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INVESTIGATING THE INFLUENCE OF U.S. TELEVISION ABROAD: THE CASE OF ADOLESCENTS IN MOROCCO

ABSTRACT

This paper set out to understand the influence of imported U.S. television on Moroccan adolescents. A survey of Moroccan adolescents was undertaken during 2002. The results of this paper support the notion that the reception and impact of imported television programs are not isolated phenomena. They are better understood by examining the components of a viewer’s schema. In this paper, preexisting affinity of local viewers, parental influence, and attitudes toward the imported TV programs were found to propel the viewers’ consumption of imported television programs.

When television made its debut in developing countries, it began relying on imported programming content. This foreign TV content came primarily from developed countries. In the 1960s and 1970s, the United States was the main exporter of TV programs (Nordenstreng & Varis, 1973). The presence of foreign TV programs in domestic television schedules progressively raised concerns on the part of policy makers and international observers. These concerns became louder as television grew in popularity.

When critics of imported TV discuss its influence, they overwhelmingly do so under the rubric of cultural imperialism (CI) (Schiller, 1969, 1991). According to its proponents, CI is “a verifiable process of social influence by which a nation imposes on other countries its set of beliefs, values, knowledge, and behavioral norms as well as its overall style of life” (Beltran, 1978, p. 184).

Critics of imported TV programs use the term CI to label both the process of influence and the outcome that is assumed to result from such a process. When it comes to foreign TV influence, the CI model is straightforward: exposure to imported TV programs will result in strong and homogenous effects on local viewers.
Over the years, a competing perspective about the influence of imported TV has emerged. This perspective takes into account a viewer’s ability to select from among television programs. As early as the 1960s, Browne (1967) pointed out the individual differences among viewers to explain the many factors that hinder foreign TV from having a homogenous impact on domestic audiences. This notion is also supported by Salwen (1991) who maintains that: “At the very least, factors inherent within cultures... account for different responses to foreign media messages” (p. 36). This alternative perspective has been recently summarized by Elasmar (2003) in his Susceptibility to Imported Media model (SIM). The SIM model contends that the effects of imported TV programs are a function of a complex process and will depend upon pre-existing antecedents among audience members.

Having both theoretical perspectives in mind, this paper sets out to understand whether U.S. TV programs have an influence on Moroccan adolescents and if so, which of the two perspectives can better explain any influence detected.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Strong and Homogenous Effects Perspective:

The flow and exchange processes of cultural products among world nations have given rise to an impassioned debate on how these artifacts move around the world and impact their consumers (Paterson, 2001). The theory of cultural imperialism has taken the lead in this debate while its conceptual underpinnings remain rooted in the theories of political economy and structuralism (Roach, 1997). Media-centered cultural imperialism theory was put forth by a number of researchers in the 1960s and 1970s (Beltran, 1978; Schiller, 1969; Mattelart, 1977). The historical context of the era, fraught with ideological strife, helped in the promulgation of its claims (Roach, 1997). Cultural imperialism underscored the close-knit relationship between the worldwide scale of the U.S. economic expansion and the exportation of American mass culture and other media products (Roach, 1997). The underlying assumption was that “theeconomic structures of capitalism were complemented by communications structures and cultural industries” (Roach, 1997, p.48).

Varis’ study (1993) of the international flow of television in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s compiled evidence for the case of media imperialism. The study observed the process was imbalanced (Varis, 1993). Countries from the south were reduced to the role of “passive recipients of information disseminated by a few other countries”(Varis, 1993, p.33). Among the exporting countries, central focus is put on the U.S. for what is characterized as its attempt to impose its “super culture” on the world (Boulding, 1968). For MacAnany (1986), accusing the U.S. of cultural imperialism is the logical corollary of its status as a dominant economic center. Critics point at the expansion of transnational corporations into the world which they believed signaled a move from the economic domain to the cultural domain via their exportation of entertainment, news and information on a massive and unprecedented scale (Schiller, 1969; Mattelart, 1977; MacAnany, 1986).

The process of influence offered by CI contends that the mere presence of foreign programs in domestic TV schedules will necessarily result in strong (intense and homogenous) effects on local television viewers. Figure 1 illustrates the process of influence of foreign TV on local viewers as it is implicit in the CI literature.
The Moderated Effects Perspective:
An alternative perspective to CI has emerged over the years. Among those who did not readily accept the de facto influence implicit in the CI argument is Browne (1967) who, as early as the 1960s, took into account the individual differences among viewers to explain the many factors that hinder foreign TV from having a homogenous impact on domestic audiences. He stated that:

Experience should have already taught us that there is no universal visual language, any more than there is universal spoken or written language... [which means that] if one picture is indeed worth a thousand words, those words will not mean the same thing to everyone (p. 206).

Browne’s perspective is echoed by Salwen (1991) who maintains that foreign TV cannot be seen as a direct cause for the loss of individuals’ indigenous cultures. “At the very least, factors inherent within cultures... account for different responses to foreign media messages” (p. 36).

There is plenty of evidence to support the contention that the process of influence of foreign TV is much more complex than CI advocates believe. After a thorough review of the scholarly writing about this topic, Lee (1980) concluded that “research on the likely influences of alien television programs on the decline of traditional cultures and arts is inconclusive” (p. 103). Hur (1982) concluded that “exposure to American television and film content by local populations has few cognitive and attitudinal effects, much less behavioral effects” (p. 546). A few years later, Tracey (1985) asserted that “we have barely begun to scratch the surface of understanding the function and consequence of TV as an international cultural process” (p. 50). Yaple and Korzenni (1989) concluded that media effects across national cultural groups are detectable but relatively small in magnitude, and that ... the environment, cultural situation, and context affect selectivity and the interpretation of content (p. 313).

Katz and Liebes (1986) study of Dallas further challenged the assumption of strong influence put forth by CI advocates. In their study of Dallas in Israel, they observed that the Israeli audience (coming from diverse ethnic backgrounds) had different interpretations of the same episodes of Dallas. They concluded that in their different readings of the Dallas text, viewers utilize a web of social relations to make sense of the program (Katz and Liebes, 1986).

There is yet another obstacle that prevents imported TV from achieving the influence that CI advocates believe imported programs possess: preference. Straubhaar’s (1991) study of television in the Dominican Republic detected this factor. Local audiences seem to prefer local to foreign media programming since it provides that feeling of cultural proximity (Straubhaar, 1991, p.54). Sinclair et al (1996) also drew the same conclusion:
Although U.S. programs might lead the world in their transportability across cultural boundaries, and even manage to dominate schedules on some channels in particular countries, they are rarely the most popular programs where viewers have a reasonable menu of locally produced material to choose from (p.10).

In the Arab world, for example, Aljazeera, a Qatar based news channel, has successfully competed with CNN and the BBC. Local media organizations seem to benefit from the dynamic of domestic audience preference (Chadha and Kavoori, 2000).

Summing up this moderated effects perspective, Elasmar (2003) presents an integrated model of influence for foreign TV. He labels this model: Susceptibility to Imported Media (SIM). The SIM model is reproduced in Figure 2.

According to Elasmar (2003), the components of a viewer’s schema can be divided into two types: antecedents related to the source, and antecedents related to the content. Demographics, knowledge about country of origin, beliefs about country of origin, values related to country of origin and content, perceived utility of content and involvement in content, as a set, predict attitudes toward country of origin and toward content. In turn, the attitude toward country of origin A and attitude toward content depicted in imported TV program will predict exposure to imported program from country of origin A. The model hypothesizes that all antecedents are at times additive and at times multiplicative. All antecedents and interrelationships among them define the viewer’s pre-existing schema. The pre-existing schema will determine how the content will be processed and, subsequently, the type of effect that the exposure to such content will produce (Elasmar, 2003).

Figure 2
The model of Susceptibility to Imported Media (SIM)
Source: Elasmar, 2003b
In sum, whether following the CI or the SIM perspectives, the potential for influence from exposure to imported TV seems to exist. For this paper, the focus is on the influence of U.S. television exposure on adolescents in Morocco.

Research Questions

Based on the SIM model, specific antecedents will drive viewers to seek imported TV from specific countries. Accordingly, this paper asks:

RQ1: Will parental opinions and knowledge about the United States wield an influence on their children's frequency of exposure to American TV programs in Morocco?
RQ2: Will the viewers' own attitudes toward American TV and pre-existing affinity toward the United States affect their frequency of exposure to American TV programs?

Based on the CI perspective and the SIM model, exposure to imported TV will be associated with certain tangible effects. Accordingly, this paper asks:

RQ3: Will an increase in the frequency of exposure to American TV programs be associated with young Moroccan viewers' attitudes toward the United States?

