. Concretely, there are no dial-up procedures for accessing the university computer system from anywhere outside about a 20-mile radius of the campus. Although this is strictly a technical and financial issue, it also reflects a bit of the parochial nature of academe, which seems to concentrate on its own community rather than on the larger world beyond. For a global journalist accustomed to processing worldwide information and maintaining almost continuous worldwide contacts, this environment is a bit of a culture shock.

Something I'd feared in my transition to academia has never materialized. I'd worried about my relationship to colleagues both in journalism and in education. I feared that my career outside education would leave me in a nether world on campus, not fully respected by my new colleagues. I'd worried that I'd feel somehow constantly "sub-par" on campus. It was a groundless fear. Most faculty and students appear to accept my background for what it is: a different set of accomplishments in a different world, not directly related to the academic world but also not measured against the standards of that world.

Colleague Acceptance

Among my colleagues in broadcast news, there are a few who seem to consider me to have "bailed out" of or "given up" journalism. I don't think they understand the cumulative stresses which led to my decision to move to the campus or the sense of accomplishment which allowed me to start down a fresh path. Or perhaps they haven't felt them in the same way. Or perhaps not yet. Most former colleagues, however, understood immediately and have been extremely supportive.

In this connection, small changes have been remarkably satisfying. Gone is my twice-daily, white-knuckle Washington beltway commute. Gone is the intense competition for air time and the struggle to shoehorn international content onto a network increasingly limited to domestic and celebrity news. (This struggle, however, has been replaced by a kindred one: trying to shoehorn global content into a campus environment almost exclusively comprised of domestic material. I've taken that on as something of a mission after 911, when I realized how little exposure most college students have to information about the world beyond the United States.)

And gone is the unpredictability of broadcast journalism, a feature which was a driving and inspiring force for me for decades, but which I now realize I'm glad to have shed. It's really nice to be able to buy theater tickets or make a dinner date… and actually attend.

"Aren't you bored?" a former colleague has asked (and many more are probably thinking). Not so far. Since arriving on campus, I've arranged for dozens of guest speakers to visit Delaware, some from as far away as the Middle East and Afghanistan. I've taken students to Washington for visits to CNN, Reuters and the Newseum, and to New York for a tour of the New York Times. I've helped students gain internships in

New York, Washington and Beijing. Last October, I organized a trip to Cuba with UD students for the 40th anniversary of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

And as I write this article in January 2003, I'm aboard a Russian ice-class ship in the Southern Ocean, co-leading a study abroad class in photojournalism to Antarctica. Yes. After 88 countries and nearly two-million miles at CNN, the University of Delaware has encouraged me to add my sixth continent. (Australia, where there was rarely any news during my CNN days, will be my seventh). Stops with the students in southern Argentina and Uruguay have expanded my global experience. In Antarctica, our class shot an estimated 40-thousand images, came face-to-face with whales, penguins and the fragile political agreements which have protected the continent from exploitation and territorial disputes. Students used state-of-the-art digital technology to capture and store their images, to manipulate them in a mobile digital photo lab on board the ship, and to transmit them using satellite communication equipment to an internet site (www.udel.edu/global/antarctica) and to CNN.

A far cry from boredom.

The writer was CNN's World Affairs Correspondent from 1981 to 1999, based in Washington, traveling extensively and reporting on international affairs and anchoring several internationally-oriented programs on the network. He left Washington and CNN in May, 1999 during the Kosovo bombing campaign, to teach journalism and political science at the University of Delaware. www.udel.edu/global

ADVISING:
THE LITTLE SECRET HIDDEN IN
TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

Keisha L. Hoerrner, Kennesaw State University
khoerrne@kennesaw.edu

A version of this article was previously presented at the 2003
Georgia Communication Association conference

Introduction

Whether it is called "program planning," "educational counseling," or "academic advising," the practice is a part of a majority of faculty members' responsibilities. Advising has been defined as "guiding the students through the intricacies of their chosen curriculum" (McKeachie, 1994, p. 177). At my institution, and most college and universities that are not Research I designees, advising is one component of the larger category of "teaching, mentoring, and supervision" responsibilities. It's a component that can be quite time consuming yet barely rewarded. Thus, it's the "little secret" of the teaching triad—the least talked about, least assessed, and least respected part. For mass communication professors, it is one more responsibility added to teaching, scholarship, service, keeping up with technology, cataloging the production equipment, working one-on-one with students to prepare resume tapes, and more. Yet, educational research clearly demonstrates it is essential to students.

One of the more interesting conclusions of educational studies exploring academic advising is the disconnect between student and faculty perceptions of the same occurrence (Saving & Keim, 1998). Students desire and appreciate personal, constructive advising (Light, 2001; Flanagan, Gerber, Hertenstein & Foster, 1998). Faculty, however, overwhelmingly disdain the practice. Wilbert McKeachie, author of the seminal pedagogical text *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*, noted that faculty view advising duties as "demeaning, much-to-be-avoided tasks comparable to KP in military service" (1994, p. 177). That seems to have been a consistent view over time. In 1953 M.S. MacLean described advising as a "process with a long and dignified history" (p. 357) in higher education but continued by noting that because it often involves "tedious clerical work combined with hit-and-run conferences with students on curricula, it is a most cordially hated activity by the majority of college teachers" (p. 357). A recent *New York Times* article called academic advising "a tertiary responsibility to professors" who do not consider it as important as their other teaching activities (Altschuler, 2001, p. A17). Part of that attitude may come from the fact that administrators perceive advising to be a "low-status function," which led to "few rewards and little recognition" for those who

attempt to do it well (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979 as cited in Flanagan et al., 1998, "The Scholarship" ¶ 3). As McKeachie concluded:

> The result of all this is that though many catalogues will carry ambitious statements about faculty [educational] counseling, conjuring up an image of the wise, genial, pipe-smoking academician in leisurely discussion with the eager, respectful student who avidly gathers up the words of wisdom that are dropped in the course of this conversation, the stark reality of the relationship is too often that of a meeting between a rebelliously impatient student and a harried and disgruntled faculty member. (1994, p. 177)

Advising clearly has benefits for student retention, growth, and development as well as higher graduation rates. Titley and Titley (1982) quoted from D.S. Crockett's work, noting that "academic advising properly delivered can be a powerful influence on student growth and development" while also enhancing and enriching "the educational development of any college or university" (p. 46). Titley and Titley also cited Noel's conclusion that competent, compassionate advisors were the key to student retention: "How an institution's academic advising measures up to students' needs is the major determinant of whether or not the institution has a 'staying' environment" (p. 47). Petress (2000), a communication professor at the University of Maine, echoed Crockett's and Noel's assertions. Petress believes that effective advising not only helps students academically but also emotionally, and it "assists institutions by reducing many avoidable problems" (2000, p. 598). There's even a community college in Texas that is so committed to quality academic advising as a method to retain students that it selects 20 professors to serve as advisors and pays them $25 an hour to do so above their standard pay (Lords, 2000).

Literature on academic advising encourages faculty members to meet with each advisee multiple times throughout the semester (Light, 2001), separate the registration function of academic advising from career counseling (Titley & Titley, 1982), be sure not to limit the time given to a student for advising (Petress, 2000), and to make advising required or strongly encouraged (Flanagan et al., 1998). Many researchers realize, however, that academic advising does not always look like this model. In fact, Habley (1988) said that advising can occur in one of seven models:

- **Faculty only**—a faculty member in the department is assigned to a certain number of students as advisees,

- **Supplementary advising**—faculty are advisors but the actual advising takes place in a central office during a specified time with support staff to assist with scheduling appointments,

- **Split advising model**—a central office of advisors deals with some students (like entering freshmen) while faculty deal with the remainder,

- **Dual advising model**—faculty only advise on major courses while a central office takes care of students' other questions and concerns,

• **Total intake model**—all students begin with a central advisor and move to a faculty member in the department only after completing a certain number of hours or a status like junior-ranking,

• **Satellite model**—academic centers are set up within departments but faculty do not advise, and

• **Self-contained model**—all advising takes place in a central office with no assistance from faculty.

Habley (1988) noted that the most common model used on campuses is the "faculty-only model," which is inappropriate if the faculty/student ratio is clearly unreasonable.

Kennesaw State's Communication Advising Center

This was the scenario at my institution when I joined the faculty in fall of 2000, and it remains so today. The reality of our department is defined by the following data: over 500 declared majors who choose one of three tracks (media studies, public relations, or organizational communication), three tenured Associate Professors, three tenure-track Assistant Professors, two tenure-track Instructors, and one Department Chair. While we utilize temporary full-time instructors and adjunct instructors, neither category is eligible to assist with academic advising. Thus, we have a departmental student-to-faculty ratio of 56:1.

Prior to Fall of 2001, advising in the department was done according to the "dual advising model" as described by Habley (1988). Students were designated a faculty advisor upon declaring their major, but they could choose to receive academic advising from whomever's door was open—or they could visit the College of Humanities and Social Sciences professional advisor. Advising took place at the convenience of the student, who had the availability to receive advising as many times during a semester as he/she chose. Advising was typically done during the faculty member's office hours, although students felt quite comfortable "dropping in" to ask questions or go over scheduling issues. The department thought of "advising" as an all-encompassing word, meaning that students could receive academic advice, career counseling, and personal counseling during the same visit.

While students were not required to receive advising prior to registration, communication majors took advantage of the option. As the student population increased, faculty began to feel overwhelmed by the advising workload, and there was no way to equitably share the load because of the external factors of (1) day versus night students, (2) availability of faculty, (3) students' preference for certain professors, and (4) recommendations from others on campus as to whom the student should see for advising. The result was a tremendous amount of time being spent to advise students without any decrease in teaching, scholarship, or service obligations. To further the advising woes, the college's professional advisor resigned in August of 2000 and was not replaced.

The department voted in early 2001 to institute an Advising Center, modeled after the successful Psychology Advising Center at Kennesaw State, that would meet Habley's

(1988) designation as a "supplementary advising model." The Communication Advising Center began operations that fall according to the following schedule:

- the Center would be open only four weeks during a semester, and students could only receive academic advising during that timeframe;
- students would be sent a letter explaining the Center and encouraging them to call the departmental office to make an appointment for advisement;
- faculty would designate three hours a week to work in the Center, so that each faculty member would advise only 12 hours a semester;
- appointments would be limited to 20 minutes; and
- students would be required to call at least 24 hours in advance to schedule an appointment.

Students were given the ability to choose an advising appointment based on the faculty member working in the Center at that time or based on the convenience of the scheduled time. They simply called the departmental office and gave the secretary their names, tracks, and any specific preference they had for advising. Once an appointment was scheduled, the departmental secretary created a folder for the student by pulling his or her latest transcript off the computer. The goal of the appointment was to ensure the student was on track for graduation, provide advice on the next semester's class schedule, and answer any curriculum questions. Students were informed prior to the appointment that the Center was open for academic advising only; career counseling would still be done during faculty office hours.

Students who had never seen a faculty member in the department for advising were not seen in the Center, because of the 20-minute time limit. These students were split into two groups: new majors and transfer students. One faculty member advised all the new majors outside the Center, offering a one-on-one environment to explain the curriculum, the three tracks, the "gateway" courses, and to assist in the development of a course schedule for the following semester. Another faculty member advised the transfer students individually, with the focus of those meetings being an explanation of the curriculum and where their transfer credits would fit into KSU requirements.

Method

An evaluation survey was developed to gain quantitative and qualitative data from students concerning the acceptance and effectiveness of the Center. This survey, with minor variations, has been distributed for three semesters (Fall 2001, Spring 2002, and Fall 2002) to all communication courses. Students are encouraged to complete the survey one time only, and both full-time and adjunct faculty are charged with the responsibility of remembering to hand out the surveys during the week following closure of the Communication Advising Center. All communication majors are asked to complete the survey, regardless of whether they utilized the Center that semester.

The two-page survey asked students if they made an appointment with the Center, whether they kept it, whether they were on time, and whether the faculty member was on time. Students were then given six statements regarding the notice, operation, expertise of the faculty advisor, usefulness of the materials in the Center, the 20-minute timeframe for appointment, and their overall pleasure with the Center with standard Likert-scale choices. The survey also asked students if they planned to use the Center the following semester and allowed them to answer two open-ended questions about their advising experience.

Response to the survey has never reached a majority of the majors, primarily because of a lackluster response from adjuncts in making the instrument available to their students. Still, the response rates are average for a mail survey, even though these are distributed in classes.

Results

The Communication Advising Center serviced 181 students in Fall 2001, 184 in Spring 2002, and 218 in Fall 2002. The survey responses were smaller: 155 usable surveys in the fall, 96 in the spring, and 122 in the most recent semester. (Surveys that noted the student had already completed a survey in a previous class were not included in the tabulation of results.) A majority of the students who completed the survey each semester had made an appointment in the Center (52.9 percent, n=82; 54.6 percent, n=53; 60.2 percent, n=74 respectively). Thus, the results were primarily from "customers" of the new system.

Overall response to the Center from students who have used it has been consistently positive. Responses to a Likert scale statement that said "I am pleased with the advising system developed by the Communication Department" showed the following responses:

- F01: 28.9 percent (n=22) strongly agree and another 40.8 percent (n=31) agree,

- Sp02: 44 percent (n=22) strongly agree and 40 percent (n=20) agree, and

- F02: 50 percent (n=35) strongly agree and 38.6 percent (n=27) agree.

An overall response of 40.3 percent (n=79) of users strongly agreed that they were pleased with the Center with another 39.8 percent (n-78) in agreement. Only 1.5 percent (n=3) of the users were strongly displeased with the new advising system.

Combined data for the three semesters showed that students believe the department provides enough notice of the opening of the Center to make appointments (52.8 percent, n=104 strongly agree and 38.1 percent, n=75 agree), that scheduling appointments is a simple process (62.4 percent, n=123 strongly agree and 33 percent, n=65 agree), and that the materials provided in the Center are appropriate for the required task (47.2 percent, n=93 strongly agree and 38.6 percent, n=76 agree). Student responses even show that the 20-minute timeframe is long enough (45.2 percent, n=89 strongly agree and 29.9 percent, n=59 agree), although that is one of the issues brought up numerous times in the open-ended suggestions for improvement.

Faculty have been particularly pleased with the student ratings of advisor knowledge. A majority of the visitors to the Advising Center (56.9 percent, n=112) strongly agree that their advisor was knowledgeable and another 31.5 percent (n=62) agree with the statement. Students also acknowledge that faculty are punctual to advisement meetings (83.2 percent, n=163), although the professors cannot keep pace with those extremely punctual students (98 percent, n=192)!

Still, the results over three semesters of operation have been encouraging, especially to those faculty members who were reticent to reduce advising to four weeks during the semester. Students consistently note that they plan to use the Center the following semester (70.1 percent, n=246), and they asked in the spring for the Center to open

two weeks during the summer (92 percent, n=80). [The survey did not ask for graduation dates, so students who said they would not use the Center the following semester may have done so because of graduation rather than dissatisfaction with the Center.]

Data show that 47.9 percent (n=58) of students who used the Center in 2002 were returning visitors, another encouraging mark. Qualitative responses have also revealed that some students chose not to revisit the Center because they were given a complete schedule of classes through graduation, an illustration that faculty are using those 20 minutes effectively. A cross-tabulation revealed a different relationship, however. Students who made an appointment in the Center that semester planned to utilize the Center again the following semester ($x2 = 6.137$, df = 1, p = .013).

	NEXT USE – Yes	NEXT USE - No
APPOINTMENT – Yes	150	49
APPOINTMENT – No	96	56
TOTAL	246	105

N=351

The only other correlation that showed a statistically significant relationship is one that would be completely expected. Students who were pleased with the Center planned to use it the following semester ($x2 = 22.083$, df = 4, p = .00).

Discussion

The Communication Advising Center is still a work in progress, and the faculty work to tweak its operation each semester. Data show that the students have accepted the system and are being served effectively because of it. The benefits to the faculty are worth noting as well: (1) Academic advising is scheduled during a limited time period each semester; (2) office hours can be spent discussing student concerns related to current classes and career goals; (3) advising time can be quantified and compared across the department; (4) advising data can be utilized for annual review and tenure and promotion portfolios, and (5) faculty who want to invest added time in advising are designated as co-coordinators or sole coordinator of the Center, thus allowing that responsibility to count as a departmental service role.

Because of the number of students the Center services in a short period of time, faculty need to have a competency in the curriculum as well as a general understanding of the university's academic policies. To facilitate these needs, an advising handbook was created that details the department's three tracks, the general education requirements, minors, double majors, overloads, and more. This handbook is helpful to all faculty members, but it is particularly helpful to new faculty who are unfamiliar with the nuances of registration. This handbook is updated each semester, and it, too, serves as an aspect of professional service for the coordinator of the Center who produces it.

Because no assessment has been done of the faculty, I can only present my personal

assessment of the Center in conclusion. I am thrilled with our new advising system. While I would love to have the time to spend with students that Petress (2000) and Light (2001) allocate, my teaching and related responsibilities do not allow for that. Budget constraints do not allow for a professional advisor to be hired for the department or for the college, and there is no discussion in the department about creating a computer program to automate the advising process or utilizing some other "high-tech" solution. KSU's CAPS Center (Counseling, Advisement, and Placement Services) is sending more students to our department for advising each semester, so students who have just declared their major as freshmen are coming to us for advisement. All of that is to say that the reality of our advising situation, given the continuing increase in majors without a doubling of the faculty, is distinct from the "ideal" advising scenario discussed within the literature.

Within our environmental constraints, empirical assessment has shown that we have developed an effective system for academic advisement. My hope in sharing Kennesaw State's case study is that it offers a somewhat different solution to the advising woes of many overburdened, understaffed departments. This could be particularly useful to mass communication programs, which continue to see increased enrollment (Becker, Vlad, Huh, and Daniels, 2002). It is obviously not the only solution, but it works for our department and might work for yours as well.

References

Altschuler, G.C. (2001, Nov. 11). Take this advice, or don't. The New York Times. A17.

Becker, L., Vlad, T., Huh, J., & Daniels, G. (2002). Annual enrollment growth: Growth in number of students studying journalism and mass communication slows. Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 57(3): 184-212.

Flanagan, T.J., Gerber, J., Hertenstein, J.E., & Foster, M.F. (1998). Academic advising in baccalaureate criminology and criminal justice programs: A national assessment. Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 9(2): 233-247.

Habley, W.R. (1988). "The organization of advising services." In The Status and Future of Academic Advising: Problems and Promises, W.R. Habley (ed.). Iowa City: American Collegiate Testing Service, 119-140.

Light, R.J. (2001, Mar. 2). The power of good advice for students. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 47(25): B11-B12.

Lords, E. (2000, Sept. 22). A revolution in academic advising at a Texas community college. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 47(4): A47-A48.

MacLean, M.S. (1953). Counseling and the Tower of Babel. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 31: 357-362.

McKeachie, W.J. (1994). Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College

and University Professors, 9th ed. D.C. Heath & Co.: Lexington, Mass.

Petress, K. (2000). How to be a good advisee. Education. 120(3): 598-599.

Saving, K.A. & Keim, M.C. (1998). Student and advisor perceptions of academic advising in two Midwestern colleges of business. College Student Journal. 32(4): 511-522.

Titley, R.W. & Titley, B.S. (1982). Academic advising: The neglected dimension in designs for undergraduate education. Teaching of Psychology. 9(1): 45-49.

SENSE-MAKING AND THE PERSONAL VIDEO RECORDER

Howard Goldbaum, University of Nevada
goldbaum@unr.edu

Convergence isn't happening solely within the intersections of established media formats.

Traditional media types may also be undergoing a convergence with large scale computer database-mining systems. The delivery of news, entertainment, and advertising may one day be personalized by "sense-making" systems currently under development. Recent advances in personal video recording devices such as TiVo present an interesting case in point.

From its early days of advertiser-branded entertainment packages presented in a structured evening's schedule, television's paradigm has been modified to an extent not envisioned by the first broadcasters. Advertising-free cable programming and the time-shifting abilities of the VCR have created a user-fashioned commodity out of the broadcaster's product.

An evolutionary change in user-controlled access to television content has now been engineered by the advent of the TiVo system and its competitors Replay TV, RCA's Scenium, and UltimateTV from Microsoft.

By incorporating concepts such as the program-in-progress pause feature, the "season's pass," and the TiVo-trainable "Suggestions" list, these machines offer a far more customizable user experience than the VCR can provide.

These programmable random-access DVR's (Digital Video Recorders) or PVR's (Personal Video Recorders) allow users to extend the concept of time-shifting to a near real-time basis. By beginning a TiVo viewing session 15 minutes after the program's scheduled start time, it is possible to fast-forward through the commercials and finish watching the program at approximately its scheduled conclusion time.

Brian Lowry, in his on-line column for the Los Angeles Times (LATimes.com, 1/22/03) labels TiVo "the ultimate script doctor," and suggests that in addition to time-shifting TiVo users can eliminate the boring segments of entertainment programs.

The latest edition of the TiVo device will allow users, after payment of a one-time $100 fee, to program their TiVo's remotely from a website. The new bells and whistles will also let consumers share programming from different TiVo's connected through their home Ethernet or Wi-Fi network. This option will also let owners use their TV's to play music or show photos that their TiVo's can retrieve from their Macintosh or Windows computer hard drive.