Methodology

A survey of Moroccan adolescents was undertaken from mid May to early June 2002. The survey measures were adopted from various sources and then organized in a self-administered questionnaire. A professional translator translated the English version of the questionnaire into Arabic. Moroccan secondary school teachers of English were asked to back translate the survey to ensure that no meaning was lost in the translation.

For our sample, we kept in mind the socio-economic variations in Moroccan society and selected three representative high schools. They are public high schools and the majority of students fall within the upper middle or lower middle classes. We were able to get access to the students in their classrooms after obtaining a written approval from the Delegate of the Ministry of National Education in Morocco. Senior high school students were asked to fill out the questionnaires. This data collection effort resulted in a total of 351 completed questionnaires with a response rate of 95 percent. This sample is representative of the student population in Kenitra, Morocco. The data was later subjected to a statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Measures and Measurement Analyses

Table 1 presents the single item measures used in our survey. Multiple item measures are later presented and analyzed for content validity and reliability.

Table 1:
Single Item Measures

Measures:
When I think about myself, overall, I feel I am more Arab than Western

Foreign Travel
Have you ever traveled abroad?
How many times have you traveled to the following countries?
USA
Education
What is the highest level of education for each member of your family?
What high school branch are you in?

Social Status
How many people live in your house?
How many bedrooms are there in your house?
What is your age?
What is your gender?
What is your religious affiliation?
In an average month, how many times do you attend religious services?

How would you rate your proficiency in these foreign languages?
How would you rate your proficiency in English?
How would you rate your proficiency in French?

Do you have a satellite dish at home?
In a typical day, how much time do you spend watching TV?
What is the number of times, per month, you spend watching the following TV
American TV series
American movies (on TV)
Moroccan TV series
Moroccan movies (on TV)

Parental Influence: Parental influence was assessed by measuring the respondents’
perception of their parents’ opinions of the U.S., communication frequency about the
U.S. and knowledge of the U.S.. A principal components factor analysis yielded one
factor that accounted for 42 percent of the variance. Table 2 outlines both the factor
loadings and the alpha for these measures.

Table 2:
Factor Analysis Results for Items Measuring Parental Influence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents’ knowledge is very useful to me</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I greatly value my parents’ opinions</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-existing Affinity Toward the United States: Pre-existing affinity toward the United
States was measured as an over time increase or decrease of the respondents’ consump-
tion of American and Egyptian food, their cravings for such food, as well as their
perception of being similar (or lack of similarity) to Americans. A principal component
factor analysis with varimax rotation was computed, yielding two factors, and accounted
for 43 percent of variance. The alpha results and factor loadings are reported in Table 3
below.
Table 3
Factor Analysis Results for Items Measuring Pre-existing Affinity toward the U.S. and Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over the years, I have found myself eating more American food</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the years, I have found myself craving American food</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the years, I found myself watching more American movies</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the years, I have found myself becoming more like Americans</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Over the years, I have found myself craving Egyptian food</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the years, I found myself watching more Egyptian movies</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the years, I have found myself becoming more like Egyptians</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude Towards Imported TV programs: The respondents’ attitude toward American TV programs is measured via a two-item scale. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they like and enjoy American TV programs. Egyptian TV programs were used as a comparative parameter for measuring the difference in appeal between American and other regional TV programs.

A principal component factor analysis yielded two factors with a variance rate of 50 percent. The results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4:
Factor Analysis for Items Measuring Attitudes toward Foreign TV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like watching American entertainment TV programs</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy watching American entertainment TV programs</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Attitude toward the U.S.: This measure attempted to gauge the respondents’ current attitude towards the United States. The measures differentiated between the U.S. government and Americans as a people. A principal component factor analysis yielded two factors that accounted for 66 percent of the variance. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table V:
Factor Analysis for Items Measuring Current Attitudes toward the U.S.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel positive toward Americans</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel positive toward U.S. government</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like the American people</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like the American Government</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the measurement analyses, relevant indices were computed by summing across their corresponding multiple item measures.

Results
All the respondents were senior high school students (third year secondary school students). The age of the respondents ranged between 16 and 23 (M=19, SD= 1.1). Fifty-eight point one percent of the respondents were female, and 41.9 percent were males. When asked about their religious affiliation, 99.7 percent identified their religion as Islam. However, the respondents’ level of religiosity, indicated by the frequency with which they attend mosque religious services and prayers, varies widely. Thus, 35 percent indicated that they never go to mosques while 26 percent of them said they go to mosques once a week.

When asked about the racial group with which they identify most (the Arabs or the Westerners), 92 percent of the respondents indicated their agreement with the statement “I am more similar to Arabs than Westerners.”

High school students in Morocco have three broad academic options or streams: modern literature (humanities), (mathematical or experimental) sciences, and technical education: 51.9 percent are from modern literature, 41.4 percent are from the sciences, and 6.7 percent are from one of the technical education branches. About 52.1 percent of the respondents indicated their parents have some sort of formal education (primary or secondary school).
Foreign travel of the respondents is used to assess their cultural capital. The great majority of the respondents (88.7 percent) indicated they have never traveled abroad, while only 6.5 percent indicated they had visited the United States at least once. Most of the respondents (88.3 percent) also indicated they have relatives and friends living abroad, mostly in France or Spain. In comparison, a few of the respondents have friends or relatives in the U.S..

The number of rooms in the respondents’ homes is used as an indicator of their socio-economic status. The responses indicate that 69 percent of the respondents live in homes of more than four rooms. In conjunction with the number of individuals living in the respondents’ households, the responses indicate that most of the respondents belong within the lower middle class of Moroccan society.

Linguistic skills have been measured to assess the comfort level of the respondents’ communication (and consumption of American TV) in foreign languages: 49.1 percent indicated their proficiency in English (compared to 46 percent in French) is intermediate. Also, 21.5 percent indicate they sometimes use English in communicating with non-Moroccans (compared to 24.1 percent who use French in such situations).

More than 60 percent of the respondents indicated during their childhood, their parents frequently (“often” and “very often”) expressed their opinions about the United States. Fifty-six point one percent indicated they have learned a fair amount ranging from “moderate”, “a lot”, to “a great deal” of information about the United States from their parents. When asked about the nature of that information, 31.4 percent indicated it was positive. Concerning the respondents’ perception of the value, usefulness and truthfulness of their parents’ opinions and knowledge about the United States, 49.1 percent agreed what they learned from their parents about those countries is true. Forty-four point seven percent “value” those opinions, while 70.2 percent indicated their parents knowledge about the United States is very useful to them.

Eighty-seven point seven percent of respondents indicated they have a satellite dish at home (increasing the availability of American and other foreign television programs). Sixty-nine point four percent of the respondents indicated they usually spend between one and five hours a day watching TV. When asked how often they watched American TV series in an average month, 40.9 percent indicated that they never watch those programs, nearly 45 percent indicated they watch those programs less frequently or sometimes (between one and five times every month). Responses to watching American films on TV indicated only a 17 percent of the respondents said they never watch those programs, while 56.9 percent indicated they sometimes watch those programs (between one and five times every month).

A somewhat similar pattern is recorded concerning the consumption of Moroccan TV programs. Twenty-four point six percent of the respondents indicated they never watch Moroccan TV series while 62.9 percent indicated they sometimes watch those programs (between one and five times every month). Watching Moroccan films on TV: 12.1 percent of the respondents indicated they never watch them while 75.3 percent indicated they sometimes watch those programs (between one and five times every month).

**Answering Research Question I:** Will parental opinions and knowledge about the U.S. wield an influence on their children’s frequency of exposure to American TV programs in Morocco?
Parental influence was estimated by multiplying the respondents’ scores about “how much they learned from their parents about the U.S.” by “how greatly they value their parents’ opinions about the U.S.” Additionally, another score of parental influence was computed by multiplying the respondents’ scores about “how often their parents expressed their opinions about the U.S.” by “How would you [the respondents] describe your parents’ comments about the U.S.”

A bivariate correlation was computed to test the relationship between parental influence and exposure to U.S. television. We observe there is a small but positive correlation between the parents’ professed opinions and knowledge about the U.S. and the respondents’ frequency of exposure to U.S. TV (r = .18, p < .05, N = 204). Similarly, a small but positive correlation exists between the respondents’ learning from their parents’ opinions about the U.S. and the respondents’ exposure to U.S. TV (r = .13, p < .05, N = 204).

In sum, parental influence about the U.S. among Moroccan students is positively correlated with consumption of U.S. television. Therefore, the more positive and frequent the parents’ opinions and knowledge about the United States happen to be, the greater is the respondents’ consumption of American television.

Answering Research Question II: Will the viewers’ own attitudes toward American TV and preexisting affinity toward the U.S. affect their frequency of exposure to American TV programs?

Affinity toward the United States has been estimated by collapsing the respondents’ scores pertaining to certain aspects of the past: their increasing consumption of American food over the years, their craving for such food, the more similar they feel they have become to Americans, as well as watching more American TV programs over the years. The respondents’ own attitudes toward U.S. TV have been estimated by collapsing their scores on how much they enjoy and they like watching American TV programs.

A bivariate correlation was computed to test the relationship between preexisting affinity toward the U.S. and the frequency of exposure to U.S. TV. We observe there is a strong and positive correlation between the respondents’ preexisting affinity toward the United States and the frequency of exposure to U.S. television (r = .42, p < .05, N = 204). A moderate and positive relationship also exists between the respondents’ own attitudes toward U.S. television and their exposure to such programs (r = .38, p < .05, N = 204).

Accordingly, pre-existing affinity toward the United States is strongly correlated with the frequency of exposure to U.S. television. The stronger and more positive the respondents’ pre-existing affinity toward U.S. TV, the more frequent exposure to U.S. television programs occurs. Furthermore, attitude toward American television programs is positively correlated with exposure to U.S. TV. That is, the more positive are the respondents’ attitudes toward American television programs, the greater is the frequency of exposure to those programs.

Answering Research Question III: Will an increase in the frequency of exposure to American TV programs be associated with young Moroccan viewers’ attitudes toward the United States?
The respondents’ attitude toward the United States was estimated by collapsing the respondents’ scores on how positive they feel, and how much they like the U.S. government and the American people. In accordance with our factor analysis of the measures, we have distinguished between two dimensions of attitudes: the respondents’ attitudes toward the American people versus their attitudes vis-à-vis the U.S. governments.

A bivariate correlation was computed to test the relationship between the frequency of exposure to American television programs and the respondents’ attitudes toward the United States. We observed there is a moderate and positive correlation between the frequency of exposure to U.S. TV and attitudes toward the American people (r = .27, p < .05, N = 204). However, there is no significant relationship between the frequency of exposure to American television programs and the respondents’ attitudes toward the U.S. government. This indicates that consumption of American television programs does not modify Moroccan viewers’ attitudes toward the U.S. government.

Therefore, it seems the more frequently the respondents are exposed to American television programs, the more positive are their attitudes toward the American people. No such conclusion can be drawn about the respondents’ frequency of exposure to American television programs and their attitudes toward the United States government.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper set out to understand the influence of imported U.S. television on Moroccan adolescents. The analysis of the results obtained reveals the existence of a close relationship between parental influence and the respondents’ frequency of exposure to American television programs. The more positive the parents’ comments were about the U.S. while these respondents were growing up, the more these respondents tended to watch U.S. television. The results indicate that positive comments and observations emanating from the respondents’ parents have the effect of influencing their children at an early age. In a traditional society like Morocco, and for that matter most other traditional societies, parents act as an invaluable source of knowledge, guiding their children’s future behaviors, preferences, habits, attitudes, and values. While the analysis reinforces the above line of thought, it also demonstrates the tenability of the SIM model’s contention about the importance of parental influence in orienting children’s exposure to foreign television programs.

The viewers’ own attitudes toward American television programs, as well as their preexisting affinity towards the United States, hold sway on the frequency of exposure to American television programs. The data analysis indicates a positive association between these variables. Viewers with positive attitudes toward U.S. television programs appear to have more frequent exposure to American television programs than those who hold negative attitudes. Also, a strong preexisting affinity toward the United States, explained here by an increasing consumption of American products over the years, among other things, has the same effect. Imported television programs appear to function as a reinforcing influence instead of a behaviorally modifying force.

The contentions of the SIM model (Elasmar, 2003) are further supported by the analysis of the effects of watching American television programs on young Moroccans’ attitudes toward the United States. In this regard, the analysis distinguishes between two sets of the respondents’ attitudes: those toward the American people versus those toward the U.S. government. Watching American television programs are associated
In a positive attitude toward the American people. In contrast it appears the viewers' attitudes toward the U.S. government have not been affected by their consumption of television programs from the U.S.

In sum, the results of this paper support the notion that the reception and impact of imported television programs are not isolated phenomena. They are better understood by examining the components of a viewer's schema. In this paper, preexisting affinity of local viewers, parental influence, and attitudes toward the imported TV programs were found to propel the viewers' consumption of imported television programs.

The implications of these results are many. First, they support the theoretical contentions of the SIM model as an explanatory framework for understanding the impact of imported television on indigenous audiences. Second, they shed light on the limitations of the assertive claims of cultural imperialism theorists with respect to the influence of imported TV programs. Indeed, the analysis of the results provides a vehement argument that the indigenous audiences' reception of imported television programs should be construed within a larger framework of reference. The impact of such programs appears far less strong and a function of a much more complex process than proponents of cultural imperialism believe it to be.
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OPINION : EXCLUSIVE EXPOSÉ
OF BREAKING NEWS!

There's been much discussion in the local-TV-news business and by those who watch it about the proliferation of “breaking news” on stations. As Audrey Shelton, a viewer, complained to the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal TV columnist Tom Dorsey last month, “Most of the breaking-news stories are way overblown, incomplete and lack depth. Every station does it.” Two other Louisville viewers complained to Dorsey that “every story aired is BREAKING NEWS!” (Their caps, not mine).

And it’s not just viewers in Louisville who are recognizing that breaking news very often is not news in the first place.

“I am so sick of ‘breaking news,’ I have almost quit watching TV. It has been so overused that no one pays attention anymore,” says Debbie Eades, a member of a Cincinnati Enquirer readers’ panel for TV polled by that paper’s veteran critic, John Kiesewetter.

Why has “breaking news” become an epidemic? I agreed with Bill Lamb, president and general manager of Louisville’s WDRB and WFTE, when he wrote on a Website, “This tactic is just hype and trickery designed to fool the audience into thinking their station is on top of more news than the other stations. … breaking news is a disturbing trend in local TV news.”

This overuse of the term “breaking news” is not new. It’s just proliferating. In a June 2001 article, Deborah Potter, executive director of non-profit resource center NewsLab.org, quotes former KYW Philadelphia news legend Larry Kane lamenting that, in the race for ratings, stations have adapted the tactics of a carnival barker: Shout louder, and maybe they’ll come to your tent.

“Stations call almost any news ‘breaking’ to hook the viewer, some of whom are getting wise to the scam,” he said.

Mostly, it’s not breaking, and it’s not even news; it’s carefully crafted, manufactured news-like matter.

I remember, once in a market where I worked, our competitor’s newscast put up a big, bold “breaking news” graphic and then showed a helicopter shot of a minor fender-bender on the freeway. The accident occurred several hours prior. No one was hurt, and even the police didn’t come to the scene. We knew this because we had seen our own helicopter shoot it and our news department deemed it the non-event it was. But to our competi-
tion, it was deviously manufactured into “breaking news.”

What’s at stake? NewsLab’s Potter wrote, “Viewers who feel disappointed or deceived by the way stories are presented might just stop believing what they see. And that seems like far too high a price to pay.”

That’s a dangerous practice anywhere that hurts the credibility of local TV news everywhere.
TV MARKET AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT MISMATCHES: EFFECTS ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING AND ELECTION OUTCOMES

“Television is one of the most expensive and important tools congressional candidates use to communicate with voters,” wrote Herrnson (2001, p. 129). Recent campaign spending numbers bear out Herrnson’s observation. Television Bureau of Advertising figures shows an increase even in non-presidential years. Political ads topped $200 million nationwide in 1990 (Foltz), and by 1998 were approximately $500 million in local broadcast TV sales (Freeman).

The Campaign Media Analysis Group and Alliance for Better Campaigns (later called the Campaign Legal Center Media Policy Program) tallied spending on TV spots in the nation’s largest 100 markets. The totals were $771 million during 2000 and $995.5 million in 2002. From the start of the year through Election Day nearly 1.5 million political ads aired on 573 stations in those markets (Saunders).

In the 2004 election the totals in the top 100 markets more than doubled to $1.6 billion, or 1.95 million spots on 615 stations. If clumped together it would be roughly 677 solid days of nothing but political ads. Cable TV trailed far behind broadcast, $64.5 million spent on 24,586 ads in those same top 100 markets (McGehee).

Active congressional candidates typically devote 40 percent of their overall campaign budgets to ads, frequently TV ads (Chinoy). Herrnson (2001, pp. 72, 74, 75) stated most congressional candidates retain independent media consultants; about a fifth have staff experts. He further noted that campaigns employing professionals to develop ads usually are at an advantage, especially over challengers who may have difficulty affording media consultants.