TiVo allows users to create personalized "Wish Lists" and "Suggestions" to customize their entertainment choices. The "Wish Lists" use a TiVo-created database of key words

to automatically record, say, all movies starring John Wayne.

TiVo's "Suggestions" programming lists are individually tailored for each viewer based upon the owner's "Thumbs Up" or "Thumbs Down" rating of previously-viewed programs. According to TiVo's website,

"Over time, as your TV preferences become more detailed, the list of TiVo's Suggestions will become more and more accurate, offering you plenty of entertainment options you otherwise might have missed."

Yet on a TiVo discussion website, not moderated by the company (http://www.tivocommunity.com/tivo-vb/), user complaints point out the deficiencies in the customized user experience. On the seemingly simple issue of TiVo knowing when a sports event is concluded, one user writes:

> "TiVo is absolutely worthless until they can find some way to make the system KNOW that a program is not over before it finishes recording. I am a huge NASCAR fan. I just spent the last 4 HOURS watching the MBNA 500 to have my TiVo cut out with 15 laps to go. The way I see it... regardless of what indexing service they use... if my TV can display the program info, there is data available to determine what is showing and if the TiVo programmers suck so bad they cannot find a way to incorporate that data so I don't lose my race with 15 laps to go... they have lost me as a customer until they have."

On the technically more complex issue of TiVo's user-based "Suggestions," another writer complains,

> "I'd like an option to mark some shows recorded as "suggestions" to never be recorded ever ever again.
>
> I like to watch Iron Chef so I record it every week. Now TiVo is recording all Martha Stewart shows available on every channels... Martha's Kitchen, Martha's Garden, Living with Martha etc.... (BTW can't wait for "Martha's Bedroom")"

Another new technology may offer refinements to TiVo's learning curve to address current complaints and also to go much farther in discerning users' programming preferences. As the science of "data mining" or "sense-making" matures and finds new commercial applications, it may intersect with future TiVo-type devices. The federal government is pouring millions of dollars into such software start-ups as a part of the war on terrorism. (There is even a CIA venture fund, In-Q-Tel, for technologies demonstrating usefulness in intelligence applications.) The March 2003 issue of MIT Technology Review lists a number of them, including Entrieva, of Reston, VA, that focuses upon the management of unstructured data, including web pages, audio, and video.

Perhaps a future PVR will have access to a database consisting of more than program titles and key-word descriptors. This database might include all the dialogue from a program, extracted either by stenographic software or parsed directly from a closed-captioning feed. This data could be used to intelligently enhance TiVo's "Favorites" programming lists, using user-supplied Boolean-structured searches through the

database. A limited implementation of this feature is already available on some PVR add-ons for personal computers.

By providing the ability for his TiVo to delete any recorded program with dialogue containing the phrase "It's a good thing," the writer to the TiVo users' website might one day use data-mining software to banish Martha Stewart from his living room forever.

Howard Goldbaum is the Reynolds Professor of Media Technologies
at the University of Nevada

REVIEW

Stinson, Jim. (2002). Video Communication & Production. Tinley Park, IL: The Goodheart-Willcox Company, Inc. This book provides a comprehensive, well-organized, lucid introduction to video field production. Author Jim Stinson's background in theater, film and television serves his readers well in his thorough coverage of all aspects of small-format video: aesthetic elements, production planning, directing, shooting and editing. The book gives equal weight to theoretical and technical topics. Two chapters are devoted to explaining the nature of screen space and screen time; full-page sidebars give detailed instructions for calculating appropriate f-stop settings and shooting night for day.

The first two chapters of this book introduce nearly all of its topics in a simple form. The greater depth provided in later chapters is easy to find through the well-integrated in-text references that point the reader to illustrations or other sections of the book without interrupting the reading flow. While this structure does make for some slight repetition, it also allows the chapters to be read out of order without confusion. Each chapter starts with a list of topics and objectives and ends with a list of terms that also can be found in the comprehensive glossary.

The book's best feature is the clarity with which it presents both abstract and concrete information. Stinson draws careful distinctions among similar terms such as "capture," "digitize" and "import." His explanations of complex topics include apt comparisons to the familiar. For example, he likens the missing frame numbers in drop-frame time code to unused house numbers on a city block, and he compares non-linear editing project files to blueprints as opposed to actual houses.

Stinson's clear text explanations are supported by a wealth of high-quality diagrams and illustrations, including sequences of pictures to demonstrate moving video. In those cases, an accompanying CD or videotape might be more helpful, but it also would raise the price of the book, which at $44.00 is about two-thirds the cost of most production texts from more traditional college textbook publishers.

Stinson's work has been widely circulated through his articles in Videomaker Magazine. Video Communication & Production brings his store of production knowledge together in a book that would make an excellent text for high school or college video production courses.

Reviewed by LuEtt Hanson, Kent State University
lhanson@kent.edu

THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE 2002 ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE NAB AND THE BEA

Mark J. Braun, Gustavus Adolphus College
mbraun@gac.edu

Rebecca Ann Lind, University of Illinois at Chicago
rebecca@uic.edu

This report marks the 10th anniversary of our annual analysis of women's involvement in the annual National Association of Broadcasters convention, and the fifth year since we expanded the scope of our report to include women's involvement in the BEA convention. Susan Tyler Eastman & Betsy Leebron had begun the BEA analyses in 1989, but upon their recommendation, we began incorporating elements of their work into our reports in 1998.

We must continue to monitor women's inclusion both in the industry's major professional organization and in the professional association most closely allied with media education. Only through careful and consistent observation will we understand whether (and how much) progress for women is being made.

Our research is guided by four research questions:

RQ 1: What was the gender distribution of participants in NAB 2002 panels/programs?

RQ 2: What was the gender distribution of the NAB Boards in 2002?

RQ 3: What was the gender distribution of participants in BEA 2002 panels/programs?

RQ 4: What was the gender distribution of the BEA Boards in 2002?

The Year in Review

As has been the pattern established over the past nine years, this report provides an update of the state of opportunity for women in broadcast employment over the past 12-15 months. The assumption behind this annual update is that if women gain in employment (both in terms of position stature and sheer numbers) there will be gains in the percentage and number of women presenting at professional conferences. For an historical perspective on these annual updates, see previous reports (Lind & Braun, 2002, 2000, 1997, 1996; Braun & Lind, 2001, 1999, 1998, 1995, 1994).

Executive employment

There was one especially bright spot in 2002, when a study by the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg Public Policy Center found that "women have become more visible at industry events" noting that more women were featured speakers at recent telecommunications and media conferences, although "many key roles still go to men" (Romano, 2002, p. 9). Nonetheless, as the following statistics indicate, there were both gains and losses in female broadcast employment in the past year.

Perhaps the group of women most likely to serve as presenters and chairs on sessions at NAB is comprised of those who work in the top executive positions in broadcasting and entertainment companies. Unfortunately, according to the Annenberg study released in August 2002, the "glass ceiling" continues to keep men in power posts to the exclusion of women. Specifically, at the ten major entertainment companies (among them, Disney, Viacom, AOL/Time Warner) women accounted for just 14 percent of the top executive spots and 15 percent of the board member slots in 2001. Apologists contended that recent industry consolidation has stripped some of the rungs from the corporate ladder, leaving women with the opportunity to run divisions but not entire companies. However, according to Discovery President and COO Judith McHale, the classic "pipeline" explanation does not fully account for the current level of women at top ranks, since there are many qualified women who have worked in the industry for more than 20 years, and "…until you have more women in leadership positions, it will be difficult to make changes and make progress." While one female executive in the television industry found the results of the Annenberg study to be "the same old story," the publication of the report "at least gets people talking about the issue" (Romano, 2002, p. 9). The Annenberg report indicated that fewer than 20 percent of the board members of the largest communication companies are women, with men accounting for more than 75 percent of the top executive positions across four different communication company sectors. According to Susan Ness, former FCC Commissioner and now Director of the Information and Society Section of the Annenberg Public Policy Center, "There continues to be a dearth of women in the executive suites and corporate boardrooms of communications and e-commerce companies…With few exceptions, we have not moved beyond tokenism in the number of women in top leadership positions or serving on the boards of communications companies" (cited in Tepavcevic & Slass, 2002, p. 1). Among the 23 biggest telecom and cable providers women accounted for only 12 percent of directors and 16 percent of executives. One bright spot was that within the seven commercial broadcast television and cable networks, women account for 32 percent of news executives. Among presidents and CEOs of more than 120 broadcast television and cable networks/channels, just 16 percent are women. The Annenberg report also stated that four out of five heads of local cable systems are men, as are more than four out of five heads of local television stations. According to Ness, "Ironically, women may have a greater opportunity now than ever before to be tapped as top executives and board members. They should not be chosen, however, solely to add diversity. Women are ready with the expertise, the commitment, and the talent to provide shareholders and management with knowledgeable and dedicated service" (Tepavcevic & Slass, 2002, p. 2). Still, according to the Annenberg study, females accounted for 30 percent of the executives at the seven national broadcast and cable news outlets last year, compared with just 20 percent the year before.i In programming at the national level, 16 percent of the top executives at 120 broadcast and cable channels are women.ii There are also a number of female GMs at cable networks, including History Channel, TNN and VH1.iii At the local broadcast TV level, in the "top 210 media markets there were 243 general managers, 823 female anchors, and 450 female news executive producers who are women. Thus the report indicated that women fare slightly better at lower levels of communication companies. (Romano, 2002, p. 9).

Local newsroom employment

In July 2002 the Radio and Television News Director Association (RTNDA), working in conjunction with Robert Papper, professor of Telecommunications at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, released the results of its annual survey examining the employment of women [and minorities] in television and radio newsrooms ("RTNDA/Ball State University: Survey…" 2002). The survey results indicated that the number of women and minorities as a percentage of the news workforce was down from the 2001 findings, although the percentage of women and minority TV and radio news directors was up in 2002. According to RTNDA president Barbara Cochran, "It's good news that women and minorities are increasing their numbers in management ranks, but the decline in total staff percentages is cause for concern" (Eggerton, 2002). Specifically, women held 25.9 percent of TV news director jobs, up from 20.2 percent in 2001. On the radio side, women accounted for 22.3 percent of news directors, a slight increase from the 21.9 percent figure reported in 2001. Overall, women held 38.6 percent of the jobs in the television news work force, compared to 39.7 percent the prior year, while women held 32.5 percent of all radio news jobs, also down from the 2001 figure, that was reported at 37.4 percent (Eggerton, 2002). The level of television news directors who are women was reported in the study as being a record high, at nearly 26%. ("Study: more…" 2002, p. 26).iv Papper noted, "Until recently, broadcasters were held to the rule that newsrooms had to reflect the population of the local community…. Stations sought out highly talented women and minorities to fill entry-level positions to meet those ratios. These people were then promoted into middle and upper management" ("Women and minorities…" 2002, p. 6). He speculated that low entry-level salaries may now be discouraging qualified job candidates from entering the broadcast news workforce, noting that recent college graduates seem to be turning to other communications fields or even other professions due to the low starting wages in broadcasting. He said that entry-level pay for broadcast news reporters is only $17,500 to $19,500 annually, while producers earn only slightly more. Papper also stated "Women and minorities have so many more well-paying entry points than just a few years ago. If the salaries don't increase, we will see broadcasters hiring people who will take the salaries instead of the most-qualified applicants." Particularly ominous for the future of the type of women who would likely present at conferences such as the NAB, Papper noted "Unless you can increase the number of women and minorities coming into the field, you won't find qualified candidates to go into management" ("Women and minorities…" 2002, p. 6). Besides low starting salaries, one of the biggest challenges for women in the news business is said to be the often unpredictable and demanding schedule. An international survey found that 64 percent of women said their top obstacle is balancing work and family ("Women's role…" 2002, p. 45).

A 2002 survey indicated that, in general, women are still under-represented in public-affairs television ("Women and media," 2002, p. 33.) The study, conducted by the White House Project, found that women held only 11 percent of all guest slots on Sunday talk shows in 2000 and 2001, and that those women who were invited to appear spoke on average ten or fewer words. They were also much less likely to be called back to the program, with only 7 percent of repeat guests being women. According to Eleanor Clift, a founding member of the board of the International

Women's Media Foundation (and a contributing editor for Newsweek), "This is a profession that has to learn a lot about bringing more voices to the table and creating more opportunities" ("Women's role…" 2002, p. 45).

EEO Developments in 2002

In January 2001 the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals struck down, for a second time since 1998, the Federal Communications Commission rules regarding Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines for broadcasters and cable operators. The court objections were related to the data-collection requirements promulgated by the Commission. The circuit court ruled that the FCC plan to review an operator's pool of applicants, and to order recruiting changes if an appropriate demographic mix was not evident, put pressure on employers by creating an illegal, de facto.

As 2001 came to a close, the FCC unveiled its new proposal, that would require broadcasters and cable systems to engage in minority and gender recruiting efforts (McConnell, 2001), prompting the NAB to decide at its 2002 annual winter meeting to form a committee to draft a "comprehensive EEO proposal" that would be presented to the FCC ("NAB to work…" 2002). However, by April, 2002 a coalition of 45 organizations, including the National Bar Association, the National Council of Churches, civil-rights groups, and minority journalist organizations had already endorsed most aspects of the FCC's proposal ("FCC EEO proposal…" 2002). The coalition, sponsored by the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council, and "represented 'the largest and broadest coalition of nonprofit organizations' ever to file comments in an FCC rule-making proceeding" urged the FCC to make sure that any new rules contained meaningful EEO regulations ("Groups deluge FCC…" 2002, p. 6). The coalition called on the Commission to write even more restrictive language related to requirements that top management be responsible for implementation of the rules. Comments also encouraged the FCC to allow independent, nonprofit websites to serve as a medium for companies to communicate job openings, but not to allow companies to rely on word-of-mouth for circulating job vacancies ("FCC EEO proposal…" 2002). The FCC held en banc hearings on the proposed new rules during June ("FCC plans…" 2002).

In November 2002 the Commission formally adopted its latest version of EEO procedures. By effectively adopting just those provisions of "Option A" of its old rule, that had gained the approval of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, the FCC hoped to avoid a fourth EEO defeat in court (Martin, 2003). The old "Option A" included a requirement for media companies to keep and submit detailed annual records to the Commission. This provision drew criticism from the NAB, that president Eddie Fritts said "…has long been concerned with rules that create undue paperwork burdens, particularly on small-market broadcasters" (cited in "FCC sets new…" 2002, p. 44). Specifically, the new rules retain "Option A" by requiring licensees to widely disseminate notices of all full-time (30 hours or more) job vacancies (except for rare emergency hires), to provide notices of openings to groups requesting such listings, and to participate in a specific number of recruitment activities every two years.v In terms of record keeping, broadcasters and cable operators must keep detailed records of all full-time vacancies, the recruitment sources used for each, copies of all employment ads and announcements, documentation to show good-faith participation in recruiting activities. Stations must also record the total number of candidates interviewed, and

the referral source of each person interviewed, along with a record of who was hired, that person's references, and the hire date (or "date of hire" – either helps remove pronoun issue). These reports must be in a station's public file, and are to be submitted to the FCC at renewal time as well as midway through the license term. In addition, beginning in September 2003, stations must file an annual report with the Commission stating the gender and race/ethnicity of each of its employees. The FCC says it will not use this information to evaluate compliance, but will use this data only for statistical purposes. However, critics of the rules are concerned that the collection of gender and race data will result in charges of discrimination related to the types of employment practices that have previously been rejected by the courts (Martin, 2003). Whether or not the new rules do pass judicial muster will remain to be seen in 2003 or 2004.

Methodology
To answer RQ 1 the authors independently coded as Male, Female, or Unknown all panelists listed in the program for the 2002 National Association of Broadcasters convention adopting a methodology devised by Eastman & Leebron (1994). Likewise, to answer RQ 3, the authors similarly coded all program participants listed in the program for the 2002 Broadcast Education Association convention. Both conventions were held in April, in Las Vegas. In both coding processes, names such as Chris, Terry, Pat and Lee were coded as "unknown," unless the authors were familiar with the individuals in question. Following independent coding of the data, the authors discussed and resolved the few discrepancies through consensus. A similar procedure was followed to answer RQ 2 and RQ 4; the authors independently coded as Male, Female, or Unknown all names listed in the NAB 2002 convention program as members of NAB Boards of Directors [i.e. Executive Committee, Radio Board, Television Board] and all persons listed in the BEA 2002 convention program as members of the BEA Leadership [i.e. Worldwide Headquarters Staff, Officers and Directors, Convention Committees, and Interest Division Chairs.] For all four research questions, the frequencies and percentages of male and female names were computed. The resulting percentages are compared to those percentages from the previous year, as well as to those from 1993, the baseline year in which we began our analyses.

NAB Results
Analysis of the 2002 NAB convention program revealed a total of 508 participants in panels and presentations. The total number of NAB speakers/panelists continues to trend downward, dropping by 26.80 percent in three years – from 694 in 1998 to 508 in 2002. Of these 508 participants, 417 (82.09 percent) were coded as male, 65 (12.80 percent) were coded as female, and 26 (5.12 percent) were coded as gender unknown. When comparing only the 482 gender-known participants, the 65 females accounted for 13.49 percent of the total, while the 417 males made up a corresponding 86.51 percent of the total. The relative percentage of women essentially remained steady, despite the overall drop in the number of chairs and presenters, with a slight increase (up 0.05 percent) in female participation over last year (2001). Table 1 describes the level of female participation in the NAB convention this year, the change

since last year, and the change since our first report in 1993, when just 8.88 percent of the gender-known participants were women.

TABLE 1 Number and Percentage of NAB Female Chairs and Presenters (gender-known)				
			% change since '01	% change since '93
	# Female	# Female		
Total (n=508-26 unknown) = 482	65	13.49	0.05	4.61

Thus, our finding on RQ 1 is that female representation on NAB 2002 panels, measured by the percentage of the total number of gender-known presenters and chairs, has increased since the prior year, but just barely. Overall, female participation in the NAB convention has increased by 4.61 percent since 1993 when this study began.

RQ 2 focused on membership of the NAB Boards, that had a total of 58 gender-known participants in 2002. The NAB Boards tallied here include the ten-member Executive Committee, the 32-member Radio Board, and the 16-member Television Board. Table 2 describes the change in level of female participation on the NAB Boards since last year as well as the total change since our first report in 1993. The NAB Executive Committee, with one female member, remains 90 percent male. The NAB Radio Board has five female members. The size of the Board had decreased from 32 members to 30 in 2001, but in 2002 went back up to 32 members. It seems the additional members are female; the percentage of female participation has increased from 10 percent to 15.63 percent. This represents a solid and steady increase of women on the Radio Board since the 3.03 percent (1 woman) in 1993. Of the 16 members of the NAB Television Board, three (18.75 percent) are female. Perhaps because the size of the TV Board has decreased from 19 to 16 this year (losing one woman total), the percentage of female participation has decreased by 2.30 percent since 2001. Still, the number of women on the TV Board is up by 4.46 percent since 1993.

In sum, 9 of the 58 members of NAB Boards in 2002 (15.52 percent) are women, while 49 (84.48 percent) are men. This represents a 1.96 percent increase from the 2001 figure for female participation on the NAB Boards. Thus it appears female participation in the NAB boards has increased since 2001. Our finding for RQ 2 is that, at 15.52 percent, female representation on the NAB Boards in 2002 has improved since last year but is still low. However, we note that the number of women on these boards has gone up significantly since 1993.

TABLE 2 Percentage of Female Members on NAB Boards (Exec/Radio/TV) (gender-known)				
			% change since '01	% change since '93
Group	# Female	# Female		
Executive Committee (n=10)	1	10.00	0.00	10.00
NAB Radio Board (n=32)	5	15.63	5.63	12.60
NAB Television Board (n=16)	3	18.75	-2.30	4.46
Total (n=58 Board members)	9	15.52	1.96	9.07

BEA Results

Research question 3 asked, "What was the gender distribution of participants in BEA 2002 panels/programs?" Our tabulation indicated a total of 769 participants in panels and presentations, an 11.29 percent increase from the 691 participants in 2001. Of these, 513 (66.71 percent) were coded as male, 202 (26.27 percent) were coded as female, and 54 (7.02 percent) were coded as gender unknown. When comparing only the 715 gender-known participants, the 202 females accounted for 28.25 percent of the total, while the 513 males made up a corresponding 71.75 percent of the total. The figure of 28.25 percent female participation represents an increase of 0.09 percent from 2001. This miniscule increase does little to counteract the 3.47 percent decrease occurring between 1999 and 2000, and even less to mitigate the trend downward from the 37.0 percent level in 1993 (as reported by Eastman & Leebron, 1994). Thus our finding on RQ 3 is that female representation on BEA 2002 panels, measured by the percentage of the total number of gender-known presenters and chairs, has increased only slightly since 2001. Table 3 displays the findings for this research question.

TABLE 3 Number and Percentage of BEA Female Chairs and Presenters (gender-known)				
	# Female	# Female	% change since '01	% change since '93
Total (n=769-54 unknown) = 715	202	28.25	0.09	-8.75

RQ 4 focused on the composition of BEA leadership, that included a total of 36 people listed in the BEA program for 2002. In this group, there are no members of unknown gender. The tabulation indicated that 28 of the 36 BEA leadership positions in 2002 were filled by males (77.78 percent), and a corresponding 8 (22.22 percent) were women.