Broadcast advertising clearly has become a significant channel by which U. S. congressional candidates communicate with voters. The importance of this channel, however, may vary greatly among the nation’s 435 congressional districts. TV
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markets and congressional districts, of course, are very different geographic areas. The nation’s 212 TV markets are determined by where viewers report picking up and watching stations from a nearby city. The lines may cross state boundaries, and the markets vary greatly in population. Congressional districts, however, are created within states and must be, within a very narrow margin, roughly equal in population. Gerrymandering, or the drawing of district lines to favor a person or party, only adds to the likely incongruity of TV and congressional boundaries.

Some congressional districts may match well the contours of mid-size broadcast markets. Other congressional districts may be small zones in much bigger metropolitan areas (large broadcast markets), making broadcast ads both prohibitively expensive and inefficient. Broadcast ads in big markets naturally cost more than in smaller markets; the potential audience is bigger and stations can demand higher prices for time compared to smaller markets. Furthermore, candidates able to pay the high price of broadcast ads in very big markets must endure great inefficiency. Candidates would be paying to reach many viewers outside the district, people who cannot vote for the candidate.

Still other congressional districts may be comprised of small pieces of several broadcast markets. While some of these may be smaller and cheaper markets in which to buy time, the inefficiency problem once again emerges. A candidate who wants to cover the district may have to buy time on many stations and markets. Many, if not most, of the viewers of each station’s signal will live outside the district.

The relationship between congressional districts and TV markets (not just number of markets but especially contour “matches” and “mismatches”) is well worthy of study. Matches may entice campaigns toward broadcast ads an efficient and effective means of voter communication. Mismatches may shift campaigns toward other alternatives such as direct mail, events, personal contact, and cable system ads. Matches and mismatches between district and coverage area even may play a role, not only in how the campaign is waged, but also whether the seat is hotly contested or incumbent-safe and unchallengable.

Some examples of match and mismatch between congressional district and TV market may prove useful in illustrating the phenomenon under study. Three good examples of “mismatch” districts are:

• Louisiana’s 4th District has been described as one of the strangest-looking in the country, and in U.S. history. It runs from Shreveport in northwest Louisiana, narrowly follows the border with Arkansas, turns south along the Mississippi River, and then splits into three arms. One juts west into central Louisiana; one curves south and west to take in parts of Baton Rouge and Lafayette; one heads east toward the Florida border. It is 66 percent African American, contains all or part of 28 parishes, and seven TV markets (Taur 1993, pp. 317, 324).

• Tennessee’s 4th District runs from rural flatland east of Memphis, snakes east then north through middle Tennessee to reach Appalachian counties on the Kentucky border, and curves around parts of Knox County and east Tennessee. Five TV markets are needed to reach voters in it (Taur 1993, pp. 684, 691-692).

• Nebraska’s 3rd District serves the central and western parts of the state and does not have the sprawling arms or twists of the two other districts in this list, but nine TV
markets slice up this area (Taur 1993, pp. 444, 450).

Some examples of congressional districts where there is a good “match” with TV market contours are:

- California’s 17th District, entirely within the Salinas-Monterey TV market, a relatively small market with very few viewers outside the 17th (Taur 1993, p. 85; Standard Rate and Data Service 2002, p. 537).
- California’s 22nd District, entirely within the Santa Barbara/Santa Maria/ San Luis Obispo market, and the majority of viewers are in the 22nd (Taur 1993, p. 91; Standard Rate and Data Service 2002, p. 735).
- Ohio’s 17th District, entirely within the relatively small TV market of Youngstown, and most Youngstown viewers inside the 17th (Taur 1993, p. 600; Standard Rate and Data Service 2002, p. 880).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Three previous projects have looked directly at effects of congruity, or lack thereof, between congressional districts and TV markets. Luttbeg (1983) created a categorization system for congressional districts. He used Census Bureau data (average household density of 2.81 persons in 1978) to convert the TV households in a market to a close approximation of the number of persons. Where the signals of a small set of stations could not reach 75 percent of the population he called that district Not Coverable. This turned out to be 53 rural districts. A total of 259 districts were identified as Not Selective. In other words, messages there reached four or more non-constituents for every constituent (congressional district resident). The remaining 124 districts he called Congruent. The findings, however, ran contrary to Luttbeg’s expectation that congruent districts would be where one would find the most competitive races and the greatest spending. Congruent districts where one might expect the greatest potential for challenge actually had the highest percentage of incumbents re-elected, the highest vote percentage obtained by winners, and the lowest challenger overall spending. Winners, in fact, spent more money on campaigns in the Not Coverable districts.

Campbell, Alford, and Henry (1984) abandoned Luttbeg’s categorization scheme for a congruence measure using data from Congressional Districts in the 1970s, the 108 congressional districts in the 1980 National Election Survey, 1980 election results, and the census. For the Not Selective, or “subsumed” district, the researchers divided the congressional district population by the TV market population. For districts with multiple TV markets the researchers calculated the same ratio (district population v. market population) for each market and adjusted it to the percentage of that TV market in the congressional district.

The researchers also contradicted Luttbeg by finding evidence of a congruency benefit for challengers. Name recognition went up slightly for incumbents and dramatically for challengers in highly congruent districts. Specifically, incumbents had a better than six to one name recognition advantage in low congruence districts (25 to 4 percent), as compared to less than a two-to-one name advantage lead (52 to 31 percent) in high congruence districts. The vote totals showed incumbents getting 72 percent of votes in low congruence districts, but only 64 percent of votes in high congruence districts.
Levy and Squire (2000) looked at all 1988 and 1990 congressional elections where incumbents faced a challenger. They also borrowed part of the Campbell, Alford, and Henry method of calculating congruence. Levy and Squire used a formula of number of people in the district divided by the number of people in the Area of Dominant Influence (ADI) in 1990. Levy and Squire found that more congruent districts did indeed make it easier for constituents, presumably as a result of both news and ads, to recall the name of the challengers. However, they did not find any congruence benefit for challengers when it came to election outcomes.

One should note Levy and Squire took one curious step regarding multiple TV market congressional districts. They only calculated a congruence ratio for any market where the congressman maintained a district office. They assumed that congressmen would place district offices to serve the bulk of their constituents. Certainly that’s likely. However, it is also possible some congressman may choose not to place an office in an area dominated by the opposing party, or may have few district offices to be able to use office resources elsewhere, or may choose to have a mobile district office, or may choose to have few offices so as to be able to brag about not spending much taxpayer money.

The experience of these three research projects all provides clues about how to approach this work. Luttbeg made clear the need to differentiate between congressional districts “subsumed” in huge TV markets and rural congressional districts spread across parts of several small TV markets. Campbell, Alford, and Henry showed the desirability of a congruence formula. Levy and Squire point out the benefit of using multiple elections.

Thus, this project examines the 1992-2000 congressional elections, the entire census-to-census “life” of all 435 U.S congressional districts. By that, the author refers to the time period between the establishment of boundaries for each district in the state legislative session following the 1990 census, and the establishment of new boundaries in the state legislative session following the 2000 census. In practical terms this means the 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000 congressional elections. Though some boundaries may shift because of court challenges or tardy legislative action, this set of elections should yield relatively stable reference points for the boundaries of the districts.

This work uses a formula that, instead of calculating the match, tallies the mismatch or the amount of waste. This technique makes it possible to use one simple formula for both subsumed and multi-market districts. That formula is the total number of adults (aged 18+) in the TV market(s) divided by the total number of adults (aged 18+) in the congressional district. Thus, a figure of 1.3 would indicate a relatively well-contoured district where a candidate reaches only slightly more adults through TV than those capable of voting for him or her. A figure of 12.7, on the other hand, would indicate a wasteful contours mismatch in which candidate ads would fall predominantly on adults not in the candidate’s district. The researcher also will calculate separate figures for subsumed and multi-market districts to see if any differences emerge regarding contour mismatches, campaign spending, and electoral outcomes.

Also, one should note a study that addressed media markets and congressional districts using an historical timeline. Prior (2000) evaluated the number of congressional districts with television stations between 1940 and 1970, and the effects the increasing number of television stations had or did not have on the congressional districts. His
results showed that the presence of TV stations in a district did, in fact, greatly increase the advantage for an incumbent. He also determined that television most enhances incumbency advantage in small districts with several television stations.

HYPOTHESES

Past work by Luttbeg (1983), Campbell, Alford, and Henry (1984), and Levy and Squire (2000) all make the logical leap that more congruent districts mean more targeted broadcast ad placement and thus more competitive districts. The links in this chain are open to question, and may explain the divergent previous findings regarding competitiveness. Instead, one should take a step back to determine if candidates take the logical step of reducing broadcast ad spending when faced with the daunting challenge of wasteful, incongruent districts.

Thus, Hypothesis One states that as contour mismatch increases \([\text{total adults in the TV market(s)} \div \text{total adults in the congressional district}]\) candidate spending on electronic media advertising will decrease.

Because the answer to Hypothesis One cannot be assumed, this project approaches competitiveness more as an exploratory research question, looking for any relationship between contour mismatch and victory margin, spending margin, and length of incumbency.

Hypothesis Two updates Prior’s conclusions, most drawn from the period during the introduction of television as a mass medium, to see if they are still valid. Specifically, as the number of television stations in a television market increases one will find more non-competitive districts with large victory margins and long-serving incumbents.

METHODS


The books provided the following information about the congressional district and the election results: state, district number, winners number and percentage of votes, second place number and percentage of votes, all candidate party affiliations, year the winner was first elected, number of terms winner has been elected to serve, and total campaign spending by the winner and loser.

These books gave accurate, detailed information about each election, district, or TV market, making this project a census (rather than a sampling) of congressional candidates, congressional districts, and TV markets. The website now known as Political Moneyline (www.tray.com/fecinfo), owned and operated by Kent Cooper and Tony Raymond helped fill in any missing Federal Elections Commission data on individual candidate overall campaign spending.

These data were further supplemented by campaign spending data from The Campaign Study Group. CSG is a for-profit consulting firm specializing in campaign finance research and public opinion analysis. Among its many projects, CSG spends
thousands of hours each year correcting and categorizing spending reports from the Federal Election Commission’s database (CSG website, http://campaignstudygroup.com). The researcher was able to take advantage of a one-year educational membership to use CSG data. Unfortunately, full congressional spending data were available only for 1992 and 1994 elections, with additional partial results from about a hundred districts from 1998. The CSG categories were: overhead such as travel and offices, campaign events including fundraisers, direct mail, telemarketing, polling, electronic media advertising, other media advertising, traditional activities such as brochures.

The number of commercial television stations in each market came from Television and Cable Factbook, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000 editions (Television Digest). The market data on the number of adults 18 and older in each market came from Standard Rate and Data’s SRDS TV & Cable Source (2001). Congressional Districts in the 1990s: A Portrait of America provided information on which media markets covered which congressional districts, and how much of each congressional district by population was in that media market.

FINDINGS

Broadcast advertising overall played an important, but quite varied, role in the elections analyzed. The number of TV stations in each congressional district ranged from a low of three to a high of 69; the mean was 15.97. Winners spent an average of $139,439 on broadcast ads, 23 percent of the campaign budget. For losers the figures were $70,203 or 23.7 percent of the budget. During this five-election timeframe 247 losers and 104 winners spent no money on broadcast ads, but one winner spent 77 percent of the budget on broadcast ads and one loser spent 89 percent.

The contour waste/mismatch ratio ranged from a well-contoured 1.008 (little waste in reaching adults within the district) to a prohibitively wasteful 47.5. The mean waste/mismatch figure was 11.829. In other words, candidates in typical districts who wish to buy broadcast ads are reaching eleven or twelve adults outside their district for every one inside the district.

Increased levels of contour mismatch between congressional districts and media markets correlated with decreased candidate spending on broadcast advertising and increased candidate spending on traditional items such as yard signs, phone banks, bumper stickers, brochures, etc. Simple regressions showed this pattern for both winning and losing candidates. This held true both for raw dollar amounts and percentages of the campaign budget (Table 1).

The regressions also revealed no statistically significant differences regarding contour mismatches and spending on direct mail, telemarketing, overhead, polling, and non-electronic media. Winners in contour mismatched districts, however, did shift some money toward campaign events (Table 1). Thus, the prediction in Hypothesis One generally was supported.

The “next step” research question regarding contour mismatch and congressional district competitiveness did not yield as clear a connection. As the contour mismatch grew, so did the winner’s percent of the vote (N=2123, F=7.857, p=.0051) just as the loser’s percent of the vote fell (N=2084, F=15.969, p=.0001). However, the number of years in Congress for winners was not significantly different for congruent and incon-
gruent districts.

One initially baffling finding is that in contour-mismatched districts the number of votes for both winners and losers both declined at statistically significant levels compared to contour-matched districts. This could be an artifact of non-competitive districts suppressing voter interest and turnout, but an alternate explanation is found when one separates the “subsumed” from the multi-market districts (Table 2).

Both single- and multiple-market districts mirrored the overall findings that as waste/mismatch increased campaigns of both winners and losers spent smaller percentages of their campaign budgets on electronic media and more on traditional campaign; winners opted for more on events as well. These redundant findings are not included in the table, but the electoral outcome differences merited special attention (Table 2).

One notices that contour mismatch or increased waste led to very different outcomes in single versus multiple TV markets. The “subsumed” districts, small parts of larger TV markets, saw larger vote percentages for winners and smaller vote percentages for losers as the mismatch/waste grew worse. However, the exact opposite happened in multiple-markets, losers got greater percentages of the vote (and winners less) as the district became a more difficult place to use broadcast advertising.

Further, in these multiple-market congressional districts the races appeared to become more competitive as the contour mismatch grew worse. Total spending and winner spending increased, and victory margin decreased. The comparable figures for “subsumed” districts yielded statistically insignificant differences.

Additional research including multiple regression and data not used in this study will be needed to address these significant differences between “subsumed” and multiple-market districts in their connections to media market mismatches. One possibility comes from historical patterns of party identification. Over this five-election timeframe 657 winners in single-market districts (60.8 percent) were Democrats. Conversely, 650 winners in multiple-market districts (59.4 percent) were Republicans. One could argue that urban constituencies who traditionally vote Democratic, African Americans and Hispanics, usually have low voter turnout and that turnout falls dramatically when the contest is perceived as a blowout (Highton and Burris, 2002; Mangum, 2003). Percent of voter turnout tends to be larger in small towns than in central cities (Pazniokas, 2002), so contour mismatch could be a double-edged sword. In central cities it means fewer broadcast ads challenging the presumption of blowout, leading both to low turnout and to high victory margins as measured by percent of vote. In multiple-markets comprised of small towns and suburbs voters, voters are more diligent in their voting. In this condition “high waste” contour mismatches marginally reduce incumbent TV advertising advantages leading to slightly closer outcomes.

Hypothesis Two yielded many fewer associations than either Hypothesis One or the Research Question. As the number of commercial TV stations within a congressional district increased, candidate spending on electronic media decreased (N=839, F=5.318, p=.0213) and spending on other media increased (N=839, F=8.112, p=.0045). However, the predicted larger victory margins and longer-serving incumbents did not emerge. Thus, Hypothesis Two was not supported. Prior’s valuable point about the development of television as related to congressional districts is less instructive now that TV is established in good numbers in every district.
DISCUSSION

This research set out to examine contour mismatches between television markets and congressional districts, using the entire 1992 to 2000 election “life span” of the 435 U.S. congressional districts. As a general rule great contour mismatches (or wasted audience from the candidate perspective) led to less candidate electronic media spending and more spending on traditional campaign items and events. However, spending on direct mail, telemarketing, polling, overhead, or non-electronic media did not grow at statistically significant levels.

The connection to electoral outcomes was a quite revealing. Contour mismatches overall were associated with larger vote percentages for winners, and smaller percentages for losers, but a more precise picture emerged when broken down by “subsumed” single-market districts and sprawling multiple-market districts. Contour mismatches appeared to exacerbate the already low turnout in urban districts, leading to easy percentage point wins but low vote totals. In multiple-market districts, the wasteful mismatches apparently lowered the effectiveness of one incumbent weapon, broadcast ads, and led to slightly more competitive congressional contests.

The previous work by Luttbeg (1983), Campbell, Alford, and Henry (1984), and Levy and Squire (2000) all assumed that congruent districts meant more targeted broadcast ad placement, and this in turn meant more competitive districts. This work rebuts much of those assumptions. Rather than measuring level of “match,” this project measured the much more common phenomenon of mismatch. In that condition congressional candidates do as expected and spend less on electronic media and more on some other forms. However, mismatch alone did not necessarily lead to more or less competitive districts. Instead, mismatch appeared to be associated with both less competitive urban single-market districts and more competitive multiple-market districts. Prior’s (2000) historical point about more stations in a market being associated with greater incumbent advantage did not hold up to the more recent period of television as a near universal phenomenon in U.S. lives.