For some leadership categories, the work of Eastman and Leebron (1994) allows a comparison with our baseline year of 1993. In 2002, three of the 17 officers and directors (17.65 percent) were female, compared with five of 15 (33.33 percent) in 2001 and four of 14 (28.57 percent) in 1993. This represents a decrease of 15.69 percent from the prior year. The 2002 percentage of female interest division chairs held steady since 2001, at 13.33 percent. The Convention Committee also held steady, at 50.00 percent. Table 4 shows the percentage of female participation by committee and function, and provides comparisons where possible. The table shows that there is generally less female participation than last year. Thus, our finding for RQ 4 is that women in 2002 made up 22.22 percent of BEA's leadership positions, down 6.35 percent from 2001 and continuing to trend downward from the 1998 figure of 35.2 percent overall.

TABLE 4 Percentage of Female Members of BEA Leadership Positions				
Group	# Female	# Female	% change since '01	% change since '93
Worldwide HQ staff (n=2)	2	100.00	33.33	66.67
Officers/Directors (n=17)	3	17.66	-15.69	-10.92
Interest Division Chairs (n=15)	2	13.33	0.00	-0.96
Convention Committees (n=2)	1	50.00	0.00	N/A
Total (n=58 Board members)	8	22.22	-6.35	N/A

Discussion and Conclusions

Our analysis of the NAB 2002 Convention Program shows that even though women continue to be underrepresented on the panels at the industry's largest convention, there are gains for woman across the board. Just as we've found in the past few years, there are significantly fewer chairs and presenters in NAB 2002 than in the previous year, but the percentage of female participation in such roles has increased. The NAB Boards, also, have welcomed more women as members. Overall, since 1993, the NAB has made slow, modest, but generally consistent improvement at involving women in its convention—even as fewer total people have been involved. When one considers that NAB 2002 had nearly 27 percent fewer speakers and panelists than NAB 1998, the consistent relative gains for women are laudable.

The BEA, on the other hand, continues to present the opposite picture. Rather than a decrease in the total number of participants in its convention, the number of chairs and presenters has significantly increased over the past few years—from 515 in 1998 to 769 in 2002. This increase gives the BEA a substantial, concrete opportunity to increase the number of women involved in its major convention event. The number of speakers and panelists rose by 8.14 percent this year alone—from 691 in 2001. As an organization, the BEA has not risen to the challenge. Even with the 8.14 percent increase in the number of participants, the number of female chairs and presenters at the 2002 BEA convention rose so slightly (by 0.09%) that one can't consider this any sort of "progress." The participation of women at the BEA convention has declined by 8.75 percent overall since 1993.

The number of female BEA Officers and Directors in 2002 is also way down. The number of women participants in this group has dropped by 15.69 percent (from 33.33 percent in 2001 to 17.65 percent in 2002) This is down 10.92 percent since 1993. The number of female Interest Division chairs remains low, at 13.33 percent. As we noted last year, we have more Interest Divisions now, but no more women serve as chairs.

The NAB, long criticized by many for being a male-dominated domain, seems to be increasingly effective at reaching out to include women—and to maintain the progress when it is made. The BEA has not been successful in this regard, and should work to improve its record. One of the authors of this report (Lind) has gained some insight by virtue of her serving as the 2002 Convention Planner. Even though she did everything she could to encourage people submitting panels to be diverse—among other things, the program proposals themselves explicitly asked about the extent of diversity among the invited panelists—this obviously did not happen as much as would be desired.

Just as in the convention, the individuals elected to the various leadership positions represent the members' decisions. And just as in the convention, women either are not seeking elected offices, or are not being supported when they do make such an attempt.

The BEA convention is almost a perfect reflection of what BEA members ask for, and it seems clear that BEA members are not exerting enough effort at including their female peers. Numerous women—both scholars and producers—attend the BEA convention. Many of these women are capable of and probably interested in becoming more involved in the organization, both as convention participants and as Divisional or Organizational leaders. We, as BEA members, bear the responsibility of reaching out to and welcoming others, particularly those in under-represented groups. By the same

token, women who wish to become involved in the convention bear the responsibility to indicate their desire to participate, and to reach out to others themselves. BEA members—both male and female—need to expend far more energy in networking. We need to step out of our "comfort zones" and expand the range and diversity of our convention acquaintances. It's not just our convention, but also our organization, that would be strengthened by greater access to the good ideas, efforts, and insights that can be offered by a wide variety of individuals.

References

Braun, M. J. & Lind, R. A. (2001, Spring). The Participation of Women in the 2000 Annual Conventions of the National Association of Broadcasters and the Broadcast Education Association. Feedback, 42, (2), pp. 27-35.

Braun, M. J. & Lind, R. A. (1999, Summer). The Participation of Women in the 1998 Annual Conventions of the National Association of Broadcasters and the Broadcast Education Association. Feedback, 40, (3), pp. 26-32.

Braun, M. J. & Lind, R. A. (1998, Summer). The Participation of Women in the April, 1997 Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. Feedback, 39, (3), pp. 8-14.

Braun, M. J., & Lind, R. A. (1995, Fall). The Participation of Women in the April, 1994 Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. Feedback, 36 (3), 26-28.

Braun, M. J., & Lind, R. A. (1994, Winter). The Participation of Women in the April, 1993 Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. Feedback, 35 (1), 8-10.

Eastman, S. T. & Leebron, E. J. (1994). 1994 report on the status of women in the Broadcast Education Association. Feedback, 35 (2), 5-9.

Eggerton, J. (2002, July 15). Not much news for women, minorities. Broadcasting & Cable [online]. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from http://www.broadcastingcable.com/index. Article ID=CA234020.

FCC EEO proposal gets broad backing (2002, April 17). Broadcasting & Cable [online]. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from http://www.broadcastingcable.com/index. Article ID=CA213368.

FCC plans hearing on EEO rules. (2002, May 6). Broadcasting & Cable [online]. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from http://www.broadcastingcable.com/index. Article ID=CA216407.

FCC sets new EEO rules (2002, Nov. 18). MEDIAWEEK, 12, [42], p. 44. Groups deluge FCC with demands for new EEO rules. (2002, May 6). Jet, 101, [20], p. 6.

Lind, R. A., & Braun, M. J. (2002, Spring). The Participation of Women in the 2001 Annual Conventions of the NAB and the BEA. Feedback, 43, (2) pp. 28-37.

Lind, R. A., & Braun, M. J. (2000, Spring). The Participation of Women in the 1999 Annual Conventions of the National Association of Broadcasters and the Broadcast Education Association. Feedback, 41, (2) pp. 40-47.

Lind, R. A., & Braun, M. J. (1997, Winter). The Participation of Women in the April, 1996 Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. Feedback, 38, (1), pp. 25-28.

Lind, R. A., & Braun, M. J. (1996, Summer). The Participation of Women in the April, 1995 Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. Feedback, 37, (3), pp. 4-6.

Martin, H. C. (2003, Jan. 1). FCC tackles EEO for a third time. Broadcast Engineering, 45, [1].

McConnell, B. (2001, Dec. 17). EEO do-over at FCC: Agency tries for third time to craft equal-employment rules. Broadcasting and Cable, 131, [52], p. 27.

NAB to work on new EEO proposal. (2002, Jan. 17). Broadcasting & Cable [online]. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from http://www.broadcastingcable.com/index. Article ID=CA192174.

Romano, A. (2002, Sept. 2). "Dearth of women" in top spots: Annenberg study shoes that the "glass ceiling" still keeps men in power posts. Broadcasting and Cable, 132, [36], p. 9.

RTNDA/Ball State University: Survey examines employment of women and minorities as television and radio news directors. (2002, July 22). Broadcasting & Cable, 132, [30], p. 18.

Study: More minorities as news directors. (2002, July 29). MEDIAWEEK, 12, [28], p.26.

Tepavcevic S., & Slass L. (2002). Women fail to crack the glass ceiling in communication companies: Men still hold vast majority of board and executive positions within entertainment, telecommunication, cable, publishing and E-companies. Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved February 15, 2003 from http://www.appcpenn.org/press/glass-ceiling-2002-release.pdf

Women and media. (2002, Summer). WIN News, 28, [3], p. 33.

Women and minorities in news are decreasing. (2002, Dec.). USA Today Magazine, 131, [2691], p. 6.

Women's role in news remains limited: Says American Society of Newspaper Editors survey. (2002, July-August). The Quill, 90, [6], p. 45.

---

[1] For instance, CNN has a female news chief in Teya Ryan, while two of the three senior vice presidents at CBS News are women (Marcy McGinnis and Betsy West). In addition, PBS has a female president (Pat Mitchell) and women hold top entertainment spots at four of the broadcast networks (Susan Lynn at ABC, Nancy Tellem at CBS, Gail Berman at Fox, and Dawn Ostroff at UPN).

[2] Including Discovery (Judith McHale), MTV (Judy McGrath), BET (Debra Lee), Lifetime (Carole Black), CNBC (Pamela Thomas Graham), Oxygen (Geraldine Laybourne), Sci Fi (Bonnie Hammer), and E! (Mindy Herman).

[3] Cable TV is cited as being less of a "boys club" than broadcasting, because women could get more hands-on opportunities, although the entry-level salaries have tended to be even lower than in broadcasting.

[4] The slight drops in overall female employment in broadcast newsrooms can be compared to the newspaper figures, in which the percentage of women in newspaper newsrooms decreased from 37.35 percent to 37 percent [with minority women at just 2.99 percent of all women], even at a time when women represent 60 percent or more of all students enrolled in college journalism programs ("Women's role…" 2002, p. 45).

[5] These could include job fairs, internships, or scholarship programs. Small-market stations, or stations with only five to ten full-time employees, must participate in two such activities annually. This number doubles for larger market stations or those with more than 10 employees.

OPEN VS CLOSED: ACADEMIC DISHONESTY ISSUES IN DIGITAL PRODUCTION COURSE INSTRUCTION

Gregory Gutenko, University of Missouri at Kansas City
gutenkog@umkc.edu

One ideal of digital media production software and technology is open file compatibility and exchange. Unrestricted transfer and duplication facilitates professional production, but may also facilitate improper reuse. This paper describes several pedagogical concerns and curricular adaptations that have arisen in dealing with student plagiarism issues in digital photography, non-linear video editing, and other digital file based university courses. Conflicts exist between the open nature of digital media and the need to control dishonesty. Technical and pedagogical methods developed to flag or obstruct ease of transport and reuse may undermine both applications and instructional design.

What is the issue in general?

Plagiarism, the act of passing off the work of another as the result of one's own intellectual or creative effort, is distinct from the issue of actual ownership rights to the work and its subsequent reuse. Copyright is about commodities and revenue. Plagiarism can be perfectly legal.

Who plagiarizes? Among students "the three main types of Internet cheaters are those who do it unintentionally, those who do it sneakily, and those who are desperate or lazy." (Renard). Another three classifications could be:

(1) Students who do not want to do the work (in general/required courses),

(2) Students who want to do the work but find themselves incapable, and

(3) Students who want to do the work, are capable, but have failed to allot

the time, effort, and discipline to produce the work. The essay buyer/thief taking a course under duress is more likely to be motivated by apathy in the subject, resistance to the requirements, ignorance, etc. The digital media thief is more likely to be motivated by "panic" factors and would much rather be capable of delivering their own work.

There is considerable literature about text (essay) plagiarism (e.g.: "Techno cheats bedevil sector" (Utley)). There is little about digital media plagiarism in the classroom. Essay-buying is historic and pre-computer, and accessing the sources of these for-purchase materials use to be less than obvious. Digital acquisition is recent, sources are infamous and very easy to access and in step with "legal" on-line text, music and image

downloading services. www.schoolsucks.com is there for any student who wants it.

What is the digital plagiarism issue?

It's incredibly easy. It's almost harder not to do it. ("Resistance is futile.")

The entire nature and ethos of the Internet promotes the user's expectation of open access without limits. If it's wrong why is it so easy?

Compounding this "design feature" of the Internet is the "hacker mystique", that arguably can trace its ethical origins back to the subversive counterculture days of Yippies, the Weather Underground, and Abbie Hoffmans "Steal this Book" (http://tenant.net/Community/steal/index.html). The "open media" ethic underlies most attitudes of disregard for academic integrity.

How do you detect and discourage plagiarized text?

Appreciating the realistic performance limitations of your students is always going to serve as an alert to something being amiss. Eccentric language usage and unexpected conceptual awareness can be clues, and "take out the big words" (Bushweller) is an essential dumbing-down rewriting task for the successful plagiarist.

There is growing use of various Internet search databases, such as Plagiarism.org, ABI/Inform, and Lexis/Nexis to detect unique phrases and text blocks (Denning; Andersen). There are some institutions that have considered screening papers on a regular basis, not just when there is cause for suspicion.

Potential in Photography, Desktop Publishing, and Web design courses

How do you steal a digital still image?

This is the simplest non-text file type to obtain over the Internet. Vast numbers of images are available on websites operated by corporations and private entities and individuals, all of whom wish to share their images without technical restriction for marketing, publicity, or shared interest motivations. While most explicitly note their copyright ownership of these images, these are still offered free for downloading and "personal" use. Acknowledging the ownership and/or refraining from modifying the images are usually the only restrictions placed on the use of these images.

To plagiarize an image one can download it with a click, modify it in PhotoShop or other photo-retouching programs to alter the slightly tell-tale original pixel size, resize and filter it (despeckle, sharpen, etc.) to improve the overall resolution, unleash a barrage of more extreme filters and tools to modify its appearance, then convert it to another file type for good measure.

The duplicate may now be so far removed from the original in appearance that even the true owner may overlook it.

How do you detect and discourage digital still image plagiarism?

The intense filtering, cropping, layering, and other software manipulations that can be brought to bear on a pirated image makes any kind of "matching-template" method of searching for the original form of the image extremely unworkable. Searching for duplicated text strings is feasible, searching for elements of images is not. The

Digimarc corporation offers as a "service solution" to this image tracking problem a process whereby a digitally readable pattern is embossed throughout an image (Digimarc). Digimarc scans the Internet for "water-marked" images with its search service, Marc Sider, and reports on their occurrences. There is a subscription cost for this protection/ detection method that might be hard to justify at the classroom level. (PhotoShop v 4.0 and highers include a Digimarc "demo" that allows the visual effect of this digital watermarking to be observed.)

Tell-tale compression artifacts and posterization (uneven gradations) can alert the teacher to the original size and probable source of the file. These digital compression vestiges are difficult if not impossible to remove from an "improved" and altered image. Unlike the evenly structured grid of pixels to be seen when any digital image is enlarged, the image area sampling patterns created by compression are more subtle but larger and result in an uneven grid structure. Thin, high-contrast lines appear to have "ringing" traced outlines and flat tones appear blocky. Originally acquired high-resolution images will not exhibit these artifacts.

One barrier that can be erected to discourage Web-source pilfering, but one that will be anathema to any network-minded person, is to have an "unplugged" graphics lab. Make the computer graphics lab graphics-dedicated and isolated from the network. Professional labs must be networked for file transfer and legitimate downloading from stock photo libraries, but this is an academic environment with unique considerations. General access labs should be and need to be Web-connected labs.

While it is certainly not difficult to download material to disk in a Web-connected general lab and carry the disk to the graphics lab, it is not as easy as just clicking a mouse key. The ease with which theft is possible can be a factor in its incidence. A $20 bill lying on a sidewalk is more likely to be snatched than a $20 bill hanging out of a person's pocket. The $20 folded away in a billfold stuffed well down in a pocket has the best odds of being left alone. A casual disregard for plagiarism prevention conveys a message about its real significance to the institution. Do we care enough about plagiarism to make it less than irresistible?

Potential plagiarism in Digital Video Editing Projects

How do you steal a nonlinear editing project?

The nature of analog linear video betrays duplication. There is evident generational loss with all but the most robust formats (1 inch, Betacam SP). It is difficult to significantly re-edit a master tape because video and audio tracks are linked and physically bound in place on the tape; assemble editing to revise and disguise will be abrupt and crude.

It is easy to assign dedicated timecode/user bits to each individual student's master tape. The videotape editing system can be set up to use externally regenerated timecode, copying the timecode from the source tape machine to the record machine. This would indicate what the source material is. However, it is not hard to enter into a machine's menu and reset the timecode, so this is not a tamper-proof method of tracking and discouraging duplication.

Digital processes encourage duplication and ease of plagiarism. Within any software manufacturer's product line, file exchange must be easy and bug-free. One of Avid's

major professional selling points is project exchange and ease of file duplication. The problem of non-compatible files exists almost exclusively between competing manufacturer's lines (in DTP and photo as well as video) and has been maintained as a "market defense" ploy used to retain the indentured customer/user base.

But within a closed "shop" such as a school lab that is likely to have a single software source, file duplication and renaming has always been easy and essentially undetectable. Any finished media product can be copied and slightly altered and so disguised.

Within the Avid product's windows environment, any clip, bin, or finished edited sequence can be duplicated and renamed in seconds. Easy duplication is essential to professional productivity, providing users and clients with multiple alternatives and quick revisions.

With the Internet, user needs and pressure have compelled adoption of more universal file forms such as QuickTime. Open file exchange is the rule. Add-on encrypting or other forms of "locking" files also makes them usable during production. This becomes a hindrance (like seat-belts) to many users who simply avoid the process.

How do you discourage nonlinear editing project plagiarism? One method is to have students keep all of their project and bin files on a removable floppy and take that floppy with them. There are problems with this solution.

Avid systems among others do not work well (if at all) if project files are not on the hard drive. Access time for files on floppies will be too slow and floppies are likely to be too small in capacity for complex projects. Zip and Jaz drives should have the capacity, but will still cause some slow-down.

Students must copy off any files that are created on the hard drive, then purge these files, a task not often remembered and observed. It is inevitable that copies of student projects will be left behind. Additionally, the Avid system in particular creates automatic backups of project files during edit sessions that are stored in an "attic" and it is difficult to distinguish among these backup files and identify which belong to a particular student.

The most effective solution? Change the methods of teaching and evaluation.

The best way to evaluate video/film editing has always been based on the use of a shared bin or collection of raw camera takes. The "bank robbery" video rushes from First Light Publishing are an example of video editing course materials that support a clear instructional objective in editing. This approach equalizes the editing challenge.

If each student works on a type of project of their own choosing, an approach that makes sense in a more holistic, introductory production course where editing is but one of many objectives, the editing challenge will not be equivalent for all. Each student's project will be unique and therefore plagiarism free, but this also makes editing requirements and evaluation inconsistent. If a major course objective is editing, using shared bins or raw footage is essential.

Professional tutorials and workshops, such as Avid's, are also based on the use of raw takes that all participants share.

One difference between the pro workshop (Avid) and the graded class is that in the former case there is no incentive to cheat because everyone gets their certification no matter how little effort they expend. In the latter case, however, there exists the grade penalty for low effort and so there is that avoidance incentive to plagiarize.

So, the best way to teach editing is by using a common footage source. Fortunately, the best way to teach digital production also provides the means to block digital plagiarism, by dividing work into discretely graded stages that can show clear evidence of evolving changes. In text writing, discretely graded stages "embracing the writing process" (Renard, 1999) examine a paper's development (outline, 1st draft without spelling-grammar penalties, 2nd draft with citations, etc.). In digital imaging and video this means breaking projects down into their stages of sequential development.

This implies more of a grading burden, since assignments aren't being dispensed with in one marathon end-of-semester grading binge. However, the burden need not be significantly greater because each discrete stage can and should have a much more limited set of criteria. This can make each evaluative stage simpler and also more consistent.

Non-linear video projects are in fact ideal content for stage-by-stage evaluation if students are actually learning to edit in a nonlinear thinking fashion as opposed to linear tape fashion. Unlike tape editing where each shot must be trimmed, in-out adjusted, level adjusted, audio adjusted, and effected before moving on to the next edit "event", an entire non-linear project can and should be worked in a more narrowly task-focused sequence of discrete work stages, each with their own particular mental and creative attention requirements.

Capturing and video level adjustment should be that only. Creating the bins should be creating the bins. The rough cut should be the rough cut. Trimming should be trimming only. Adding effects should be adding effects. Retrimming to fit in transition effects this that process. Titling is titling, and so on. If the project is dealt with in a step by step evolutionary manner then the originality of the work will be obvious from the beginning of the process.

Unfortunately, a common tendency is for teachers and students alike to use a nonlinear editing system in a linear tape fashion, assembling a chain of edit-by-edit refined shots. The nonlinear capabilities tend to come into use as revision tools rather than creation tools. As Thomas Ohanian states, "the first-time user of the nonlinear system begins in a linear fashion. Only after significant minutes or hours have passed do the first-timers magically discover that editing nonlinearly is easy; it's thinking nonlinearly that can be difficult..."

Evaluating discrete stages with limited objectives becomes a teaching strategy that, aside from assuring originality of student work, also fosters the nonlinear frame of mind. Below are the grading elements from a production course wherein each student executes an edited project from a shared pool of film footage:

COURSE GRADING		
Element	**Percent of Course Grade**	**Due Date**
Session Test (10)	15%	
Midterm Test	10%	
Final Exam	15%	
Film Crew Project	15%	
Dub/Digitize Project	5%	March 10
Rough Cut Project	10%	March 17
Trimmer Project	10%	March 31
Final or FX Cut Project	10%	April 14

In this example, the editing portion of the production is subdivided into four graded stages with specific due dates. One difficulty that can arise with this approach occurs when students, on a wild roll, complete one stage and charge onto the next without saving a version of the first for evaluation! Reminding these rampant editors to pause and save is an ongoing lecture component.

It is also difficult, as mentioned earlier, to redirect students' thinking and working methods towards the specific parameters of a particular stage; during the rough cut phase it is hard to resist the compulsion to trim or add transitions. This is the mindset holdover from linear video, "an orthodoxy of presumptions that are based in the linear mode of the editorial process and, consequently, the story-telling process. That is wrong." (Ohanian)

The conflicting ends and ideals that exist between the open nature of digital media and the need to discourage academic dishonesty will keep those in digital production course instruction off guard and looking for balance. The most unobstructive solutions for imaging and video appear to be pedagogical rather than technological. Breaking out, delimiting, and distributing scrutiny of student progress throughout the course is one solution that both obstructs plagiarism and stimulates nonlinear thinking in creative production.

Note: This article appeared in a 2002 issue of Feedback but complications prevented the entire article from appearing in print. This is the entire article.

References

Andersen, Espen. (Feb 1996). Battling plagiarism: discussion of the December 1995 article, Plagiarism in the Web. Communications of the ACM v 39   p.11-12

Bushweller, Kevin. (March 1999). Digital Deception: The Internet makes cheating easier than ever. Electronic School. National School Boards Association.

Denning, Peter J. (Dec 1995).   Plagiarism in the Web. Communications of the ACM v. 38   p.29.

Renard, Lisa. (Dec. 1999/Jan. 2000). Cut and paste 101: plagiarism and the Net. Educational Leadership v. 57 no4. p.38-42.

Index Stock Imagery and Digimarc Partner To Protect Photographer's Copyrights On The Web. (April 3, 2000). Digimarc press release.

Ohanian, Thomas A. (1993). Digital Nonlinear Editing. Stoneham, MA: Focal Press. p. 153

Utley, Alison. (July 16 1999). Techno cheats bedevil sector. The Times Higher Education Supplement no1393   p.1.

REVIEW

Hyde, Stuart (2003). Idea to Script: Storytelling for Today's Media. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. Idea to Script focuses on how to reach people with your scripts. It concentrates on what touches human beings. If you can tap into that, you can write successful scripts. Successful scriptwriting will be marked by the writer's ability to craft an experience the audience will embrace.

Idea to Script examines the nature of storytelling, not just the mechanics of it. This is not to say that the book discounts the value of proper format. Several different styles of scripts are covered and many examples are used throughout the book. While proper formatting is important, it is relatively easy to teach to students. More importantly, the book stresses the importance of telling stories for maximum effectiveness. This is perhaps one of the hardest things to communicate to students and much more intangible than format.

Idea to Script is divided into two parts. Part One sets the psychological and theoretical basis for storytelling. Hyde holds that the successful scriptwriter will have a thorough understanding of human nature. Toward that end, fundamental needs and desires inherent in the audience are explored. Universal themes in the arts are also explored as well as the forms these themes often take. Hyde demonstrates how these themes may be used to form the basis for effective stories. An interesting Appendix B details 80 universal themes. These are some of the tools available to writers. Students should know about them.

I also like the "questions" at the end of each chapter. Hyde uses these questions to bring theory to life through the personal experiences of the students. Rather than ask the students to recall bits of specific information from the chapter, the questions require the students to understand the material, then relate to it. The students must explore their own feelings, fears, and motivations.

This is not to say that Hyde discourages a firm grounding in fundamentals and a systematic approach to scriptwriting. His process begins with determining project objectives, works through structuring your story elements effectively, all the way toward finally channeling your creativity into formats that tell the story most clearly.

Part Two puts theory into practice as the lessons learned in Part One are applied to the conceptualizing and writing of scripts. Chapter 12 covers the requisite information on several script formats, including story boards, that are used in the radio, television, and film industries. Following chapters focus on writing specific types of scripts including commercials, dramatic narrative, and comedic works. Special attention is given to the writing of commercials as Hyde notes that the principles used to develop a successful commercial also apply to many other forms of writing. Appendix A offers a helpful collection of script examples.

Hyde recognizes the risk he takes in structuring the book as he has. The typical student will most likely want to start writing scripts immediately and will have little patience for theoretical groundwork. While Idea to Script does include exercises at the end of each chapter, an instructor might supplement these by having students write stories that use the principles covered to that point. Even if these stories aren't in the form of scripts, the students' creative urges will be satisfied and their enthusiasm kept intact, until the actual scriptwriting begins.

Reviewed by: Robert M. Prisco, John Carroll University
rprisco@jcu.edu

NEWS ANCHOR'S CONCERN FOR THE COMMUNITY AND LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS VIEWER LOYALTY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

John J. Lombardi, Frostburg State University
jlombardi@frostburg.edu

INTRODUCTION

Academics and media professionals alike are interested in developing a better understanding of the local television news audience. While much research has been done, much is still not known. For example, the academic community has yet to get a handle on exactly why people watch a particular television station for their news. An increase in competition, an increase in the local television news audience, and an increase in money spent on news programming by local television station owners makes the need to better understand the local television news audience increasingly important. This study does three things. First, it examines how important an anchor's concern for the community is to audience members. Secondly, this study presents a formula for calculating audience members' level of loyalty. Thirdly, this study examines the relationship between the importance of an anchor's concern for the community and local television news viewer loyalty.

Local television news anchors are thought to be the cornerstone to any successful newscast. Additionally the success of a station's programming goes far in determining the financial success of the overall station. As long ago as 1970 the news anchor has been the "dominant figure around whom the entire newscast turns" (Cathcart, 1970). Ellis (1992) also says that the "primary" news anchors (those who anchor the Monday through Friday evening newscast) are the ones who are most responsible for developing and/or conveying a station's image. O'Malley (1999) also recognized the role news anchors play in cultivating news viewers. Her article, "News Readers or News Leaders" talks exclusively about keeping news anchors happy and productive. This has to be done, she suggests, because highly visible anchors "are still the favorite sons and daughters of local news audiences" (p. 40). Meeske, Maunez-Caundra, and Shearer (1992), Harmon (1997), and Engstrom and Ferri (1999) also suggest that the news anchors are the faces of the station. Engstrom and Ferri (1999) go as far as to suggest that "television news anchors play perhaps the most prominent role in the US broadcast news industry" (p. 8).

The primary purpose of this study is to determine how important an anchor's concern for the community is to a viewer's decision to watch. Also, this study is concerned with determining whether a relationship exists between the level of importance and the level of loyalty viewers possess.

The following research questions will, therefore, be examined:

RQ 1: How important is an anchor's perceived concern for the community to respondent's decision to watch a particular station for news?

RQ 2: Is there a significant relationship between the level of influence of the anchor's perceived concern for the community and the viewer loyalty rating of the respondents?

LITERATURE REVIEW

It would appear that many industry professionals look simply at the frequency of viewing of a particular program or the program's ratings when attempting to identify a level of commitment by their viewers. While this may be sufficient in some ways, it is not sufficient when attempting to determine why people continually watch a particular program or station. Nor does it account for the possibility that viewers may also be watching competing programs. It is for this reason that both the frequency and the exclusivity of viewing should be examined in the context of loyalty. Ratings may prove that a particular show is "successful," but they do not identify program characteristics involved with loyal viewing.

Stamm (1987), in an unpublished conference paper, looked at characteristics of loyal and non-loyal television news viewers. Specifically, Stamm wanted to determine whether para-social interaction, the perception of a face-to-face relationship between spectator and media performer, precedes the formation of loyalty to a particular newscast, or whether the viewers see newscasts as a way of reaffirming their ties with the community. Respondents were asked whether they would be likely to engage in a number of behaviors such as feeling good to hear a newscaster's voice, or acknowledging the newscaster's sign-off. Respondents were also asked questions concerning the importance of newscaster concern for the local community and their own feelings about the community.

The results found that para-social interaction was, indeed, correlated with loyalty, but it was not necessarily an antecedent condition. Age was not found to be a factor in viewer loyalty. Additionally, Stamm (1987) found that respondents' own community ties are more strongly related to loyalty than to the perceived importance of the community by the newscaster. It may be important to note that Stamm (1987) used the term loyalty to refer to viewers who watch two or more newscasts per week on a particular station. Using this definition it is not hard to imagine a person being "loyal" to more than one station in a given market. This provides even more evidence that the exclusivity of viewing should also be considered in any discussion of loyalty.

Brosius, Wober, and Weimann (1992) examined viewer consistency among British television viewers. By analyzing viewing records from a two week time period it was determined that television viewing is remarkably consistent over time. The authors found that the channel, the program type, and the specific program watched in the first week strongly correlated to the channel, program type, and specific program watched in the second week.

Rosenstein and Grant (1997) explored the role "habit" plays in television viewing. They hypothesized that "controlling for impact of lead-in viewing, each hour of weekday viewing will be a positive predictor of the corresponding weekend hour" (p. 333). The authors began with the idea that "habit formation [is] neither passive nor active, neither ritual nor instrumental. Instead it is conceptualized as an underlying cognitive process which plays an important role in the development of individual media dependency relationships" (p. 329).

The model that Rosenstein and Grant (1997) developed suggests that program availability, viewer availability, and viewer goals and needs are all antecedents to "initial exposure" which is itself an antecedent to the development of an identifiable pattern of exposure. With this model, the authors postulated that a pattern of viewing is relatively consistent from one day to the next. They found support for the idea that, despite a difference in programming strategies by television executives for weekday and weekend fare, individual viewing patterns remained relatively constant. While this study may help understand why people watch television fare at particular times it does not attempt identify reasons why viewers would habitually watch a particular channel.

The idea that the news anchors are key figures in attracting and holding news audiences is not a new one. As long ago as 1970 researchers suggested that the news anchors present the face of the station (Cathcart, 1970). Since then numerous scholars have presented similar postulations (Matusow, 1983; Lin, 1992; Meeske, Maunez-Cuadra, & Shearer, 1992; Harmon, 1997; and Engstrom & Ferri, 1999).

Lin (1992) found that local television news viewers decide what stations to watch based on a number of factors, including liking the newscaster(s). This study found that the majority of local television news viewers consider the news anchors to be "important" (39.3%) or "very important" (32.9%) in their news program selection. The study did not identify characteristics associated with news anchors that audience members believe to be important to their viewing decisions.

Harmon (1997) examined, among other things, the relationship between regular local television news viewing and para-social interaction and para-community orientation. One hypothesis presented suggested that "those who report regular local TV news viewership will score higher on para-social interaction and para-community orientation with news anchors than will those viewers who are not regular local TV news anchors" (p. 7). Support for this hypothesis was found. Individuals who reported watching television regularly were more likely to agree with certain para-social questions than non-regular viewers. The regular viewers appeared to value such things as the friendliness of the anchors, the anchor's ability to stay calm in a crisis, and the anchor's concern for the community. No other anchor characteristics were identified. It should be noted, however, that with the exception of friendliness and concern for the community, Harmon's study did not examine other characteristics as they relate to frequency and/or exclusivity of viewing.

METHODOLOGY

In order to address the posed research questions a survey questionnaire was developed. It was decided that the survey would be most successfully administered via the telephone. A randomly selected list of Knox County, Tennessee residential telephone numbers was purchased. The company provided the researcher with a list

detailing the number of phone numbers available in all of the Knox County zip codes. A corresponding percentage of phone numbers was purchased for each of the zip codes available. The company drew the appropriate number of telephone numbers from each of the zip codes that were registered to someone who was 25-years of age or older. The primary target audience of local television newscasts includes viewers who are 25-years-old and older. Therefore, telephone numbers belonging to persons in that age range were ordered. A total of 4,000 telephone numbers was ultimately obtained.

Calls were made by a group of trained undergraduate students at a small regional comprehensive university. Callers were instructed to ask to speak to the person in the household 25-years of age or older who had most recently celebrated a birthday. This did two things. First, it further ensured that only people 25-years-old or older were surveyed (in case the telephone list was not quite accurate). Secondly, asking for the person who has most recently celebrated a birthday helped further ensure a random sample of participants.

As mentioned above, respondents were selected from the Knox County, Tennessee area. This area is home to the Knoxville, Tennessee, television market. While the Knoxville area is a convenient one for the researcher to use, there are other benefits involved in using that market. First, Knoxville, at the time of this survey, was the 63rd market and had three established local television newscasts and one station (WTNZ-TV, Fox) which had just recently begun airing local news programming. Knoxville is neither a very large nor a very small television market. For this reason it is thought that the Knoxville market will be more representative of all television markets than a particularly large (top 10) or a particularly small (150+) market. Second, the Knoxville market has a dominant number one station, a strong number two, and an up-and-coming number three station. This should allow for more diversity in answers which should provide a more complete understanding of the loyalty issue.

Data was collected on Monday May 3rd and Tuesday May 4th 1999. A total of 2,087 telephone numbers were dialed. Of those, nearly half (1,087) reached a member of the household. Of the 1,087 people contacted 667 (61.36 percent) declined participation. A total of 420 completed surveys (38.64 percent) were obtained. Of the 420 surveys obtained, three had to be discarded because they had not been completely filled out. This produced a usable n of 417 or 38.36 percent of the total number of households reached. This should provide a sufficient level of variance to conduct statistical analysis. Also, a sample of this size will yield a sufficiently low error level (less than .05 percent error with a confidence interval of just more than 95 percet).

Based on the available research and a series of pretests, loyalty is defined by the presence of frequent and exclusive local television news viewing. A loyalty rating, using data addressing these two variables, was created. This scale ranges from 0 (no loyalty) to 10 (total loyalty to one particular station). The idea here is that the more a person watches one station, the more loyal to that station he or she is thought to be. The mathematical formula is as follows:

$$\text{Loyalty} = \frac{\textbf{T}\textit{n}}{\textbf{T}\textit{s}} - \frac{\textbf{OT}\textit{n}}{\textbf{OT}\textit{s}}$$

Where:

T*n* is the total number of newscasts watched on all stations

T*s* is the total number of stations watched.

OT*n* is the total number of newscasts watched on all "other" stations. This excludes the number of newscasts watched on the station where the most newscasts were watched.

OT*s* is the total number of stations watched on all "other" stations. This excludes the station where the most number of newscasts were watched.

   This equation produces a number from 0 to 10. With the help of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the loyalty ratings were divided into quartiles or categories. The quartiles were named by the researcher and are as follows: 1) A loyalty rating of between 0 and .99 (Low), 2) A loyalty rating of between 1.00 and 2.00 (Moderate), 3) A loyalty rating of between 2.01 and 5.00 (High), and 4) A loyalty rating of between 5.01 and 10.00 (Very High). Following are a list of examples. A person who watches one newscast per week, but on only one station has a loyalty rating of one. A person who watches four newscasts on one station, two on a second station, and one on a third station has a loyalty rating of 0.83. A person who watches three newscasts per week on each of three stations has a loyalty rating of 0.
   Despite the arguments of most hard scientists, math is not a perfect science. Indeed it produces real numbers, but those numbers are not always as reliable as some may want them to be. This is the case with the above formula. While it is not perfect, it is more than just reasonably accurate. This formula provides a numerical succession of loyalty ratings. The imperfection lies in the rating of some of the viewing combinations. The imperfection is caused merely by an anomalous relationship among certain numbers. For example, a person who watches four newscasts on one station, three on a second and two on a third would receive a loyalty rating of 0.50. A person who watches four newscasts on one station, three on a second, two on a third, and one of a fourth would also receive a loyalty rating of 0.50. This mathematical anomaly is simply caused by the pairing of certain combinations of numbers. Of the 396 potential viewing combinations listed in Appendix A this occurred in less than 10% of the cases. In no situation did this problem occur in a loyalty rating over 0.67. A loyalty rating of 1 can be obtained by, among other combinations, watching one newscast on one station and none on any other station. Therefore, a loyalty rating of 0.67 is quite low. The fact that this mathematical problem occurs in less than 10% of the potential combinations and in no cases in which the loyalty rating even approaches 1 should suggest little cause for concern. As a safeguard in these circumstances, however, the researcher scaled down the loyalty rating to reflect the proper distribution. In these cases, both the original loyalty rating and the scaled loyalty rating are presented.
   The frequent and exclusive viewing of weekday evening newscasts was examined because these are the most often watched newscasts a station offers. In addition, it is in

these newscasts that "primary" or most popular news anchors work. Research has suggested that the primary news anchors (those who anchor the Monday through Friday evening newscasts) are the ones who are most responsible for developing and/or conveying a station's image. Because of this, this study focuses only on the professional attributes of the weekday evening news anchors.

FINDINGS

Of the 417 people who responded, 190 (45.6%) are male and 227 (54.4%) are female. A total of 383 (91.8%) are Caucasian (11 chose not to tell of their race). There are ten Native Americans, seven African Americans, five Asians, and one Hispanic respondent in the data set.

Only two people declined to respond to the age question. Of the remaining 415 who did, 79 (19.0 percent) fall into the 25-35 age range, 89 (21.4 percent) fall into the 36-45 range, 91 (21.9 percent) fall into the 46-55 range, 66 (15.9 percent) fall into the 56-65 range, and 90 (21.7 percent) fall into the over 65 age category .

A loyalty rating was calculated for each respondent. The loyalty rating value ranges from 0 to 10.00. A loyalty rating of less than 1.00 should not be considered very notable. A person needs only to watch one newscast per week on only one station in order to earn a loyalty rating of 1.00. There are, of course, other combinations that will produce a loyalty rating of 1.00. This is mentioned in an attempt to illustrate how inconsequential a loyalty rating below 1.00 may be. Unfortunately 103 (24.7%) of respondents have a loyalty rating below 1.00.

RQ 1: *How important is an anchor's perceived concern for the community to respondent's decision to watch a particular station for news?*

The vast majority of respondents said that an anchor's concern for the community was important to their decision to watch. Nearly 70 percent of all respondents said that an anchor's concern for the community was "very important" to their decision to watch. Conversely less than four percent said that an anchor's concern for the community is "not important" to their decision to watch. See table 1.1.

Table 1.1
**The Importance of An Anchor's Perceived Concern
for the Community to Respondent's Decision to Watch**

	Frequency	Percent
Not Important	16	3.8
Somewhat Important	110	26.4
Very Important	291	69.8
TOTALS	417	100

RQ 2: *Is there a significant relationship between the level of influence of the anchor's perceived concern for the community and the viewer loyalty rating of the respondents?*

Most respondents believe that the anchor's concern for the community is an important factor in their decision to watch. This left too many empty cells in the "not important" category. Because of this, the data were collapsed grouping "not important"

responses with "somewhat important" responses.

Upon collapsing the data chi square analysis was conducted. This time, a significant relationship was found between the two variables (concern for community and loyalty level). A significant relationship between the importance of an anchor's concern for the community and the levels of loyalty of respondents in all four quartiles (p = .006). The results here show that those with low loyalty levels are less likely to say that an anchor's concern for the community is important to them. At the same time it shows that people with Very High loyalty levels are less likely to say that an anchor's concern for the community is not important to them. It is important to note that this comparison examines the relationship between four categories of loyalty (Low, Moderate, High, and Very High). See table 1.2.

Table 1.2
The Relationship Between Importance of Concern for Community
and Viewer Loyalty Levels (4 Groups)

			Levels of Loyalty				
			Low	Mod.	High	Very High	Total
Importance of Concern	Not-to-Somewhat Important	Count	45	29	33	19	126
		% within CONCERN2	35.7%	23.0%	26.2%	15.1%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	43.7%	26.6%	27.7%	22.1%	30.2%
		% of Total	10.8%	7.0%	7.9%	4.6%	30.2%
		Adjusted Residual	3.4	-1.0	-.7	-1.8	
	Very Important	Count	58	80	86	67	291
		% within CONCERN2	19.9%	27.5%	29.6%	23.0%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	56.3%	73.4%	72.3%	77.9%	69.8%
		% of Total	13.9%	19.2%	20.6%	16.1%	69.8%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.4	1.0	.7	1.8	
Total		Count	103	109	119	86	417
		% within CONCERN2	24.7%	26.1%	28.5%	230.6%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	24.7%	26.1%	20.6%	20.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.581[a]	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	12.203	3	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.330	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	417		

[a] 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.99.

As Table 1.3 shows, comparing only Low loyalty viewers to Very High loyalty viewers reveals an more direct relationship (p = .002). Very High loyalty viewers are more likely to say that an anchor's concern for the community is important to their decision to watch. Low loyalty viewers are more likely to say that an anchor's concern for the community is less important to their decision to watch.

Table 1.3
The Relationship Between Importance of Concern for Community
and Viewer Loyalty Levels (2 Groups)

| | | | Levels of Loyalty | | |
			Low	Very High	Total
Importance of Concern	Not-to-Somewhat Important	Count	45	19	64
		% within CONCERN2	70.3%	29.7%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	43.7%	22.1%	33.9%
		% of Total	23.8%	10.1%	33.9%
		Adjusted Residual	3.1	-3.1	
	Very Important	Count	58	67	125
		% within CONCERN2	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	56.3%	77.9%	66.1%
		% of Total	30.7%	35.4%	66.1%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.4	3.1	
Total		Count	103	86	189
		% within CONCERN2	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within NTILES of LOYALTY	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.760[b]	1	.002		
Continuity Correction [a]	8.820	1	.003		
Likelihood Ratio	9.992	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.709	1	.002		
N of Valid Cases	189				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table
[b] 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.99.