This research demonstrated that the surrounding broadcast markets certainly affect the manner by which congressional campaigns are waged. The key appears to be the efficiency of the buy, whether paid broadcast ads are an efficient way of reaching most of a candidate’s potential voters or a wasteful, overpriced collection of people most of whom live outside the district. The importance of broadcast ads only will grow assuming local TV news continues the recent trend of decreased attention to local congressional campaigns (Rosen, 2002; Lear Center, 2002; Trigoboff, 1998). Furthermore, paid advertising is communication whose content is controlled by the candidate. It is not surprising that in districts where broadcast ads efficiently reach voters, candidates spend more resources on it.

Candidates lately have not been the only ones spending money to influence the outcome in congressional races. Political parties and interest groups also selectively place ads to reward some candidates and to punish others. The Brennan Center used 1998 House and Senate data from Campaign Media Analysis Group, a company that monitors political advertising in the largest 75 U.S. media markets. The data were more than 300,000 airings of 2,100 ads. Candidates remained uniformly dominant in TV ad purchases, spending five times more than parties, and ten times more than
interest groups. The project tallied 236,177 candidate ads, 7,391 coordinated or co-financed through political parties, 1,152 from independent interest groups reporting their activity to the Federal Election Commission, and 57,037 unreported to the FEC by parties or interest groups (Krasno and Seltz, 2000).

One likely can assume “broadcast congruency” works in an inverse relationship with the power of incumbency. Highly congruent districts with newly elected congressmen and small margins of past victory become, in effect, target districts for interest groups and the Democratic and Republican national committees to focus resources. Spending on broadcasting rises, but so does spending on other media.

Of course, competitive campaigns also must seek to secure victory by good efforts to get one’s persuaded citizens to the polls. The Democratic Party and AFL-CIO had a successful Get Out The Vote effort in 2000, an effort copied by the Republican National Committee’s 72-Hour Project in 2002 (Glasgow, 2002; Balz and Broder, 2002; Balz, 2003). The “shoe leather and phone banks,” of course, also tend to flow to the targeted, often broadcast congruent, districts.

On the other hand, challengers in low-congruency districts with well established incumbents stand little chance of becoming a targeted district. Those challengers must allocate scarce resources between media and grassroots efforts with not enough money available for either while both are needed.

This research project documented a role for media market and congressional district congruence in both the competitiveness of the contest and the strategies used for paid messages. What merits further inquiry are the roles played by media markets and congruency early in the process when parties and major donors are deciding where to spend resources—or, even earlier and less often, when state legislators are deciding where to draw lines.

Table 1. Increased Waste (Contour Mismatch) Television Markets and Congressional Districts, Simple Regressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decreased Spending</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Amount Spent on Electronic Media Ads</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>34.864</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Percent of Budget, Electronic Media Ads</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>85.954</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losers, Amount Spent on Electronic Media Ads</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>15.004</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losers, Percent of Budget, Electronic Media Ads</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>42.056</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased Spending</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Amount Spent on Traditional Items</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>39.371</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Percent of Budget, Traditional Items</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>96.704</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losers, Amount Spent on Traditional Items</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losers, Percent of Budget, Traditional Items</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>33.923</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Amount Spent on Campaign Events</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>13.207</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winners, Percent of Budget, Campaign Events</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>14.376</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Significant Electoral Differences, Single v. Multiple TV Market Congressional Districts as Waste (Contour Mismatch) Increased, Simple Regressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Market Congressional Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Winner Percentage of the Vote</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>7.768</td>
<td>.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Loser Percentage of the Vote</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>7.349</td>
<td>.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Market (“Subsumed”) Congressional Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Winner Percentage of the Vote</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>26.899</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Loser Percentage of the Vote</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>34.547</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Market Congressional Districts</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Winner Spending</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>10.606</td>
<td>.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Total Spending, Winner and Loser</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Winner Percentage Margin of Victory</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* with no statistically significant result in same category for single-market districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Market Congressional Districts</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Total Number of Votes for Winner</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>76.448</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Total Number of votes for Loser</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>34.012</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* with no statistically significant result in same category for multiple-market districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOW SERVICE-LEARNING, THREE PROFESSORS AND A CLIENT MET IN THE MASS COMM CLASSROOM

It has become a buzzword with a hyphen: service-learning. It integrates academic learning with community service in which students meet identified needs, and then critically reflect on the activity (Messiah, 2006). While the University of Minnesota traces service-learning’s roots as far back as the 1860s, S-L undoubtedly gained its modern-day momentum from the National & Community Service Trust Act of 1990, which led to the Corporation for National Service in 1993. Then the first refereed service-learning journal, the Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, and the creation of AmeriCorps, followed in 1994 (Univ. of Minn., p.1). Service-learning has since worked its way into Academe on the heels of the experiential learning movement, typically involving students in a planned activity with the Salvation Army, a community volunteer clearing-house, or a health organization, to name a few.

But does such pedagogy have a place in the media curriculum of multi-million dollar conglomerates, expanding ownership, and regulatory conflict? This is the first of a two-part story on how three professors combined multiple college classes in marketing, computer graphics, and mass communications to create non-profit advertising campaigns—and ultimately, a cross-disciplinary service-learning project—north of Baltimore, Maryland. Its value lies both in its use to media faculty, as well as its service-learning applications across a variety of curriculum. The six-year old project is first explained, then examined in its “second life” as a service-learning vehicle that turns up few counterparts on the World Wide Web. But one of those is Dalton and Ingram’s (2004) Wake Forest media production course, in which they concluded, “Perhaps the best model for effectively integrating theory into practice within a critical context is the approach advocated by proponents of service-learning” (p.2).

THE SET-UP

In the summer of 2000, Business Administration Professor Sandie Ferriter received a phone call from the Bel Air Volunteer
Fire Company asking if Harford Community College students could develop an advertising campaign to recruit volunteers (Ferriter, personal communication, 2000). Ferriter’s Advertising and Sales Promotion class dealt mostly with the business aspects of advertising. So she called two colleagues, Jim McFarland in Visual Communications and Wayne Hepler in Mass Communications, and asked if their classes could develop the creative content of the campaign. Like Ferriter, both were veteran professors who welcomed real life projects for their students, but what about logistics? What about communication—between three or more classes on two ends of campus, and with clients who know nothing about academic schedules, let alone advertising? Could the timing be worked out for their three, or even six class schedules? And how would the inevitable unforeseen events affect the project, the students, and the client? After much discussion, the professors believed that their uninitiated students could benefit from the project, even if they did not pull it off. Though numerous details were yet to be settled—and none of the professors realized it—the foundation was being laid for a cross-disciplinary project that would also prove perfectly suited for the service-learning procedures that would be introduced to the campus four years later.

The trio met with fire company representatives a few times before the fall semester to discuss the basic theme, brochures, print ads, and broadcast public service announcements that six classes would produce over the course of the school year. As with most service-learning activities, critical part of this project was timing. Bethel University in Minnesota goes so far as to create a service-learning timeline with a detailed breakdown of responsibilities occurring prior to the course, during the second week, throughout the semester, at semester’s end, and after the course concludes (Bethel University, p.1). This is what Ferriter, McFarland, and Hepler did before ever undertaking service-learning. But at a community college where “advanced” students are sophomores and professors teach 5 classes per semester, coordinating six staggered class schedules over the course of a school year was especially challenging.

The fall schedule first called for Ferriter to make the critical estimations as to how long her freshmen groups would take to learn some advertising basics, then develop the campaign theme and rough copy for every class that followed. Likewise, Hepler had to gauge how long his teams of basic audio production students needed to scout out respectable talent, revise the copy, and record and edit public service announcements (PSAs). At the same time, McFarland was determining how his teams of introductory graphic artists would get up to speed converting the Ferriter material into brochures, newspaper ads, and banners. In the spring, his more advanced class would at least benefit from fully developed copy from Hepler’s writing class. Finally, Michael Blum, an adjunct video professor, was to teach the only advanced students in the fall mix how to progress from his early assignments to the more demanding client PSAs as their final projects. Each professor decided independently on using student teams who then worked with another class’s teams in making the transition from one stage of the project to the next. Holland and Gelmon write that service-learning’s success is indeed defined by both institutional and community teams (1998). Ferriter, McFarland, and Hepler were to find that partners could help each other produce better projects, and consequently, enjoy better learning experiences.

The clients would also learn; a semester schedule put them on deadline to provide campaign information, brochure and PSA content, photographs, field trips, and
classroom visitation. But the semester schedule also meant that nothing would be completed until December, and some clients opted to wait until May, when students in McFarland’s and Hepler’s more advanced classes would combine to write and design brochures. In 2005-6, the three professors spread two clients’ campaigns over two semesters, when Ferriter made use of a more advanced class of her own. This meant that the client who started in August finished in December, but had to be satisfied with the work of introductory classes rather than the advanced classes of spring. But that was of no concern to the Bel Air Volunteer Fire Company on the first project, who told Ferriter, “Whatever level of product you provide will be better than what we have” (Ferriter, personal communication, 2006). Such service to community is one reason why the project slipped so easily into service-learning in 2004.