Discussion

The relationship between respondent's level of loyalty and their thought that an anchor's concern for the community is important is worthy of further attention. The more loyal respondents are, the more important an anchor's concern for the community is to their decision to watch a particular newscast. More and more stations are trying to position themselves as being involved with and concerned for the community they serve. The recent collaborative effort between WBIR-TV (Knoxville, TN) and WLOS-TV (Asheville, NC) in raising money for the Great Smoky Mountains

supports this assumption. O'Malley (1999) says news "managers are insisting that their local celebrities spend time in the communities that revere them" (p. 40). It is therefore suggested that stations need to become even more cognizant of their anchor's perceived level of commitment to their community.

This study also has methodological implications. Until now there existed no clear way of quantifying viewer loyalty. While the equation presented in this project is not fool-proof, it is a viable option. At the very least it should serve as a jumping off point for future attempts of loyalty quantification. Having a way to calculate viewer loyalty can make future studies concerning reasons people watch television news that much more viable. Future studies that can more accurately identify reasons people watch television news can also determine if relationships exist between any new variables and viewer loyalty.

This study found that the anchor's concern for the community is linked to viewer loyalty. Future research should, therefore, expand on this finding. Future studies can delve more deeply into the issue of community concern. Research should attempt to find out what types of things lead viewers to think their anchors are concerned about the community. Research in this area could include examining both on-air and off-air activities.

Future research can also be conducted in an effort to strengthen our ability to quantify viewer loyalty. While previous studies suggest that the frequency and exclusivity of news viewing are major factors used in assessing loyalty, there may be others. The equation presented in this study seems to work, but there is also room for improvement. Future research may be able to devise a weighting system that more accurately represents the relationship between loyal viewing or other variables should there be others.

References

Brosius, H., Wober, M., & Weimann, G. (1992). The loyalty of television viewing: How consistent viewing behavior? Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 36(30): 321-335.

Cathcart, W.L. (1970). Viewer needs and desires in television newscasters. Journal of Broadcasting, 14(4): 55-62.

Ellis, S.L. (1992). Television news directors: An examination of the relationship among leadership style, effectiveness and specified variables. Doctoral Dissertation.

Engstrom, E., & Ferri, A. (1999). A career profile of local television news anchors in the us. Feedback, 40(2): 8-13.

Harmon, M.D. (1997). Television news anchor longevity, name recall, para-social interaction, and para-community orientation. Feedback, 38(2): 6-9.

Lin, C.A. (1992). Audience selectivity of local television newscasts. Journalism Quarterly, 69(2): 373-382.

Matusow, B. (1983). The evening stars: The making of the network news anchor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Meeske, M.D., Maunez-Caundra, J., & Shearer, R. (1992). A profile of television news anchors. Feedback, 33(3): 30-32.

O'Malley, S. (1999, April). News readers or news leaders? RTNDA Communicator, p. 38.

Rosenstein, A.W. & Grant, A.E. (1997). Reconceptualizing the role of habit: A new model of television audience activity. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 41(3): 324-344

ACCURACY IN LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS—REVISITED: ARE THINGS ANY DIFFERENT 25 YEARS LATER?

Mark D. Harmon, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
mdharmon@utk.edu

Steven McClung, Florida State University
steven.mcclung@comm.fsu.edu

Amy Varecka, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
vareck@earthlink.net

News organizations strive for accuracy both as an ethical imperative and as an economic reality. Error-prone news organizations may lose both credibility and audience. Surprisingly few research projects, however, have addressed local television news accuracy. This project addressed that deficiency. One previous work, Singletary and Lipsky (1977), provided guidance for this project. The current work can and should be considered an update of that good, but dated, 1976 research project on accuracy in local television news. The results should help identify problem areas for news directors. In turn, the results may help in the design of fact checking to reduce such factual errors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Television news has been in the spotlight recently for mistakes, jumping the gun, and other problems with accuracy. Source credibility always has been an issue with mass media, notably the credibility problems associated with yellow journalism. In an attempt to correct those problems, and re-gain credibility lost during the heyday of that trend, print organizations began to establish standards, professional organizations and journalism schools to help restore lost credibility. "Yellow journalism was only one tradition in the news industry. Other news outlets, both print and broadcast, later developed professional norms that committed journalists to providing independent information so as to serve the public interest," (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000).

Television, especially network television, has been criticized recently because of the problems associated with the 2000 presidential results. "Early in the evening-and long before Dan Rather reached cruising speed -he observed, 'The race for president is jar-lid tight.' But the networks blew it making an errant call, twice, for the state that determined the outcome of presidential election. Not only did ABC, CBS, NBC Fox and CNN give Florida to Gore, then withdraw it and later hand it to Bush, they also

called Florida before the polls closed in the Western Panhandle region of the state, the only section situated in the Central Time Zone" (McClellan, et.al, 2000).

When there are problems with accuracy, credibility suffers both among the general public and potential sources. There is usually plenty of blame tossed around for the mistakes. Some blame pollsters (Donath, 2001). Often, mistakes are quickly acknowledged, and apologized for near the end of newscasts or some other inconspicuous point in the show.

Part of the problem, both at the local and national level is the streamlining of news departments. Fewer people are asked to do more work. On the local level, many news operations have expanded the traditional six-o'clock news into the five-o'clock hour while failing to hire additional staff to assist with the larger workload. "As media mergers continue and Programming Departments and bottom-line business interests take over news operations, TV News has cut back on reporters, writers, videographers and technicians, and rely more on outside sources for news and videotape. In January of 2001, CBS, ABC, NBC and CNN all announced major staff reductions" (Whitaker, 2001).

No matter who is to blame or where the blame lies, network television news recently has suffered a loss of credibility at the same time the public is relying and praising local television news. "Local TV newscasts are now the public's number one source of news, according to a survey by Louis Harris for The Center for Media and Public Affairs. Not only do they get the biggest ratings, but people also rank them higher in quality and credibility than network news, local newspapers, or any other news source. That's scary" (Grossman, 1997). Despite Grossman's misgivings, three 1998 Roper polls found from 68 to 74 percent of respondents believe they can trust the accuracy of the news and information they get from local television news in their area (Howard W. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science Public Opinion Poll Question Database, 2001).

Local TV news tends to get fairly good ratings for accuracy in other public opinion polls. A Los Angeles Times telephone poll of 2,993 persons (Shaw, 1985) found, "On accuracy, 50 percent of the general public said their local television news program does a 'very good' job; 39 percent gave that rating to their newspaper and only 37 percent gave it to their network television news program." On the flip side, only 3 percent said their local TV news program does a bad job on accuracy, 4 percent said their network TV news program does badly on accuracy, and 7 percent said their newspaper does a bad job. A NewsLab survey (Potter and Mitchell, 2001) of 246 working TV journalists found substantial concern about accuracy. While 94 percent said it was important to review daily reporter scripts before they air, only 65 percent said that always occurs. Eight of ten said it was important to review anchor scripts, but only four in ten said that always happens. But is either the professional concern or the public trust justified?

This research examines accuracy in local television news, by re-visiting a 25 year-old study that originally looked at accuracy in local television news. The technique of sending stories to sources for accuracy comments is not new. Charnley (1936) did it with newspaper clippings. Berry (1967) and Brown (1965) borrowed from Charnley's technique to examine further newspaper accuracy. Singletary and Lipsky transcribed fifteen early- or late-evening newscasts in late July and early August of 1976. The transcriptions came from three stations, one in a top-25 market, two in markets

ranked 26 to 50. After eliminating national and international stories, as well as sports and weather blocks, the researchers were able to identify 112 sources to be surveyed about the accuracy of the story involving them.

Five surveys came back for insufficient or incorrect address and were not forwardable. Of the remaining 107 packets, 61 sources did complete and return the surveys. Thirty-nine of them (64.5 percent) said the story was entirely correct, 19 of them or 30.6 percent generally correct (implying one or more errors), and only three (4.9 percent) said the stories were largely incorrect.

Roughly two-thirds of the noted errors were "objective" in that they were demonstrably untrue. The remaining third were more of the "subjective" variety, complaints about misleading emphasis or inadequate clarity. The relatively high accuracy scores may be a function of a phenomenon noted in reporter-source relations studies. Cameron, Sallot, and Curtin (1997) summarized dozens of such studies. They observed that many sources are wary of the overall skills of reporters. However, a satisfying news experience with one reporter, while it may not cause a source to rethink his or her overall opinion of news or media or journalists, probably will cause that source to make a mental exception for that reporter or that story.

METHOD

This work used TV station web sites as a new tool for investigating accuracy in local TV news. The researchers identified and selected eleven station web sites. These sites at the time offered at least a week's worth of full-text newscast scripts. The stations also represent large, medium and small markets, and affiliations with all of the leading four television networks.

The stations used were: WTVF, Nashville, Tennessee; WDBJ, Roanoke, Virginia; KHON, Honolulu, Hawaii; KMEG, Sioux City, Iowa; WMDT, Salisbury, Maryland; WTVQ, Lexington, Kentucky; KVOA, Tucson, Arizona; WBRZ, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; WKBN, Youngstown, Ohio; WDTV, Bridgeport, West Virginia; and WLOS, Asheville, North Carolina.

The researchers noted all identifiable sources (paraphrased, quoted, or appearing in sound bites) within five weekdays of those news scripts, and then mailed each source the script in which he or she appears, a questionnaire about the accuracy of that script, and a postage-paid reply envelope. The researchers also used Internet search engines and reference tools to identify home or business addresses of the sources.

The questionnaire covered "objective" flaws (demonstrably untrue statements) such as the wrong time, day, or location given; spelling errors in a person's name, title, or location. The survey provided an opportunity for respondents to comment on more "subjective" errors such as misleading statements, improper emphasis, or a story too complicated for the time given. The objective/subjective error distinction was used by Berry, and supported by Ryan (1975) using factor analysis.

This project will address the research questions:

1.) *As reviewed by news sources, how common are [objectively defined] errors in local television newscasts?*

2.) *How often do news sources complain of more subjective errors in local TV newscast content, such as misleading statements, improper emphasis, or insufficient time or detail?*

3.) *What are the error rates across small, medium, and large markets?*
4.) *What do sources regard as the likely causes of the errors noted?*
5.) *What type of contact did the source have with reporters and/or producers?*
6.) *What are the sources media use habits?*

The questionnaire largely replicated the original Singletary/Lipsky questions, and added a few new ones related to the current set of research questions. This allowed both for new areas of inquiry and time-based comparisons to the original findings.

The data were entered into the statistical program SPSS for analysis of results. The results offered not only descriptive statistics on the types of errors noted but also correlations between the type and length of contact with reporters/producers (and source attitudes and characteristics) and the type/number of inaccuracies reported by that source.

RESULTS

A total of 214 questionnaires were sent out to 180 unduplicated names. In some communities it was impossible to determine which of two people with common names was the source. Nineteen surveys were returned for insufficient addresses or unknown addressees. Four people used the reply envelope to send back the material and to state we had reached the wrong person. In all, 50 useful questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 27.8 percent. Very few respondents noted serious accuracy problems in the stories quoting them.

1. *As reviewed by news sources, how common are [objectively defined] errors in local television newscasts?*

Question one was structured as a Likert scale and asked if the story was factually correct. Overwhelmingly, 98 percent (n=49) of the respondents reported that the stories were either entirely or generally correct. 68 percent reported the stories were entirely correct and 30 percent reported the stories to be generally correct. Only one respondent indicated the story was generally incorrect (see Table 1).

Table 1. Correctness of Story

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Entirely correct	34	68.0	68.0
Generally correct	15	30.0	30.0
Generally incorrect	1	2.0	2.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0

Respondents who reported the stories not to be entirely correct (32 percent of all surveyed) then were asked the number of errors noticed in the stories that were reported not entirely correct. The number of mistakes in these stories ranged from zero to five. Interestingly, 80 percent of those surveyed reported no actual mistakes in the stories. One mistake was reported by 10 percent (n=5) of the respondents, 4 percent reported two mistakes, 4 percent also reported four mistakes, and only 2 percent (n=1) reported five mistakes in a story.

2. *How often do news sources complain of more subjective errors in local TV newscast content, such as misleading statements, improper emphasis, or insufficient time or detail?*

This question deals with any area of the incorrect story that may have been misleading as opposed to being incorrect. Misleading, of course, is a more subjective judgment by the respondent. Again, participants were asked if the story was not entirely correct, what might have made the story misleading. Most respondents (82 percent, n= 41) said there was nothing in the story that was misleading, but those who did find fault gave a number of reasons. The most occurring theme here dealt with context. Respondents noted that "quotes were out of context," and "quotes seemed anti-prayer" (in a school prayer story). Other responses that led to misleading stories were confusing writing, wrong order of events, and "slant," an apparent reference to reporter bias.

3. *What are the error rates across small, medium, and large markets?*

Conventional thinking might lead one to believe that there would probably be a gap in the number of errors in TV reporting based on market size. After all, younger, less experienced reporters and producers are generally hired in smaller markets. As they become more experienced and seasoned professionals, they move up through markets where mistakes are tolerated less by news directors. Many respondents say that the stories were entirely correct across all three sizes of markets. In large markets respondents say stories are either entirely correct or generally correct. The only generally incorrect story was reported in a small market (see Table 2).

Table 2. Correctness and Market Size

		Market Size			
		Large	Medium	Small	Total
Correctness	Entirely correct	5	11	18	34
	Generally correct	5	3	7	15
	Generally incorrect			1	1
Total		10	14	26	50

4. *What do sources regard as the likely causes of the errors noted?*

The fourth area of inquiry sought to determine the cause of errors in the news stories. Again, only those who cited errors responded to this question. Most respondents didn't place blame for errors (76 percent, n=38), mainly because more reported no errors. Those who did report errors cited a number of reasons, including misunderstanding on behalf of the reporter, poor English skills. Frequently blame for error was put on "reporter bias" or sensationalism.

In an attempt to determine whether the story was "complete" all respondents were asked if the story included sufficient detail. Half of all respondents (50 percent, n=25) simply replied, "Yes." Only 10 percent (n=5) of the interviewees indicated "No." Most of the other respondents indicated the story was generally complete with some sort of qualifier such as, "Pretty good job," or "Great detail in interview."

5. *What type of contact did the source have with reporters and producers?*

The study also attempted to deal with the amount of contact the interviewee had

with a person from the station concerning the story, whether that person was the actual reporter or the producer who created the story. The question was asked, "Which ONE [out of five] best describes your contact with the producer or reporter who created the story. Overall, most interviewees were contacted by a reporter or a producer from the station (70 percent, n=35). Of those who didn't engage in any contact with a producer or reporter, 10 percent indicated they simply had no contact, 8 percent said there was no reason for contact, and 2 percent said they were unaware of any contact.

Table 3. Contact with Reporter or Producer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Contacted me	35	70.0	76.1	76.1
	Didn't contact me	5	10.0	10.9	87.0
	No need to contact me	4	8.0	8.7	95.7
	Unaware of contact	2	4.0	4.3	100.0
	Total	46	92.0	100.0	
Missing	(no answer)	4	8.0		
Total		50	100.0		

6. *What are the sources media use habits?*

The final three survey questions were designed to determine the media usage of the people who took part in the survey. When asked where the respondents tend to get most of their news, 36 percent (n=18) said newspaper was their first choice. Local TV news was a close second, followed by a huge falloff in the places where the respondents get news with cable TV, the Internet, network TV news, or magazines getting more than 4 percent of responses.

Participants then were asked how frequently they watched local TV news. The results indicate most of the respondents were frequent users of local TV news with nearly half (44 percent) indicating they watch local TV news daily. Nearly a third (30 percent) indicate they watch local TV news several times a week, and 14 percent said they watched local TV news several times a day (see Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency of Local TV News Use

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Daily	22	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Several times a week	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Several times a day	7	14.0	14.0	64.0
	Several times a month	3	6.0	6.0	70.0
	Only a few times a year	3	6.0	6.0	50.0
Total		50	100.0		

Participants were asked which one medium tends to be the most accurate. The results here tended to follow the results of use patterns with newspapers coming in first, followed by local TV news, and then a drop-off of sources clustered together with less than 10 percent of responses individually (see Table 5).

Table 5. Perceptions of Most Accurate Medium

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Newspapers	19	38.0	38.0
Local TV News	10	20.0	20.0
Radio News	5	10.0	10.0
Cable TV News	4	8.0	8.0
Magazines, news	4	8.0	8.0
Internet sites	2	4.0	4.0
Network TV News	2	4.0	4.0
No reply	4	8.0	8.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0

CONCLUSIONS

The on-air local TV news sources responding to this survey generally found the stories involving them to be accurate. Only a few respondents noted either objective errors or subjective flaws. The overall results neatly paralleled the Singletary/Lipsky findings from 25 years earlier, including the rough proportions of respondents for entirely correct, generally correct, and largely incorrect. The proportion of objective versus subjective errors also was similar to the respondent complaints in the Singletary/Lipsky study.

A few respondents vented traditional gripes about bias or sloppiness as the reasons for the errors. Market size did not appear to affect the number of reported errors.

The idea that "familiarity builds contentment" found in past analyses of reporter-source relations gained only partial support in this survey. Contact with the reporter or producer led to fewer accuracy complaints, but not at statistically significant levels. However, sources did tend to validate indirectly their own media choices. In other words, sources who reported getting most of their news from newspapers also called newspapers the most accurate. The same was true for radio, cable TV news, and the internet, but not quite as pronounced for local TV news. Seventeen of the 50 sources said they relied most on local TV news; seven of them said they also believed it is the most accurate medium for news, five said newspaper, two indicated cable TV, and one each for radio, network TV, and no answer. Local TV news also was found to be most accurate from two sources who said they relied most on cable TV news, and from one source who gave multiple answers to the question "From which ONE medium do you tend to get most of your news?"

One final methodological point should be made. Local TV news operations rapidly are going to slick (often subcontracted) websites that do not offer full scripts. Sadly, this report may be one of the last using this resource to examine local television news.

REFERENCES

Berry Jr., Fred C. (1967). A Study of Accuracy in Local News Stories of Three Dailies, Journalism Quarterly, 44, 482-90.

Brown, Charles H. (1965, February 13). Majority of Readers Give Papers an A for Accuracy. Editor and Publisher, 13.

Cameron, Glen T.; Sallot, Lynne M.; Curtin, Patricia A. (1997). Public Relations and the Production of News: A Critical Review and Theoretical Framework. In Brent R. Burleson (Series Ed.) Communication Yearbook: Vol. 20 (Ch. 4, pp. 111-155). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Charnley, Mitchell V. (1936) Preliminary Notes on a Study of Newspaper Accuracy, Journalism Quarterly, 13, 394-401.

Croteau, David and Hoynes, William (2000). How Business Strategy Shapes Media Content. Retrieved Sept., 2001 from WWW from the site: http://www.people.vcu.edu/~dcroteau/370%20Media/business_ch_5.htm

Donath, Bob. (2001, Jan. 1). Election lesson: Be precise in imprecision. Marketing News.

Grossman, Lawrence K. (1997). Why Local TV News Is So Awful. Retrieved July, 2001 from WWW from the site: http://www.cjr.org/year/97/6/grossman.asp

McClellan, S., Higgins, J., Trigoboff, D., McConell, B., Tedesco, R. (2000, November 13) It's Gore! It's Bush! It's a mess! Broadcasting & Cable, 47, 6-10.

Howard W. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science Public Opinion Poll Question Database (2001). http://www.irss.unc.edu/data_archive/pollsearch.html, accessed September 21, 2001, Roper Center at University of Connecticut Public Opinion Online ACCESSION NUMBERS: 0306225, 0304537, 0311996 (July 1998, July 1998, and Oct. 1998).

Ryan, Michael (1975). A Factor Analytic Study of Scientists' Responses to Errors. Journalism Quarterly, 52, 333-6.

Shaw, David. (1985, August 12). Papers get respondents' nod for job well done; TV listed as primary source for news. Los Angeles Times, (Home Edition, Sec. 1, Pt. 1) p. 9.

Singletary, Michael W., and Lipsky, Richard (1977). Accuracy in Local TV News. Journalism Quarterly, 54, 362-364.

Whitaker, Ron. (2000). The Decline of TV News Credibility. Retrieved June, 2001 from WWW from the site: http://www.cybercollege.com/tvnews.htm

WTVF and WLOS have apparently stopped archiving scripts.
   WTVF, Nashville, Tennessee – www.newschannel5.com.
   WLOS, Asheville, North Carolina – www.wlos.com

These stations still archive scripts as of 4/16/03:

WDBJ, Roanoke, Virginia – scholar.lib.vt.edu/VA-news/WDBJ-7/

KHON, Honolulu, Hawaii – www.khon.com/news.asp#Archive

KMEG, Sioux City, Iowa – www.kmeg.com/news.asp

WMDT, Salisbury, Md. – archive.wmdt.com/wmdt-news-links.htm

WTVQ, Lexington, Kentucky – www.wtvq.com/news/index/.shtml

KVOA, Tucson, Arizona – www.kvoa.com/news/transcripts/index.html

WBRZ, Baton Rouge Louisiana – pqasb.pqarchiver.com/theadvocate/search.html

WKBN, Youngstown, Ohio – www.wkbn.com/Global/link.asp?L=4308&nav=81A10X01

WDTV, Bridgeport, West Virginia, www.wdtv.com/news/archives/search.html

BEA STUDENT NEWS AWARDS

Dana Rosengard, University of Memphis
danar@memphis.edu

Year two of the Broadcast Education Association News Division's student news awards brought another round of excitement and anticipation to the national convention in Las Vegas. The Division competition also fed directly into the BEA Festival awards, naming two individual students from among all the news winners to take part in a grand presentation of impressive broadcast work by students and faculty from across the country.

"The Student News Division was one of the two largest competitions within the BEA Festival of Media Arts. At the convention, I heard nothing but praise for your awards session. Working as a part of the BEA Festival you are establishing some important precedents for the future," Festival Chairman Don Godfrey, a professor in the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Telecommunication at Arizona State University, said.

Categories of competition were increased for the 2002 student competition with awards now given for newscast, hard news reporting, feature news reporting and sports reporting. Also new this year, a judging evaluation sheet with ranking requests in seven areas: news value, creativity, technical quality/video, technical quality/audio, delivery, writing and overall quality.

Radio judges listened to 32 entries: four newscasts, five sports reports, 11 hard news stories and 12 feature news stories. Judging captain for the newscast category was Candace Holmstrom at the Canadian Broadcasting Company. Leading the judging efforts in the sports was Bob Priddy of Learfield Communications in Missouri. Judging captain for the hard news competition was Lisa Wolf at WTOP-Radio in Washington, D.C. Leading the judging duties for the feature reports was Steve Butler at KYW-Radio in Philadelphia.

With first, second and third place awards in each of the four categories, 12 awards winners were named during convention festivities at BEA 2003: The Next Generation, the 48th Convention and Exhibition, held at the Las Vegas Convention Center. Broadcast students from Arizona State University and the University of Montana captured eight of the awards with single winners representing Trinity University, Northwestern University, the University of Alabama and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

TABLE 1

2002 BEA News Division student news competition: Radio

Category	1st Place	2nd Place	3rd Place
NEWSCAST	University of Montana	Trinity University	University of Alabama
HARD news reporting	William Pitts Arizona State U.	Danielle Cross U. of Montana	Kegan Harsha U. of Montana
FEATURE news reporting	Josh Davis Arizona State U.	Josh Davis Arizona State U.	William Pitts Arizona State U.
SPORTS reporting	Sudhir Kumar UNC/Chapel Hill	Jessica Hamner U. of Montana	Matthew Pearl Northwestern U.

William Pitts' winning hard news story was a report on mock terrorism that judges called, "(high) energy that had me interested from the start," and "well-written with a good nat sound."

The winning feature news story from Josh Davis on American Idol tryouts in Phoenix was noted as "entertaining" and "fun" by judges.

Sudhir Kumar's winning sports reporting piece was on club football at Chapel Hill and won raves for "an opening soundbite that captures the spirit of the piece," and for offering an "entertaining look at a part of college sports where the joy of play has not been corrupted by the big sports dollar."

Television competition brought in 119 entries from 23 different colleges and universities. (Table 2) In a change from last year's competition, judging for the newscast competition was a 2-step process. Newscast entries were first sent to one of two preliminary judging teams, one led by assistant news director Greg Boyce at KOAA-TV, Colorado Springs-Pueblo, Colorado, the other led by news producer Korie

University of South Carolina Assistant Professor Tim Brown (at podium in background) announces William Pitts as the hard news radio reporting winner at BEA's national convention. William, from Arizona State University, accepts the award from University of Memphis Assistant Professor Dana Rosengard.

school	newscast entries	hard news reporting entries	feature news reporting entries	sports reporting entries	total
Arizona State U.	2	4	4	4	14
Bowling Green State University	-	-	1	-	1
Butler University	1	-	-	-	1
Colorado State U.	2	-	2	1	5
Northwestern U.	2	3	1	4	10
Pacific Lutheran U.	-	-	-	1	1
Sam Houston State University	1	-	-	-	1
Southern Illinois University	1	4	4	-	9
Syracuse University	-	1	2	-	3
Temple University	1	1	3	-	6
Texas Tech U.	2	-	-	-	2
Trinity University	1	1	-	-	2
U. of Alabama	1	2	-	1	4
U. of Central Alabama	1	-	-	-	1
U. of Illinois	1	-	-	-	1
U. of Kansas	-	-	5	-	5
U. of Maryland	2	9	12	3	26
U. of Miami	1	2	2	-	5
U. of Montana	-	1	3	-	4
UNC/Chapel Hill	2	4	6	3	15
U. of North Dakota	1	-	-	-	1
U. of North Texas	2	-	-	-	2
U. of Texas	1	-	-	-	1
Schools entered	18	11	12	7	23
Tapes entered	25	32	45	17	119

Eiles at WCHS-TV, Portland, Maine. The top three newscasts from each preliminary judging panel where then sent to the NBC News bureau in Washington, DC, where national correspondent Rosalind Jordan led the final judging process.

Judging captain for the hard news reporting competition was Danielle North, anchor/reporter at WPRI-TV in Providence, Rhode Island. Eileen Floyd, news director at KTVA-TV, Anchorage, took charge of the feature news reporting selection process and KUSA-TV sports anchor Tony Zarrella served as sports reporting judging captain from his mile-high desk in Denver.

Six schools from the entered 23 took away win, place and show awards this year. Among them, Colorado State University, took top honors in the newscast category after placing second last year, and Arizona State University captured two first place awards. The University of Maryland also took two first place certificates from the awards program in Las Vegas on April 5th. Other winning television reports came from students at Southern Illinois University, Northwestern University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

TABLE 3
2002 BEA News Division Student News Competition: Television

Category	1st place	2nd place	3rd place
NEWSCAST	Colorado State University	Southern Illinois University	Northwestern University
HARD news reporting	Katie Calautti U. of Maryland	Rishi Barran U. of Maryland	Regina Willis UNC/Chapel Hill
FEATURE news reporting	Holly Naylor Arizona State U.	Adam Atchison Colorado State U.	Alex Lawson UNC/Chapel Hill
SPORTS reporting	Dan Bubany Arizona State U.	Ricky Doyle Northwestern U.	Rishi Barran U. of Maryland

Team Zarrella called ASU Dan Bubany's "Young Gun QBs" creative and fun. Judges in Alaska described ASU Holly Naylor's winning feature, "Charlie VanDyke," about a former hard-partying voice-over professional turned man of the cloth, as a great feature idea with good use of music and a great ending. The Rhode Island judging crew chose Maryland Katie Calautti's "IMF Impact" as the best hard news reporting piece of the year for its pacing, stand-up and very professional overall feel and flavor.

Judges from the three panels viewing newscasts praised all six finalists (the other three finalists were from Arizona State University, University of Maryland and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) for strong graphics, solid weather presentations ("Better then some of what I've seen in smaller markets," raved one judge), interesting story selection and well-told stories. The network judges gave the edge to Colorado State University for its hard-hitting local lead, good tease and quantity of video.

A delegation of winning student journalists from Southern Illinois University gathers in celebration after being named 2nd place winners in the News Division student newscast award competition. That's SIU faculty member Ken Fischer, former News Division Chairman, hiding in the back row, second from right.

Tim Brown at USC/Columbia is once again coordinating the 2003 BEA News Division student radio news awards program while Rosengard will again handle the process for student television news entries. Competition categories will stay the same—newscast, hard news reporting, feature news reporting and sports reporting. Only one VHS copy of each entry is necessary with all entries on individual, clearly labeled tapes (slug, school, category).

Anchor leads and tags should be included with a completed application form available on the BEA Festival website. All entries must be received by December 12, 2003, in Columbia, SC (radio) or Memphis (television). Entry fees will once again be sent directly to BEA headquarters in Washington, DC. Complete details are available at www.beaweb.org/festival/student.html

Remember, you can't win if you don't play. Let the dubbing begin!

WHAT'S OLD IS NEW AGAIN: THE RISE OF 24-HOUR LOCAL NEWS CHANNELS

Adam Clayton Powell III
acpowell@usc.edu

Local 24-hour cable news channels are operating in two dozen cities in the U.S. and are gaining audiences and revenues, somewhat at the expense of the broadcasters who offer "appointment" local news. As these local news channels proliferate and prosper, some predict the marginal or lowest audience local news broadcasts will become economically unsustainable. This would repeat the growth pattern of all-news radio stations in commercial and then public radio over the past four decades, growth that all but eliminated once prevalent "appointment" local news on the vast majority of radio stations in cities across the U.S.

"The audience, the delivery and the economics are all changing", said Deborah Potter, Executive Director of NewsLab [for footnote purposes, all sources are listed alphabetically at the end] and those changes are all exerting powerful forces that are reshaping—some say squeezing—local television news.

Local 24-hour news channels are now available in markets large and small, from New York City's New York 1 and the Cablevision News Channel 12 services in Connecticut, New Jersey and Long Island serving the most populous local region to news channels in cities as small as Las Vegas, according to an annual survey by the National Cable Television Association [Cable Developments 2002, Volume 26, Number 1, published by NCTA]. Those who work at the 24-hour local channels and those in broadcast newsrooms who compete with them point to the local news channels as sources of solid coverage of breaking news, beat reporting and enterprise features. Advantages they have over broadcasters include 24-hour coverage and geographically focused coverage.

"The problem is that stations have a mandate to cover areas that are too big," said Paul Sagan, who stepped down as news director of WCBS-TV to start New York 1 in 1992. "The trend at regional news channels is to cover one city, one government."

These channels also exhibited a different relationship to the audience: for example, Robin Smythe, General Manager of Orlando's 24-hour news channel, said her newsroom served "customers," not "viewers."

Partnerships across media are also typical of local news channels, providing financial and journalistic resources from day one. In Chicago, New England and Florida, noted Greg Klein, who directs research for the National Cable Television Association, joint

newsrooms provide reporting for the daily newspaper, a local television station, the local 24-hour news channel and sometimes a local radio station as well, combining to provide far deeper coverage than a television newsroom alone.

These news channels are modeled after the all-news radio stations that spread through the U.S. in the 1960's and 1970's and are quite different from the 24-hour long-form information and public access channels, some modeled after C-SPAN, that have been started with partners including municipalities and government agencies. They are also different from the university-run channels, such as George Mason University's GMU-TV in Virginia, that provide community information along with classroom and other educational programming. By contrast, the 24-hour news channels are journalistic in their entirety, all news all the time, 24 hours a day.

From the start, the local 24-hour news channels were also deliberately differentiated from local broadcast news, focusing on neighborhoods and a newspaper-style "beat" system. This capitalized on their geographic focus and responded to the complaint by many, including television news directors, that local television news in larger cities covers such a large area that it was no longer truly local.

"Some cities are next to impossible to cover, "said Marty Haag, longtime news executive at WFAA-TV in Dallas, "because they are so large, so diverse, that news organizations have never wrestled with how to create a threshold of relevance for stories in one particular area and bring that to interest level of people in the general audience."

"It's so hard to do stories that people can react to," said Sagan, who noted local newscasts in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia are among cities where viewers might not have any tie to the governments being covered in their local news. Sagan said he could imagine viewers exclaiming, "'It's not even my state!" By contrast, Sagan termed the new channels "hyper-local" and therefore more focused on a core of viewers.

"One of the roles the hyper-local cable channels can fill is doing stories that are relevant," he added, noting each local news channel can focus on a particular government.

"In some of these large cities," said Haag, "news directors wrestle with the idea that people in Pasadena don't care what happened in Thousand Oaks, the people in the Bronx don't give a whit for what happened in Yonkers. How can we take a story that comes out of your neighborhood and say to the viewer this is something of trends and of pressures and of concerns of people all over this city? You have to get the news directors to say, 'Short of zoning, what is the threshold of relevance, get stories of interest that are of interest to the public at large?'"

One way to reach that threshold of relevance is to produce "zoned" newscasts or news segments for different communities in a station's coverage area, just as newspapers produce different zoned editions for different neighborhoods. Some of the stories seen in Pasadena or Thousand Oaks would be about Pasadena or Thousand Oaks. And some of those stories would be seen only in the community "zone" where they originate. And that, many noted, helped make hyper-local news more credible.

"What works best in local news is knowing the people - both the players and the citizens," said Kojo Nnamdi, who has been a local news anchor on Washington, D.C., public television and radio stations for over three decades. "By which I mean, all too often, local leaders are characterized more by their official positions than by who they

are. If the news agency editor or reporter knows the people, they can be three-dimensional, they can be real. And people are interested in real people."

"The second thing," he continued, "is knowing places and what places mean to people. When people read about real places, that means something. Whenever you have issues presented that way it means something to them."

But it was the superior local journalism at the 24-hour local news channels that was cited repeatedly by journalists who work for them—and by journalists who compete with them—at broadcast stations. Also praised was their predictability, almost news on demand, as opposed to the "appointment viewing" schedule of broadcast station newscasts at 5, 6, 10 and 11.

"It's very straightforward, very local," said Potter. "It looks like the old radio news wheel. What's old is new again."

Measured by reporters on the street every day, the local news channels were all staffed to be competitive: Steve Paulus, Senior Vice President and General Manager of New York 1, said he has a staff of 160. In Orlando, there are 100 people at the 24-hour local news channel, according to Robin A. Smythe, General Manager of Central Florida News, and that number seemed typical even in smaller cities.

These large news channel staffs were deliberately deployed as efficiently as possible, using innovative automation to minimize production crews. Paulus recalled a 30-person production crew was required for the one-hour six o'clock news broadcast that he produced at WCBS-TV. By contrast, he said, New York 1 only uses as few as three people in the control room and another three in the newsroom, all producing a multi-hour block of local news. That meant he could hire more street reporters, a total of 28, to cover the city of New York. With a staff that large, Paulus said he could field a beat system more elaborate than New York's all-news WINS or WCBS radio stations, including six reporters devoted full-time to covering city politics.

Sagan, who started the beat system at New York 1, said his model was not broadcast news: he termed his assignment structure "newspaper beats," with reporters assigned full-time to such specialties as local governments, education, and critical for New Yorkers, subways and buses.

Sagan said he also never hired reporters who were new to New York City, and he required reporters to live where they worked, if it was a geographic beat. The New York 1 reporter covering the borough, or county, of Staten Island covered it much better, he said, because the reporter lived there. And those resident reporters can connect with their neighbors. This, in turn, led to a very different style for New York 1.

"You're covering news," said Sagan. "You're not doing promos or sweeps or ratings. You're doing it very straight."

"Since it's 24 hours a day, you have to do a lot of reporting, because you have so much time to fill," said Stephen C. Miller, former news manager at CBS News and WUSA-TV in Washington, who now covers technology for The New York Times. "You can do some of the smaller stories that would be passed over, so you can do the little feature about the bodega on the corner where everyone seems to love the guy and hang out. And that's an interesting story about who he is and who's in the neighborhood."

Jonathan Knopf, News Director and General Manager of News 12 New Jersey, said his channel has an I-team that was the equal of any broadcaster in the area. Reporters are allowed to spend two months developing each investigative story that will run in

seven-minute packages. The New Jersey channel plays the reports over 24 hours and also makes them available on demand.

From the start, New York 1 also relied on heavy repetition of weather, traffic and other features, including its highly promoted "weather on the ones," weather forecasts at :01, :11, :21 and so on, around the clock. Borrowed from New York's all-news WINS radio, that has broadcast weather and traffic at ten-minute intervals "on the ones" for decades, New York 1's "clock" has been copied by local news channels around the country.

"Weather on the ones was a slam dunk for us," said Smythe, who observed that even sunny central Florida has enough weather news to attract repeat viewers to her station. Some news channels have a spinoff weather channel, a separate cable channel devoted to the time, temperature, forecast and sometimes a live weather radar image.

NewsChannel 8, the local 24-hour cable news channel serving the Washington, D.C. area, has a different strategy than most of its local news counterparts around the country. Operating from the same newsroom as co-owned WJLA-TV, NewsChannel 8 alternates newscasts targeting the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia, with each "zoned" newscast delivered only to cable viewers in the geographical area covered by that particular newscast.

"It goes back to the start of NewsChannel 8, when it only covered Virginia," said anchor Nathan Roberts. As cable distribution expanded to D.C. and Maryland discrete newscasts were added to cover those new viewers.

All microlocal channels must operate within strict budgets and one almost universal technique of addressing economic pressures is a practice that has become widespread at the local 24-hour news channels (as well as in broadcast newsrooms in smaller cities): single-person coverage, with one person handling both the reporting and photography. Replacing a two- or three-person field crew with one journalist has certainly been economically attractive, but Deborah Potter expressed misgivings about single-person coverage saying she was not persuaded these changes might reduce the quality of the channels' journalism.

"I'm not convinced you get good journalism," Potter said. "There's no question it can be done. But does it make a qualitative difference"?

Paulus said his calculation was a simple one: use single-person coverage to field 28 reporters at New York 1, or deploy two-person crews and cut the total to 15 reporters, changing the coverage, programming and even the very nature of the news channel.

And economics are critical: Time Warner, Hearst and other operators of the 24-hour local news channels are not producing these news services as philanthropic exercises. While a few channels are still losing money—Knopf said News 12 New Jersey had yet to turn a profit—many were moneymakers. Smythe said the Orlando channel went into positive cash flow after 20 months and was in the black two years ahead of schedule. Paulus said New York 1 has been profitable for years, so much so that it is now the template for nationwide expansion.

"Time Warner is committed to launching news channels in all parts of the country," Paulus said, noting recent and imminent launches in San Antonio, Houston, and three in New York State; Albany, Rochester and Syracuse.

These "zoned" 24-hour local news channels make business sense, "if you look at the dual revenue stream," according to Sagan. One revenue stream is from commercials,

said Sagan, just as broadcast channels receive commercial revenue. However, Paulus, Smythe and others who run microlocal news channels said they do not receive their fair share of advertising sales, both because of the audience ratings services' failure to measure small audiences correctly and because advertising agencies have not realized the true value of either the size of the microlocal news audience or the value of having commercial messages surrounded by community-oriented news and information services. Smythe said her channel reached more viewers than any broadcast station in Orlando—and more people than read the daily Orlando Sentinel— but advertisers were still slow to accept the local news channel's audience.

But in addition to commercial revenue, noted Sagan, the local news channels can also benefit from per-household fees charged by cable companies. Just as your local cable company pays CNN, ESPN, Nickelodeon and other popular national cable networks a monthly fee to televise them locally, microlocal 24-hour channels can generate carriage revenue from local cable operators. New York 1 reached 2.2 million subscribers by early 2003, according to Paulus, with 170,000 more scheduled to come on line in the Hudson Valley north of New York City. The channel was also scheduled to expand to Albany, New York—that is in addition to the separate all-Albany local news channel Time Warner will start. New York 1 has been available on the Internet for years, at http://www.ny1.com/, along with a video archive that now totals over 15,000 clips. And Paulus said he would be delighted if New York 1 went national on cable and satellite to offer expatriate New Yorkers news from home. Expanding the channel's reach can add new per-subscriber revenue at minimal cost, he noted.

And when a local cable company launched a microlocal news channel, Sagan said the motivation was often at least in part a desire to avoid paying someone else those per-household fees. Sagan pointed to Time Warner's New York 1, which covers New York City and is ringed by Cablevision's News 12 channels covering New Jersey, Long Island, Westchester and Connecticut. Time Warner not only charges Cablevision to carry the New York 1 channel—and some Cablevision systems feel it is essential programming—but also could have faced making payments to Cablevision if Cablevision had moved its local news channel into New York City.

They are also an effective defense against "overbuilds"—new cable companies that are competing for viewers in some cities, such as RCN, that compete with Time Warner for cable subscribers in New York City.

"If you have Time Warner Cable you will have New York 1. If you have RCN you will not have New York 1," is how Paulus summarized Time Warner's pitch to wavering subscribers:

Sagan said 24-hour local news channels are "differentiated programming" that can defend the entire cable television industry because no one else can provide these services, at least not yet. In particular, according to Sagan, the microlocal news channels represented effective defensive programming against DirecTV and other satellite operators, that do not have channel capacity to distribute local news channels.

Two news channels recently ceased operation in Los Angeles and San Francisco: Klein and Sagan also noted the recent failure of the 24-hour local news channel serving Orange County, California, could be traced at least in part to its unique lack of partners. The channel was started by a local newspaper, the Orange County Register, with neither a cable nor broadcast news partner. In the end, the stand-alone channel

could not survive financially, and early in 2003, the parent company that owns the Register was put up for sale.

Bay TV, the local public affairs channel serving San Francisco, ceased operation for a similar reason. Bay TV had been operated by KRON-TV, then the NBC affiliate, and KRON's co-owned daily, the San Francisco Chronicle. But after the Chronicle company sold KRON to Young Broadcasting, the new owners lost the NBC affiliation and KRON became a money-losing station, according to industry financial analysts. Soon after taking over KRON, the new owners pulled the plug on Bay TV.

But these were exceptions to the trend: head to head against broadcast newscasts, the 24-hour local channels have scored striking gains. Paulus said New York 1 had a larger audience in the morning than the broadcast news on the local CBS station, and it was making inroads at other times of the day.

"We are the wave of the future," he said, predicting some local broadcast channels in New York and in smaller markets will drop their local newscasts, as they continue to lose viewers and revenue to the all-news channels. Paulus' prediction was echoed in the fears of medium- and small-market broadcast journalists interviewed, who were looking over their shoulders as the new competition began attracting news viewers and advertising dollars from their stations. One reaction: More discussions of outsourced newscasts, where the UPN, WB or Fox station closes its newsroom and broadcasts a newscast produced across town by the ABC, CBS or NBC affiliate. But those are still following the "appointment viewing" schedule, when television audiences are drifting more into radio- and Internet-style "on demand" viewing.