IMPLEMENTATION
In the fall semester, the four inaugural classes—Ferriter’s Advertising and Sales Promotion, McFarland’s Introduction to Graphic Communication, Hepler’s Audio Production, and adjunct Blum’s Video Production and Editing—formed their teams. In keeping with the mutually agreed timetable, Ferriter’s students tackled the campaign early in the semester, serving largely as typical advertising account executives, or AEs, who facilitated the other classes. At the same time, McFarland, Hepler and Blum taught typical creative department responsibilities to their graphic artists and producers, who, as professionals, would expect the hand-off of client information from AEs. Ferriter’s groups of five took six-to-seven weeks to reach that point, during which they met the client, identified campaign goals, created a slogan, determined the target audience, and developed the campaign theme and copy points, some of which overlapped with typical creative department responsibilities, such as creating the slogan. Thus, if some of Hepler’s audio students decided that their projects might suffer without changes to some of Ferriter’s group copy points, he permitted changes with his approval. But Hepler straddled the fence, discouraging wholesale changes as a reflection of industry realities and support of Ferriter’s students, while also stating up front his commitment to fair grading of students subject to another class’s material. In the spring, McFarland would grant his advanced designers the same powers when Hepler’s writers delivered brochure copy. All students had access to the client in varying degrees from class-to-class and semester-to-semester. “They learn to communicate, compromise and develop a campaign to meet the needs of a client,” says Ferriter (2005). “In some cases the communication, through e-mail, or attending the other classes, went smoothly, in other cases poor communication resulted in less satisfactory results” (p.2). Harper and Rawson made a point of communication in their service-learning workshop, saying, “Effective communication is essential to successful service-learning” (mcli, p.1). This interaction with both the client and classes later facilitated a number of traditional service-learning benefits among later students, including the required hours of reflection about the experience.

THE HAND-OFF
Both McFarland and Hepler received Ferriter’s materials mid-semester and worked separately, since McFarland’s artists had no need of Hepler’s audio producers, and vice versa. Hepler would later realize the need to tell students early in the semester to be
on the look-out for talent suitable for Baltimore airwaves, since it is not something students routinely encounter. Like the other classes, Hepler allowed teams (of two) to tackle the project, with the stipulation that they include a typed, one-page report on specifically who did what and what problems they encountered; he did not hesitate to grade teammates differently. Hepler’s later students expanded their typed reports to include the reflections that come with service-learning and which are required under the competitive federal grant. But due to the fairly lengthy project involving site visitation and interaction with the client, the reflection process did not prove as contrived as feared. While a social work student may reflect on issues of diversity or poverty, Hepler’s students considered the contribution an audio professional could make to the community by doing normally high-cost productions, gratis, in the classroom. Says Hepler, “That is where service-learning leaves the world of contrived annoyance to students and becomes a unique, hands-on learning experience. And then it can serve curriculum not usually associated with service-learning.”

**THE ADVANCED CLASSES**

In the spring, the project was relayed from Ferriter, to Hepler and the video adjunct, to McFarland. Hepler’s writing teams needed to produce brochure copy on deadline for McFarland’s digital artists who needed to finish not only before semester’s end, but with time to spare for the inevitable client revisions. (One semester’s audio students were still doing revisions for a client months after the semester ended and a new one had begun. But they were motivated by their governor’s involvement in that semester’s suicide prevention campaign.)

Though many of the writers were graduating after this capstone course, it was their one-and-only media writing class. Thus, while the students were “advanced,” they still needed to develop their skills to the place where they could do justice to the project’s brochure copy. At issue was timing: the usual writing class started with audio copy and transitioned to television before moving on to the internet, outdoor, and so on. To facilitate McFarland’s deadline, Hepler’s class had to deal with brochure copy a few weeks into the spring semester. This caused a serious change to the instructional schedule, placing a major brochure project squarely between radio and television writing. Nonetheless, the early project allowed some comfort margin for the writers, who, schedules permitting, were encouraged to follow their work to McFarland’s class and meet the artists who would put their copy to print. Hepler found that this helped prevent disappointed writers when finished brochures returned late-semester, and enabled students to not only see the finished product, but reflect on it as well for the sake of service-learning. “It’s a good process,” says McFarland, “where my student artists get to meet what would usually be the other half of a creative team and work cooperatively to resolve design issues” (McFarland, personal communication, 2005).

After two-to-three weeks with Hepler’s teams, the project’s first polished copy moved on to McFarland’s advanced designers before spring break in mid-March. Like Hepler’s students, they had the power to change what they received to both better a real world project and address their grades. McFarland came to note many opportunities for the “enhanced academic learning” (Howard, 2001) expected of service-learning projects, including the reflection he found more inherent in creating art (p.26). His students’ back-and-forth interactions with Hepler’s writers would spawn additional reflections.
for both groups. Says McFarland (2005), “Because my students were working for an actual client, they found the course content more relevant” (p.4) This sentiment echoes the service-learning experience of Bringle and Hatcher (1999), who state, “…educational outcomes are enriched, deepened, and expanded when student learning is more engaged, active and relevant” (p.179).

As in the fall, McFarland invited Ferriter and Hepler to his class, but unlike his colleagues, McFarland formed 3-member groups specifically based on his assessment of their skills and personalities, then strived to create a class environment like that of a creative studio. “The whole class reviewed the work of each group regularly throughout the creative process,” says McFarland. “The client was included in…reviews which allowed students to hear the client’s perspective first-hand, have their own questions answered, and reduce revisions at the end of the process. “ (In fact, all four professors, adjunct included, sought client input during the projects, but achieved varying degrees of success, as discussed in part two.) McFarland says the most successful projects resulted in the print materials being used for many years (2005). “These projects have been exciting and educational,” assisting local non-profit organizations and involving students in their community. With a focus on community and effective communication, the possibilities are endless,” says McFarland (p.5).

Finally, Mass Communications video students found more favorable conditions for their PSAs, especially in terms of deadlines; the client project was the final project for the class, so there was more time for students to hone skills on early projects en route to the “grand finale”. And the upper-level videography and editing course was also taught year-round, so only advanced students addressed the project’s video needs, fall or spring semester. In addition, Michael Blum, the adjunct professor who participated in the first four projects, also ran his own full-service advertising agency, and consequently brought to the project the energy and urgency commonly found in the world of non-stop production and deadlines. Video tape for thirty-second PSAs or for longer informational museum segments was more readily obtained by students since they had more time and opportunity to make use of client resources, including the house-burning training exercise scheduled by the volunteer firefighters. “I told my students how I handled my clients,” says Blum, “and they tried to emulate that with the fire company, right down to the client presentation. There were a lot of excited students” (Blum, personal communication, 2001). Thus, as Dalton and Ingram (2004) write, both students and clients came to “learn lessons and (find) other opportunities through the experience” (p.9). One such lesson included the confidentiality required for the controlled burn, since opportunists traditionally take matters into their own hands when word gets out in advance.

PRESENTING TO THE CLIENT

At the conclusion of the fall semester, 2000, the work of four classes in three degree programs was presented to the Bel Air Volunteer Fire Company. All four professors, and a fair mix of students who could meet outside class time, extended an invitation to the client, the professors’ two deans, and local media to attend a formal presentation in a central administrative building on campus. The project’s first students received all manor of feedback from beyond their professors. The event received prominent attention in the local bi-weekly newspaper, including photographs of the professionally clad
students. But that required a Herculean scheduling effort which, even then, resulted in a second presentation to accommodate night class students, who received less fanfare. And since the first presentation, more than one project has passed in which participating classes never found out whose work “won” for reasons ranging from childbirth to the closing of a museum. Other projects experienced extended life spans for the sake of the aforementioned governor. And in year number five, the project metamorphosed into service-learning, where new experiences included pot belly pigs, llamas, and Ralph the dog. These are among the subjects to come in the conclusion to this article in the next edition of Feedback.
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ADVERTISING AVOIDANCE AND DIGITAL VIDEO RECORDERS

ABSTRACT

The researchers conducted a survey on Advertising Avoidance and Digital Video Recorders of 460 Florida State University graduate and FSU undergraduate students in the College of Communication and the College of Information. Through analyses of the surveys it was found the respondents recognized the need for advertising but avoided it. It was also found that the respondent’s main reason for purchasing a DVR would be to time shift to watch movies and primetime TV series. The potential impact of the DVR on the advertising industry could be quite significant if commercial quality does not improve and the prices of DVRs and DVR services continue to fall. Also, this avoidance may lead to product placement in television programming, that some of the respondents indicated would bring negative feelings toward some products.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Recently more and more sponsorships and product placements are slipped into the dialogue of shows. On American Idol there is the “Coke Red Room” where contestants wait to see if they have been voted off. On Trading Spaces the Swiffer Wet Jet is used to clean all of the floors. On Extreme Makeover: Home Edition Sears and Kenmore products are used in the houses. Many industry veterans such as Bob Wingerson of J. Walter Thompson contribute this shift to the invention of digital video recorders (DVRs) (personal communication, November 11, 2004).