Those strategies also could not counter a strength of the new channels: breaking news. Paulus and Smythe said breaking news was attracting more and more viewers to their channel, and Knopf was planning a new news channel devoted entirely to breaking news.

September 11th was one of the biggest breaking stories in the history of New York City, and New York 1's audience soared. But Paulus provided a more routine example: At eight o'clock on a Sunday night, during NBC's popular commercial-free broadcast of the movie "Schindler's List," a man tried to take over the observation deck of the Empire State Building. Unable to interrupt the network movie, WNBC-TV ran a "crawl" about the story across the bottom of the screen. According to Paulus, that crawl prompted thousands of viewers to switch channels from NBC to New York 1, that grabbed the audience by offering extended live coverage. Even if local news channels are not the first to break in with a bulletin, most have firm rules to stay with a breaking until long after every broadcast channel has returned to regular programming.

"Events hammer at broadcasters," explained Smythe. "We make money on breaking news. Broadcasters don't." Smythe added that broadcasters trying to compete by breaking into entertainment programs with live news coverage, lose both money from commercials that are bumped and alienate viewers who want to watch the regular programs.

Managers of local news channels said their current services were just a beginning: Paulus said New York 1's news coverage and programs were being used to launch new microlocal news channels and Internet-delivered news services. The first spinoff, he said, was a channel for taxi cabs, a joint service with Fox News Channel providing national news.

"We're perfectly positioned to repurpose video," said Paulus, noting the new automated subsidiary channels and websites cost little or nothing to start, so they are highly profitable.

Knopf said he was repurposing News 12 coverage to create five new local news channels to serve cable subscribers who have new digital set-top boxes. In addition to the basic News 12 New Jersey channel, the digital service includes an all-weather channel, a channel devoted to nothing but breaking news, a channel for long-form investigative and health features, an on-demand channel serving a looped video tour of New Jersey, and an on-demand channel with clips from the News 12 archive.

That also positions the local news channels to market their video news services to customers with broadband Internet service, a growing market. And as other technologies gain favor, from news on video cell phones to neighborhood-level and even apartment-house newscasts, the 24-hour local news channels will be there to help serve the market and extend their local news franchises.

Sources (partial list but includes all who are quoted)

Robert Aglow Executive Producer, News, MSNBC, One Microsoft Way Redmond, Washington 98052, interviewed in Los Angeles, March 6, 2003.

Walter R. Bender, Executive Director and Senior Research Scientist, M.I.T. Media Laboratory, interviewed at his office, 20 Ames Street, Room E15-208, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307, on February 24, 2003.

Christy Carpenter, member of the board, Community Television of Southern California (KCET-TV), 4401 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90027, interviewed in Los Angeles, January 23, 2003.

Susan Clampitt, General Manager and Executive Director, WAMU Radio, interviewed at her office in the American University Brandywine Building, Washington, D.C. 20016-8082, on January 29, 2003

Barbara Cochran, President, Radio Television News Directors Association, interviewed at her office, 1600 K Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20006-2838, March 21, 2003.

Steven Cohen, Diverse Talent Group, interviewed at his office, 1875 Century Park East, Suite 2250, Los Angeles, California 90067

Stephanie A. Crockett, News Producer, Black Entertainment Television, 2000 M Street NW, Suite 602 Washington, D.C. 20036, interviewed at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, on February 7, 2003.

Jack Driscoll, Editor-in-Residence, News in the Future Consortium, M.I.T. Media Laboratory, interviewed at his office, Room E15-020F, Massachusetts Institute of Technology 20 Ames Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307, on February 24, 2003.

Edward M. Fouhy, Executive Director and Editor, Pew Center on the States and Stateline.org, at his office, 1101 30th Street NW, Suite 301 Washington, D.C. 20007, on February 4, 2003.

Jack Fox, Managing Editor, Positive News Network, 13455 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 230, Sherman Oaks, California 91423, interviewed in Los Angeles on February 12, 2003.

Marty Haag, Broadcast Executive in Residence, Southern Methodist University, interviewed by telephone, March 19, 2003.

Al Jerome, President and General Manager, KCET Television, interviewed at his office, 4401 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90027, February 10, 2003.

Greg Klein, Director of Research, National Cable Television Association, interviewed at his office, 1724 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. 20036-1969, on February 21, 2003.

Jonathan C. Knopf, News Director and General Manager, News 12 New Jersey, 450 Raritan Center Parkway, Edison, New Jersey 08837, remarks and subsequent interview at the Radio-Television News Directors Association convention, Las Vegas, April 9, 2003.

Bill Kovach, Chairman, Committee of Concerned Journalists, interviewed at his office, 1900 M Street NW, Suite 210, Washington, DC 20036, on January 29, 2003.

John Marvel, vice president and executive editor, ESPN.com, remarks at the University of Florida, February 7, 2003.

Paul McMasters, First Amendment Ombudsman, The Freedom Forum, interviewed at his office, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, 22nd floor Arlington, Virginia 22209, on January 27, 2003.

Karen Menichelli, Deputy Director, Benton Foundation, interviewed at her office, 1625 K Street NW, 11th floor Washington, D. C. 20006, on February 3, 2003.

Kathy Merritt, Director, Public Media Strategies, Station Resource Group, 6935 Laurel Avenue, Suite 202, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912, interviewed in Washington, D.C., January 29, 2003.

John Miller, News Director of KTVT-TV, 10111 N. Central Expressway, Dallas, Texas 75231, remarks at the Radio-Television News Directors Association convention, Las Vegas, April 9, 2003.

Stephen C. Miller, Assistant to the Technology Editor, The New York Times, 229 West 43rd Street, New York, New York 10036, interviewed by telephone on February 20, 2003.

Anthony Moor, New Media Editor, Democrat and Chronicle, 55 Exchange Boulevard, Rochester, New York 14614-2001, remarks at and subsequent interview at the University of Florida, February 6-7, 2003.

Ulrich Neumann, Director, Integrated Media Systems Center, interviewed at his office at the University of Southern California, January 24 and March 5, 2003.

Kojo Nnamdi, host, "Evening Exchange" and "The DC Politics Hour," both on WHUT-TV and "The Kojo Nnamdi Show" on NPR and WAMU Radio, interviewed at WAMU Radio, American University Brandywine Building, Washington, D.C. 20016-8082, on March 18, 2003.

Steve Paulus, Senior Vice President and General Manager, New York One, 75 Ninth Avenue New York, New York 10011, remarks at the Radio-Television News Directors Association convention, Las Vegas, April 9, 2003.

Deborah Potter, Executive Director, NewsLab, interviewed at her office, 1900 M Street NW, Suite 210 Washington, D.C. 20036, February 4, 2003.

Mitchel Resnick LEGO Papert Associate Professor of Learning Research, M.I.T. Media Laboratory, interviewed at his office, Room E15-020AA, 20 Ames Street, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307, on February 24, 2003.

Nathan Roberts, anchor/reporter, News Channel 8, 1000 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, interviewed in Washington, February 21, 2003.

Pail Sagan, President, Akamai Technologies, Inc., interviewed at his office, 8 Cambridge Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142, on February 24, 2003.

Richard Sambrook, Director, BBC News, interviewed at his office, British Broadcasting Corporation Television Centre Room 5601, Stage 6, Wood Lane, London W12 7RJ, England, on January 7, 2003.

Alexander Sawchuk, Deputy Director, Integrated Media Systems Center, interviewed at his office at the University of Southern California, February 12, 2003.

Jan Schaffer Executive Director, Institute for Interactive Journalism, 7100 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 101 College Park, MD 20740-3637, interviewed by telephone January 28, 2003, and at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, February 7, 2003.

Robin A. Smythe, General Manager, Central Florida News, 1364 East Concord Street, Orlando, Florida 32801, remarks at the Radio-Television News Directors Association convention, Las Vegas, April 9, 2003.

Mark Thalhimer, Project Director, News in the Next Century, Radio Television News Directors Foundation, interviewed at his office, 1600 K Street NW, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20006-2838, on March 21, 2003.

Val Zavala, Vice President, News and Public Affairs, KCET Television, interviewed at her office, 4401 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90027, February 10, 2003.

GUEST SPEAKERS IN BROADCAST NEWS AND OTHER JOURNALISM COURSES: MAXIMIZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROFESSIONAL-STUDENT CONTACT

Don Heider, University of Texas at Austin
donheider@mail.utexas.edu

Using guest speakers from the professional world in courses can be successful, but often achieves less than the desired goal educationally. If you've taught for long, you may know this scenario: the guest speaker arrives and you speak briefly before class. After an introduction designed to help students' appreciate why this person has credibility, the guest takes their place at the front of the classroom. They begin with great enthusiasm. They tell one story, then another. Students carefully listen to each word, but as you listen, it's hard to discern what message is being sent. What exactly was the point of that last story? After eight or ten minutes the speaker is slowing down, apparently running out of ammunition. With no notes and no exact purpose, the presentation rambles. After filling twelve minutes of the fifty-minute class period, the speaker stops. "Questions?" they ask hopefully. If you are lucky, the class fills in the blanks with inquiries most often centered on how one might go about securing a job in the speaker's industry. The result often is thoroughly unsuccessful.

   Therein lies the problem or question for this article: Can professors use guest speakers in classes to meet educational goals? I will be addressing experience I have gained while teaching broadcast journalism courses, but the lessons can apply to any discipline that has professional practitioners.

Archetypes

Using participant observation as a method for gathering information, after watching dozens of these guest speakers in classroom settings, certain archetypes emerged. These archetypes are not meant to be either exhaustive or mutually exclusive, but will serve as guideposts of larger problems that often occur in classroom settings.

The Angry Burnout

Certain professionals, when placed in front of a class, see the occasion as a perfect opportunity to express their discontent with their own professional lives. They tell students about low salaries, poor benefit packages, long hours, having to work weekends and holidays, and being called out in the middle of the night.

   The Angry Burnout also often talks about ferocious office politics including details

about bad management, favoritism, pettiness, unfair decisions, and who got ahead by sleeping around. The students are often shocked and keenly interested in these kinds of lurid details, and after the fact have many specific questions about how workplaces operate. What's often left out of the guest speaker's perspective is that inter-office politics are not the exclusive domain of any one profession. One can find difficult and at times intolerable working conditions in almost any line of work.

The Angry Burnout often spends so much time complaining about their work and their life that little time is left to teach students anything about their craft.

They also are effective at telling stories from the field. Narrative can be a powerful form by which to deliver information or to illustrate a point. But there must be substance behind the story. The Angry Burnout often has no bottom-line message, just a collection of favorite anecdotes, designed primarily to entertain and impress and convince listeners of the authenticity of the teller's experience, or what Clifford Geertz called, evidence of "being there."

The stories may continue, one after another, till students are lost in a long-winded jumble of interesting and personal memories, never made more useful to them by the war-horse because of the failure to take the story beyond it's immediate context.

The Meteor

The Meteor is the guest speaker who begins with great enthusiasm. In certain instances, in fact, they have actually contacted the school or professor and asked to come speak to students. Once in front of the class they are self-assured and brassy. They often look good, are well coifed and sport the latest in professional wardrobe. There are often one or two important messages they have brought along for students to hear. Often among those are; "do an internship—get real-world experience," or "learn how to write well while you're still in school." Both are messages that are often music to an instructor's ears, though the guest speaker may not be aware of the large emphasis already placed on writing and the fact that many programs require internships.

After delivering their one or perhaps two important messages, there is a transformation; the Meteor begins to lose confidence as they realize they have quickly said most everything they came to say. After all, professionals are taught to be concise and to-the-point. As they glance at the clock or their watch and do the mental math they suddenly realize they have another thirty eight minutes to fill, not an easy task for even the person with extensive experience with television news chit-chat and cross-talk.

The Meteor crashes into the academic atmosphere and burns a radiant orange. But the show is short-lived; it burns out quickly, suddenly and violently plummeting toward the earth. It can be a painful experience for the speaker, the class and the instructor.

The Insider

The Insider is the wily, experienced professional who lives, eats sleeps and breathes their job. Their dress is pedestrian, complimented with slightly unkempt hair and scuffed, sensible shoes. They often haven't been in school in quite some time and most likely have a hard time remembering what it was like when they were a student.

They come prepared with insights and tips and facts and figures but there's still a problem. Their vocabulary is so riddled with jargon and inside information, to

students just starting out, their message is often unintelligible. One newspaper editor came to class armed with the latest national research sponsored by an association of newspaper editors. She spent the first forty-five minutes reciting book, chapter and verse of the study. As a researcher, I found it fascinating. My students, on the other hand, were completely bored, even those who were headed toward journalism careers. Finally, toward the end of the period, I interrupted from the back of the room. What, I asked, do you think all theis means for students headed toward careers in newspapers or other media? The speaker had no idea. The insider comes and talks about their world, their job, their views, often without fully considering who they are speaking to or what level of knowledge the audience might have.

Managing Guest Speakers

After enduring these archetypes in various forms and fashion in my own classroom, I decided to attempt to develop strategies for using guest speakers more effectively. Rather than giving up entirely on inviting speakers into my classes, I knew there must be a way to make the experience more productive for both the speakers and the students.

Speakers as Curriculum

The first step came in developing a stable of speakers who came in and did a wonderful job of communicating. Despite the above archetypes, there are professionals who can come into a classroom and engage, entertain and inform. But even with these speakers, it's crucial to discover what their strengths are and build those strengths into a curriculum. This involves two steps. First, through listening to professionals and quizzing them about their interests and expertise, you determine what their strengths are. Some are better lecturing about developing story ideas, others excel when talking about ethics, still others have developed special techniques in investigative or on-line journalism that they can teach effectively to students. The key, no matter their field, is to find where their passion and expertise lies. The second step comes in building these speakers and their strengths into the course curriculum.

Keeping Speakers on Message

It falls upon the instructor to prepare the speaker as best he can for the class ahead. When I schedule a speaker, we talk first about a specific topic the speaker is likely to cover. This makes it clear from the outset that the class will not be a free-for-all. I make it clear that I need the speaker's help to cover a particular topic, and between us, we decide what that topic should be.

 I then ask the speaker to provide me, several weeks in advance, an outline of exactly what will be covered. This is a not-so-subtle way of sending a message that there should be an outline. Few professionals give a presentation without an outline. No broadcast journalist does a story for an evening newscast without first writing a script, so I am merely asking for the same kind of preparation for the class presentation. Although some speakers are surprised by the request, most comply. If, as the date approaches, I have not received the outline, I e-mail the professional, with another request for the outline. Once I have received the outline, I review it and may make suggestions for what additional points might be covered. When a speaker arrives with

an outline in hand, my experience has been the presentation is most likely to be closer to the topic we discussed in advance and with more substance.

If a speaker strays or begins telling endless war stories, I then employ another strategy, using questions to try to guide the speaker back on track. These questions, sometimes called task-oriented questions, are designed to bring a person or group back to a primary task, or in this case, the topic for the class period.

Play to Their Strengths
Over the years I've found that some courses lend themselves to guest speakers more than others. For instance, in large lecture classes, guest speakers can be a very effective tool for helping break the pattern of hearing one person lecture over and over again. But in smaller, skills courses I've found guest speakers less effective. These are often classes where lectures are not the primary method of teaching. Thus it may be most appropriate to utilize guest speakers in different and creative ways. What follows are three suggestions.

Brainstorming
In skills classes where a news product in produced, it is not uncommon to have a weekly or daily news meeting as part of the course. This is the where the students, with guidance and help from the instructor, discuss story ideas. I've found this to be an ideal place to ask a professional to come and participate. In news organizations these meetings take place every day, so it's a setting where most professionals immediately feel comfortable. In this setting they can help students as they think about what it is that constitutes a news story, where they can find sources, what video might help illustrate the story and so on. No matter what you teach, getting professionals involved in brainstorming with students can be effective.

Production
Professionals also have quite a bit to offer in labs where news product is produced. I have invited visiting professionals into these labs to sit side-by side with students as they write and edit stories, as they put together news program rundowns, and generally be present, offering advice during the bedlam of putting product together to air.

It may seem students could get this kind of instruction from professionals during internships, but I have found that's not always the case. Having a pro visit your lab takes on a much different tenor than that of a student being in a local professional setting during the same process. First, the professional is on the student's turf, so there is a fundamental power difference. The students are in charge, the professional is the advisor, rather than in a newsroom or business where the student is an intern who may or not be brought into the key decision-making moments. But during the student lab the professional, rather than being under deadline pressure and often not able to explain the process they are in the middle of, are now available and open to questions. Professionals who might not be gifted in speaking before a group may be excellent when teaching one-on-one during the production process.

Critiquing
The final way I've employed professionals in classroom settings is to invite a group of

professionals, often with varied job descriptions—producers, reporters, anchors, videographers, managers—to class and ask them to critique student work on an individual basis. We will set up a room or several rooms with different television viewing stations and students sit down, one at a time, with the professional and show some of their work. The journalist then critiques that work, whether it is a news package, some anchoring or a photo essay.

To look at a piece of work and critique it is something that takes place very frequently in newsrooms—mangers critique employees' work, colleagues critique each others' work, and most professionals examine their own work to see what they might improve upon. I've seen professionals who did not do well in front of a class do exceptionally well in these individual critique sessions.

There are multiple benefits to the students. They get an abundance of feedback on their work, much of it may reinforce feedback they have already received from an instructor. But they also get a variety of opinions. Quality is a very subjective standard, so hearing from different voices with different perspectives gives students quite a bit to think about. It also gives students the opportunity to practice something they may experience in job interviews; reviewing their work with a perspective employer.

Conclusion
The Pauley Report and The Winds of Change emphasized the importance of putting people with professional experience and students together in journalism education, but value can be gained from this idea in any of a wide variety of fields. As discussed early in this piece, simply inviting professionals to speak in classes may not always be the best way to encourage interaction between professionals and students. Because of some of the patterns identified by the archetypes – educators at times must find more creative and innovative ways of helping professionals share their expertise. This article has sought to identify some of the pitfalls and to suggest some strategies for successfully making professionals a part of the curriculum. Through some planning and managing in advance, an instructor may be able to convert archetypes such as the Angry Burnout, the Meteor, and the Insider into more effective classroom guests.

BEA Related News from Across the Country

Division News

BEA Communication Technology Division Leadership for 2003-2004

CHAIR
Tom McHardy
James Madison University
MSC 4010
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
Office: 540-568-2547
mchardtj@jmu.edu

VICE CHAIR – PAPER
COMPETITION CHAIR
Melissa Lee Price
Staffordshire University
PO Box 660
College Road
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 2XN
United Kingdom
Office: 01782294565
m.l.price@staffs.ac.uk

BEA FESTIVAL – STUDENT
INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA
COMPETITION CHAIR
Andy Lapham
London College of Music & Media
Grove House, 1 The Grove
Ealing, London W5 5DX
United Kingdom
Office: +44 (0) 20 8231 2262
andy.lapham@tvu.ac.uk/dim

BEA FESTIVAL – STUDENT
INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA
COMPETITION VICE-CHAIR
Position vacant

BEA FESTIVAL – FACULTY
INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA
COMPETITION CHAIR
Tim Clukey
Plattsburg - State University of New York
Yokum Hall 136E
101 Broad Street
Plattsburg, NY 12901-2681
Office: 518-564-4290
clukeytj@plattsburg.edu

BEA FESTIVAL – FACULTY
INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA
COMPETITION VICE-CHAIR
Howard Goldbaum
University of Nevada - Reno
Mail Stop 310
Reno, Nevada 89557-0040
Office: 775-784-6531
goldbaum@unr.edu

Webmanager
Carla Gesell-Streeter
Cincinnati State Technical and
Community College
Division of Humanities
3520 Central Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45223-2690
Office: 513-569-5740
carla.gesellstreeter@cincinnatistate.edu

LIST SERVE MANAGER FOR LIFE
Tom Streeter
University of Cincinnati
Electronic Media Division/CCM
Mailstop 0003
Cincinnati, OH 45221
tom.streeter@uc.edu

To the members of District 1 and all of BEA, my heartfelt thanks. It was a wonderful four years working with you, the officers and the other Board members, and I really appreciate the support for the projects and ideas I tried to put forward. My congratulations to Margot Hardenburg who will be taking over the District seat. Everyone give her a warm welcome, and a helping hand. Godspeed!

Mary Alice Molgard
Communications Department
College of Saint Rose
molgardm@mail.strose.edu

State Association News

WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin Broadcasters Association is proud to have a very active and innovative Educational Committee. With their help, in 2002, the WBA and the WBA Foundation:

- Awarded $15,494 in educational support grants to assist non-profit college and technical school broadcast education programs in acquiring equipment, hardware, software, and/or other teaching materials that are necessary to conduct broadcast education programs and promote careers in broadcasting.
- Continued our mentorship program "WBA's Broadcast Partnerships For The Future", which, in the past four years, has resulted in close to 150 mentor/mentee pairings between broadcasters and broadcast students from around the state. In 2003, 50 such pairings were developed.
- Awarded $6,000 in scholarship monies to students who are interested in pursuing a career in the field of broadcasting.
- Sponsored a day-long Student Seminar at UW-Madison, which was attended by a record-breaking 95 students, as well as WBA member general managers, sales managers, program and news directors who served as panelists.
- Offered students and broadcast educators a significantly reduce fee to attend any WBA Program/Conference. The schedule for 2003 was/is:
    - January, 2003 - Winter Conference (includes Programmers & Sales Workshops)
    - April 9 & 10, 2003 - Sales Workshops
    - April 12, 2003 - News Reporters Workshop
    - April 26, 2003 - Student Seminar
    - June 18 & 19, 2003 - Summer Conference (includes Sales Workshops)
    - July/August, 2003 - Sports Workshop
    - October 29, 2003 - Copywriter's Workshop

Michelle Lukens, CAE
Vice President, Wisconsin Broadcasters Assn
mlukens@wi-broadcasters.org

OKLAHOMA

1) We were instrumental in the formation of the OBEA Chapter in Oklahoma and maintain a very close relationship with them, as their President is an ex-officio member of our board.

2) Each year at our convention we host a Student Day Program for around 175 students and faculty. This is an all-day program featuring panelists and professionals in discussion groups. The presentation of the awards program is a part of the agenda. At the noon luncheon we award our scholarships, faculty grant and have a featured speaker. This year NAB President Eddie Fritts was the speaker and Newslab's Deborah Potter was a part of their program. There is no cost to the students.

3) We award 6-$1,000 scholarships and a $2,000 Faculty Fellowships each year.

4) Our seminars and workshops are open to the students who wish to attend for a minimal fee.

5) We have served as a resource for students, the universities and assisted some faculty in arranging contacts for work on their masters.

6) Last year we started a two-week on-campus radio and television program for 20 high school juniors and seniors at the University of Central Oklahoma. The students live on campus, Monday thru Friday and attend classes throughout the day.

7) This summer 4 of the outstanding students from the last year's Institute will serve a one-week internship at one radio and three television stations.

8) This office also provides office assistance to the OBEA.

9) Our Foundation funds the scholarships and fellowship grant. In addition, we establish each year a $1,000 student assistance fund to aid students who may have a financial emergency. (Car trouble, transportation, baby sitting, books, etc.) The maximum provided is $250 and must be a formal request from a professor.

NEVADA

Bob Fisher, President and CEO of the Nevada Broadcasters Association is willing to work with schools, students and faculty in Nevada. Contact Bob at rdfnba@aol.com

INDIANA

The Indiana Broadcasters Association will award five $500 scholarships to high school seniors who have been accepted to a University and are planning to major in radio/TV/film and seven $2,000 scholarships to current University students majoring in radio/TV/film. The IBA also just finished hosting several regional sales seminars,

several held on college campuses. IBA's Spring Job Fair was successful with 40 companies represented and just over 360 potential applicants attending. IBA info can be obtained at indba@aol.com

Related Association's News

WASHINGTON—The Radio and Television News Directors Foundation has announced the 2003 recipients of its Educator in the Newsroom fellowships. The program places university-level broadcast educators in radio and television newsrooms for four weeks during the summer to refresh their skills, master new technologies, and develop contacts and partnerships with news managers to improve classroom curricula. Those chosen to participate this summer are:

- ◆ Bob Allison, University of King's College, Halifax, Nova Scotia
- ◆ Philip J. Auter, University of Louisiana at Lafayette
- ◆ George Bagley, University of Central Florida, Orlando
- ◆ Andrew E. Barton, University of Miami, Coral Gables
- ◆ Tommy G. Booras, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX
- ◆ Joseph L. Bridges, Malone College, Canton, OH
- ◆ Otilio Gonzalez, University of Puerto Rico, Arecibo
- ◆ Mary Arnold Hemlinger, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD
- ◆ Michael "Jaye" Jackson, Langston University, Langston, OK
- ◆ Catherine C. Krein, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY
- ◆ Jeremy Harris Lipschultz, University of Nebraska, Omaha
- ◆ Rosa E. Morales, Michigan State University, East Lansing
- ◆ John Morris, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville
- ◆ Mark Nordstrom, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, MO
- ◆ Dana Rosengard, University of Memphis
- ◆ Tony Silvia, University of Rhode Island, Kingston

Now in its fourth year, the Educator in the Newsroom project is funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

http://beaweb.org/festival/2003winners.html

February 12, 2003—The BEA Festival of Film, Video and Media Arts Committee is pleased to announce winners in the 2003 competition. The Festival had more than 400 entries overall and the success of this first year has been remarkable. All entries were reviewed by a panel of professional judges and the entries have been pared down to the winners announced here. The Festival Awards Ceremony and Screening will take place on Saturday, April 5th in the Las Vegas Convention Center as part of the annual convention of the Broadcast Education Association. On that night, the best of the best from among this list of winners will receive their "Best of Festival" awards. We hope to see you there. Thanks to Avid for sponsoring the event. We also thank Robb Weller and Gary Grossman, our M.C.s for the event. Congratulations to all the winners!

2003 BEA Festival of Film, Video & Media Arts
Competition Winners

Faculty Audio Competition
David E. Reese, John Carroll University, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Terry Likes, Western Kentucky University, "Media Coverage of 9-11: Responsible or Unreliable?"
AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Sam Lovato, University of Southern Colorado "XMAS Party!"
Best of Competition Awards
STATION IMAGE PROMO: Don Connelly, Western Carolina University "The Met"
LONG-FORM PRODUCTION: Gordon C. Webb, Ithaca College "Steal Away: A Slave's Journey on the Underground Railroad"
RADIO DOCUMENTARY: Stephen Adams, Cameron University "Can't Buy Me Love: The 1966 Radio Station Boycott of the Beatles"

Student Audio Competition
Maryjo Adams Cochran, Sam Houston State University, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Mike Santos, Colorado State University "9/11 Remembrance"
BEST SPORTSCAST
  1ST PLACE: Brian Skowron, University of North Texas
  2ND PLACE: Chris Dittmer & Travis Huntington, Colorado State University
BEST SPORTSCASTER
  1ST PLACE: Travis Huntington, Colorado State University
BEST PLAY BY PLAY
  1ST PLACE: Jarrod Shadrick, U Alabama
NEWSCASTER
  1ST PLACE: Joel Neden, Seymour College / SUNY Brockport

2ND PLACE: Jillian Oppegard, Colorado State University

3RD PLACE: Joshua Bryant, SUNY Brockport

SPECIALITY PROGRAM

1ST PLACE: Erin Michelle Oesterle, Azusa Pacific University " Erin's Rental Review: Resident Evil"

2ND PLACE: Megan Flanagan, Jack Crumley, Deb Snyder & Kat Brown, Bowling Green State "Haunted Tales Show IV"

3RD PLACE: Adam Schlosser, Bowling Green "The Bedtime Stories Christmas Special"

DJ 1ST PLACE: William W. Wolfe, aka "Wolfe Kincaid", U. of Alabama "Lee & Wolfe"

2ND PLACE: Peter Fryer, Colorado State University "Moses"

3RD PLACE: William Chandler, Western Carolina University

PSA/COMMERCIAL

1ST PLACE: William Candler, Western Carolina University "Systems Shut Down"

2ND PLACE: Timothy Johnson, Northwestern College "97.7 - The New WVOE"

2ND PLACE: Erin Michelle Oesterle, Azusa Pacific University "General Manager PSA"

COMEDY/DRAMA

1ST PLACE: Mike Santos, Colorado State University "9/11 Remembrance"

2ND PLACE: Christian King, Julie Field, Steve Moenter & Sidney Lawrence, Bowling Green State University "The Joke's on Us"

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

1ST PLACE: Sharon Gaudrea, Colorado State University "Pagan Student Alliance"

2ND PLACE: Adam Schlosser, Nic Seuberling, Doria Gestand, Bowling Green State "Bedtime Stories Show #3"

Faculty Interactive Multimedia Competition
Tim Clukey, Plattsburgh State University, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Paul Parsons, Elon University, "Elon School of Communications Web Site"

INFORM/EDUCATE (ONLINE)

BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Paul Parsons, Elon University, "Elon School of Communications Web Site"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Rich Beckman, University of North Carolina, "A Living Stage"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Jerry Henderson and Songqing Sun, Central Michigan University, "Broadcast and Cinematic Arts Website"

INFORM / EDUCATE (FIXED MEDIA):

BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Anthony Friedmann, Mount Ida College, "Writing for Visual Media"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Edward Lee Lamoureux, Bradley University, "Introduction to Communication: Allyn and Bacon Video Workshop CD-ROM"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Fred Wyman, Ferris State University "He Who Dreamed A College"

INSTRUCT / TRAIN (ONLINE):
  BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Melissa Lee Price, Staffordshire University, "Technological Innovations"
PERSUADE / SELL (FIXED MEDIA):
  BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Howard Goldbaum, Bradley University, "Tri-County Trails for the Future"
  AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Jonathan Adams, Florida State University, "Interactive and New Communication Technology Program (INCT)"

Student Interactive Multimedia Competition
Dietrich Maune, James Madison University, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Laura Buckham, Bournemouth University, "Acute Lymphoblastic Leukaemia- A Parents Guide"
INFORM /EDUCATE-FIXED MEDIA
  1ST PLACE: Laura Buckham, Bournemouth University, "Acute Lymphoblastic Leukaemia- A Parents Guide"
  2ND PLACE: Laura Cremeens, Arkansas State University, "Introduction to Communications"
  3RD PLACE: Vikki Collins, Staffordshire University, "Tropical Rainforest"
INFORM /EDUCATE-ONLINE MEDIA
  1ST PLACE: Chris Steele, Staffordshire University, "The Earth and Beyond"
  2ND PLACE: Valerie Aguirre, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "Flags of South America"
  3RD PLACE: Jason Garber, Jeff Goelz, Bryan Graves, Stephanie Guy, James Madison University, "iSMAD"
ENTERTAIN
  1ST PLACE: Lorna Dargavel, Staffordshire University, "The Adventures of Yasim and Jack at the Dentist"
  2ND PLACE: Kristian Klamar, Staffordshire University, "Anglo Saxon Crime and Punishment"
  3RD PLACE: Jason Garber, James Madison University, "Murphy's Kids"
  HONORABLE MENTION: Jenalee Peterson, Brigham Young University- Idaho, "Rixida: Back to the Elements"
PERSUADE/SELL
  1ST PLACE: Richard Everett, Bradley University, "Digital Portfolio"
  2ND PLACE: Tim Plumb, Staffordshire University, "A Year Out"
  3RD PLACE: Vikki Collins, Nick Crossland, and Tim Plumb, Staffordshire University "Monitored"
INSTRUCT/TRAIN
  1ST PLACE: Nick Child, Staffordshire University, "Electric Circuits"
  2ND PLACE: Nick Crossland, Staffordshire University, "Alien Language"
  3RD PLACE: Anthony Abbott, Staffordshire University, "The Aztecs"

Faculty News Competition
C.A. Tuggle, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Television Chair
Bill Davie, University of Louisiana, Radio Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Bob Jacobs, Bradley University "A Boy and His Dog"
TV NEWS/FEATURE
   BEST OF COMPETITION: Bob Jacobs, Bradley University "Wind and Fire - A Ride to Remember"
   AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Ray Ekness, University of Montana "Deer Lodge Wheelwright"
TV NEWS/HARD
   BEST OF COMPETITION: Tony DeMars, Sam Houston State University "Hannibal Drowning"
RADIO NEWS/HARD
   AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Pam Doyle, University of Alabama

Student News Competition
Dana Rosengard, University of Memphis, Television Competition Chair
Tim Brown, University of South Carolina, Radio Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER - TELEVISION: Katie Calautti, UMTV/University of Maryland "IMF Impact"
BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER - RADIO: Josh Davis, Arizona State University "American Idol"
In alphabetical order by institution, student winners in radio come from:
   Arizona State University
   Northwestern University
   University of Montana
   University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
In alphabetical order by institution, student winners in television come from:
   Arizona State University
   Colorado State University
   Northwestern University
   University of Maryland
   University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Judging continues in some categories and exact award placements will be announced at our News Division student awards session in Las Vegas.

Faculty Scriptwriting Competition
Fred Thorne, Cal State-Chico, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Kevin Corbett, Central Michigan University "Monkey Boy"
   1ST PLACE: Kevin Corbett, Central Michigan University "Monkey Boy "
   2ND PLACE: Frederick Jones, Southeast Missouri State University "The Governor's Wife"
   3RD PLACE: Emily D. Edwards, University of North Carolina, Greensboro "The Root Doctor"

Awards of Excellence:
Frederick Jones, Southeast Missouri State University "The Governor's Wife"
Emily D. Edwards, University of North Carolina, Greensboro "The Root Doctor"
Robert M. Prisco, John Carroll University "Get Together"
Jon Stahl, California State University, Northridge "Fast Lane"
William Deering, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point "Christmas Connections"
Glenda C. Williams , University of Alabama "Lonley Hearts Club"

Student Scriptwriting Competition
Glenda C. Williams, The University of Alabama, Competition Chair

Best of Festival Winner: Mickey Adolph, California State University, Chico "Richard's Doll"

Feature Film 1st Place: Thomas Jon Hanada, Stanford University "Old Soldiers"
2nd Place: Stephanie Wiseman, Washington State University "Just a Woman"

Short Film 1st Place: Mickey Adolph, California State University, Chico "Richard's Doll"
2nd Place: Sydney Daniels, California State University, Northridge "Death Bed"
3rd Place: Brad Bear, Ohio University "The Caro-Kann Defense"

Television Series 1st Place: Mary Sue Woodbury, San Francisco State University "The Manliest Man" (Frasier)
2nd Place: Trysta Bissett, Ohio University "Takes Two to Tango" (Sex & the City)
3rd Place: Eric Alan Sera, Peter Aranda, Joel R. Franklin, Purdue University, Calumet "RoBart Wars" (The Simpsons)

Small & 2-Year Colleges Competition
Christie Kelley, York College, Competition Chair

Best of Festival Winner: Steven C. Trauger, York College of Pennsylvania "The Final Step"

Video Production 1st Place: Steven C. Trauger, York College of Pennsylvania, PA. "The Final Step"

Audio Production 1st Place: Paige Gibson, Grossmont Community College "Dinner"

Honorable Mention: Ruth Castillo-Eggett, Grossmont Community College, CA "The New iMac"

Faculty Video Competition
Gary Wade, Drake University, Competition Co-Chair
Kevin Burke, University of Cincinnati, Competition Co-Chair

Best of Festival Winner: Rebecca Abbott, Quinnipiac University "HERBERT III"
Educational/Instructional
Best of the Competition: John M. Woody & John Hodges, James Madison University "Foundation 2002-Building a Better Virginia"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Kevin Hager, Wichita State University "Ready to Respond"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Hamid Khani, San Francisco State University "Recycling News"

PROMOTIONAL

BEST OF THE COMPETITION: John M. Woody, James Madison University "Army Surgeon General Video: Army Medical Logistics"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Michael Trinklein, Idaho State University "Grace Lutheran School"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Hamid Khani, San Francisco State University "Circle of Love"

MIXED BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Babak Sarrafan, San Jose State University "The Donnas"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Mara Alper, Ithaca College "To Erzulie"

DOCUMENTARY

BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Dale Carpenter, University of Arkansas "The Forgotten Expedition"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Jan Thompson, Southern Illinois University "Hidden Korea"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Jay Rosenstein, The University of Illinois "The Amasong Chorus"

NARRATIVE BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Andrew Quicke, Regent University "Byline"

COMMERCIAL

BEST OF THE COMPETITION: Scott Hodgson, Southern Illinois University "Digital TV: New Arrival"

AWARD OF EXCELLENCE: Mark Krein, Oklahoma State University "Reality Primer"

Student Video Competition

Bill Bolduc, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Competition Chair

BEST OF FESTIVAL WINNER: Jason Mergott, James Madison University "Shadows of the Shenandoah"

PSA/PROMOTIONAL 1ST PLACE: Katy Boggio, California State @ Los Angeles "BS-1000"

2ND PLACE: Hilla Medalia & Kate Bleeker, Southern Illinois University "Tantastic - A Better Way"

3RD PLACE: Patrick Duff, Asbury College "One Ichthus"

HONORABLE MENTIONS: Christian Sorge, University of Maryland "Election 2002"

Ryan Smith, Cincinnati State

DOCUMENTARY

1ST PLACE: Jason Mergott, James Madison University "Shadows of the Shenandoah"

2ND PLACE: Mi-jung Youm, University of North Texas "Two Fingers: Michael's Struggle"

3RD PLACE: Leon De La Rosa & Jaime Cano, University of Texas at El Paso "And the Wheels Turned...the 1966 NCAA Basketball Championship"

HONORABLE MENTIONS:

Alex Farnsley, San Diego State University "Shadow Children-Five Stories from the Street"

Oscar Arana, University of Oregon "Rich in Different Ways" Darren Henson, Staffordshire University "24/7"

MIXED

1ST PLACE: "Made in Montana" crew, Univ. of Montana "Business: Made in Montana" Faculty Sponsor, Denise Dowling

2ND PLACE: Stephanie M. Kun, Ohio University Jukebox - Guest episode Faculty Sponsor, Frederick Lewis

3RD PLACE: Kate Turnipseed, University of Alabama "Speck" Faculty Sponsor: Tom & Joyce Cherones

HONORABLE MENTIONS:

Ryan Notch, Elon University "Timescape Sydney"

Gayathree Achu & David Iacch, Southern Illinois University "Studio A Presents:Ep. #507 - Carter & Connelly"

NARRATIVE

1ST PLACE: Ben Moore, Staffordshire University "Cabin Fever" Faculty Sponsor, John Holden

2ND PLACE: Azhur Saleem, Staffordshire University "Limbo" Faculty Sponsor, John Holden

3RD PLACE: John Hull, Southwest Missouri State University "Held Captive" Faculty Sponsor, Mark M. Biggs

HONORABLE MENTIONS: Brad Bear, Ohio University "Next Time"; Robert E. Kreipke, Wayne State University "Nocturnal Evolution"

GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR 2003-2004

Alan B. Albarran, BEA President
albarran@unt.edu

I'm honored to have the opportunity to serve as BEA President. We have a hard-working Board of Directors along with a dedicated Executive Director and her Administrative Assistant who are all committed to strengthening and further developing the BEA. In this article, I'd like to outline my goals and expectations for BEA for the next year.

Improving BEA's Financial Position—BEA@50. BEA must continue to control costs and develop additional revenue streams to ensure our financial stability. At the same time, we must build our permanent asset base, which is why we are announcing a three-year capital campaign among the membership to raise at least $100,000 to our endowment. This campaign actually began as a silent phase in November 2002, and as of mid-April has received pledges of approximately $26,000. You will hear more about BEA@50 via email news blasts and in Feedback. I hope each member of BEA will please consider making a gift to BEA over the next three years to ensure the long-term future of BEA.

Strategic Alliances. BEA needs to consider and expand potential alliances with other professional and non-profit associations to provide additional benefits and services to our members. I've asked Dr. Joe Misiewicz, BEA Board Secretary-Treasurer, to Chair this important committee and provide a preliminary report to the Board at our October meeting.

Council of Professionals. The Council of Professionals is being reactivated under the leadership of two of our industry Board members, VP for Industry Relations Gary Corbitt, and Steve Cohen. The goal is to recruit 6-8 media professionals to join a new council to provide support to the BEA Board in the areas of training and cooperation between academe and industry, fund raising, and helping develop convention panels and programs.

BEA Journals. The Board of Directors, working closely with the Publications Committee, is considering the possibility of outsourcing the production, distribution and marketing of the Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, and the Journal of Radio Studies. The Publications Committee began work on this issue over the past year under former Publications Committee Chair Lynne Gross, and will now be led by new Chair Alan Rubin. BEA will only consider outsourcing our journals if BEA retains ownership and editorial control of our content, and it is a financially viable option. You will be hearing more about this effort in the coming months.

BEA Elections. Our election process to elect new members to the BEA Board is somewhat antiquated and cumbersome. I've asked District V Board Rep Dave Byland to chair a Task Force to look at our election procedures and processes, and see if there

are some recommendations that can be made to streamline the process and reduce costs. We won't be able to make changes in time for fall 2003 elections, but should be able to consider ideas from the Task Force beginning in 2004.

As you can see, this is an ambitious set of goals for the next year. BEA will continue to focus organizing a terrific convention and festival, awarding scholarships, and other important committees (e.g., diversity, broadcast research initiative). Your feedback and ideas on these goals and expectations are welcome, and I look forward to working with each of you to ensure a stronger BEA.

Corporate Contributors

Platinum Leadership Level
National Association of Broadcasters
Norman and Mary Pattiz Foundation

Bronze Level
Patrick Communications LLC
Radio Computing Services, Inc.
The Hubbard Foundation

Individual Contributors

Benefactor Level
Don Godfrey
Louisa A. Nielsen

Patron Level
Jannette L. Dates
Norm Medoff
Suzanne Rautiola-Williams

For information on becoming an Individual or Corporate Contributor of BEA, please contact Louisa Nielsen, Executive Director, 202-429-5355, lnielsen@nab.org

Feedback
Broadcast Education Association
World Headquarters
1771 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA

http://www.beaweb.org

THANK YOU to the following individuals and companies for their support in *"Educating Tomorrow's Electronic Media Professionals"*

BROADCAST EDUCATION BEA ASSOCIATION