TiVo is one of the brand names of digital video recorder. On its website (www.tivo.com) TiVo describes the device as a digital video recorder that “operates like a VCR but with a hard drive”. TiVos work with a television, a phone line, and whatever television feed the consumer might have whether it is cable, digital cable, satellite, or the television antenna. The phone line is used to gather up-to-date programming information so that TiVo knows when and how long to record specified programs.

As of 2004, TiVo could store and record more than 140 hours of shows and had an easy to use menu where the consumer could
record a whole season of a show with a click of a button. There is a button on TiVo that lets the consumer fast-forward through programs in 30 second increments (Taub, 2004). Thirty seconds is the industry standard time of an advertisement for television.

The *New York Times* reported March 18, 2004 there were approximately 3.5 million DVRs in the United States which has more than 108 million households with television (Taub, 2004). This means TiVo, around since 1999, has a following that’s fast becoming a national pastime. Proctor and Gamble Interactive Strategist Sekhar Krishnamoorthy wasn’t worried in 2001 about the gadget stating, “You have to be scared when the penetration gets high. You don’t have to be scared today” (Taub, 2004). But will this change?

Digital video recorders are working through the stages of diffusion. According to Everett Rogers (1995) diffusion is “the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (Rogers, 1995, p. 5). The difference between the diffusion of innovation and communication is that the interactions are concerned with the new idea (Rogers, 1995, p. 5). The adoption level of an innovation is shaped like an S-curve if it is in fact successful. The curve begins with few adopters and then rises rapidly until half of the population has adopted the new innovation. Then the curve rises slowly and levels off as the rest of the population adopts the new innovation (p. 257). The curve levels off because of status differences, geographical barriers, and other barriers to interaction. It becomes increasingly harder to find people that haven’t adopted the innovation as time goes on (Rogers, 1995, p. 259).

When the video cassette recorder (VCR) became popular the same fears were present that are arising with the invention of TiVo and other DVRs including fears that, “home video will...bankrupt the networks who rely on commercial advertisements that are not being zapped” (Levy, 1989, p. 40). “Zapping” in this context means avoiding advertising all together by not recording and “zipping” means fast forwarding through commercials (Levy, 1989, p. 149).

In 1985, Nielsen data showed more than one-third of people who own VCRs passed over commercials during playback (Levy, 1989). In 1984, Nielsen showed that 41 percent of reported recordings involved just 11 different programs, and out of these ten were daytime soap operas. The commercial avoidance during these programs was more than 70 percent. To deal with commercial avoidance by VCR owners, which by 1987 was more than 52 percent of TV households, some ad agencies started to bill networks for lost audiences (Levy, 1989).

In response, network executives retaliated by shifting the burden to the agencies. They said the agencies weren’t doing their job of making creative commercials that people wanted to watch. Improvement of content to make ads more trustworthy, informative, and entertaining would bring more respect to advertising as a service (Levy, 1989). This can be compared to the reaction of TiVos executives today whose answer to the ad industry is to make better commercials (Goetzl, 2001).

Today, many of the same fears that surfaced with the rise of the VCR are found today with the rise of the DVR; although the advertising industry and DVR developers seem to be bumping heads on the issue of the future of advertising.

The senior vice president of business development and revenue operations for TiVo, Morgan Guenther, said the thirty second spot will not die (Goetzl, 2001). Consumers
will just stop and watch the commercials that are interesting to them (Goetzl, 2001).

So does this mean DVRs can be a blessing to good ads? The Advertising Educational Foundation says that advertisers have mixed feelings. In one aspect, they are excited about tailoring their message, because they know exactly who is watching what. In another, the ad agencies and media companies are used to making shallow messages and spreading them over the entire medium. (Black, 2004).

According to the American Advertising Federation in September 2003, two-thirds of the agency professionals foresee this transition of content and marketing as a future trend. Seventy-three percent of clients and 61 percent of agency professionals see technologies, such as TiVo, as a threat to traditional advertising. Fourteen percent of agencies fear DVRs spell the death of the 30-second spot (American Advertising Federation, 2003), while clients are split on the impact of DVRs.

The American Broadcast Companies has taken a stand recently on the issue backing technology that would disable the fast-forward button on DVRs. “I’m not so sure that the whole issue really is one of commercial avoidance,” Mike Shaw, ABC President of Advertising Sales said. “It really is a matter of convenience—so you don’t miss your favorite show. And quite frankly, we’re just training a new generation of viewers to skip commercials because they can,” (Goetzl & Friedman, 2006).

A study conducted in 2000-2001 by Ferguson and Perse on “Audience Satisfaction among TiVo and ReplayTV Users” with a sample of DVR users found in a DVR chatroom (Ferguson, 2004) showed many interesting results. The researchers found their sample watched about 20-minutes more television per day (255.85 minutes) than the Nielsen sample that corresponded with the age and sex categories of their respondents (236.14 minutes for men age 25 to 54). The functions found to be the most widely used were to fast-forward past commercials and to record programs shown at inconvenient times (Ferguson, 2004).

The study hypothesized that the DVR would replace the VCR in recording because the study showed their sample thought it was easier to record with a DVR and that participants recorded more with a DVR. The sample also said they are less likely to watch commercials and channel surf, since they have a DVR. The sample thought they watched television with their DVR with more enjoyment and control (Ferguson, 2004).

**METHOD**

The researchers conducted a convenience sample survey of 460 Florida State University undergraduate and graduate students to examine how they might use a DVR. The survey was distributed to classes in both the Department of Communication and College of Information. Undergraduate and graduate students were also used to give more variance to the results. Permission was granted by the instructors of each class before surveys were distributed. Instructors in each department were sent a letter via e-mail describing the thesis work and were asked to let their class participate. Once the professor responded, a time was established to distribute the survey to the students or a hyperlink was emailed to the class directing students to the online survey. The mode of distribution was determined by the instructor.

The survey questions were adapted from *Attitudes of Canadians Toward Advertising on Television* (Minister of Supply and Service Canada, 1978) and set up on a seven point
Likert-type scale with “Completely Disagree” and “Completely Agree” on the ends of each scale. Number values were assigned so that each question had worth. An open ended question was included about the subject’s thoughts about DVRs and advertising so that, if the subject has strong feelings about either, they could be expressed. The period of data collection was three weeks. The data from the online surveys were combined with surveys taken on paper and then converted to an SPSS file for analysis.

RESULTS

Demographics
Approximately 70 percent of participants were female. The mean age was approximately 23. The most common age (mode) was 21. Nearly 70 percent of the participants were Caucasian. These numbers are consistent with the breakdown of the student body reported in Florida State University’s 2003 Student Fact Sheet (Florida State University Office of Institutional Research, 2003). More than 65 percent of the students surveyed were juniors or seniors in college.

Psychographics
The students reported watching about nine hours of television during the week and nearly six hours on the weekend (See Table 1). This is slightly less than the number reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that reported on an average day” persons in the U.S. spent 5.1 hours a day doing leisure activities (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). Half of this time was spent watching television averaging around 2.57 hours a day (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). This equals twelve hours during the week. This report did not mention weekend television watching hours.

Table 1. Television viewed on weekdays and weekends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately how many hours do you spend watching television on the weekdays?</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>9.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately how many hours do you spend watching television on the weekend?</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>6.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey participants think advertising should remain on television with the majority believing there should be advertising on television, it is necessary to our economy, and advertising informs us about new products on the market.

In response to the “technologies owned” questions, the majority of the respondents reported they owned or had owned wireless Internet service, a scanner, a digital camera, and a DVD player. They reported they did not own a GIS, PDA, or satellite radio.
The responses were split on owning MP3 players and camera phones.

**R1:** To what degree can consumers avoid advertisements?

The data shows that with a mean of 6.18 the majority of respondents would often fast forward through commercials if they had a DVR (see Chart 1). If respondents hypothetically had a DVR, few (a mean of 2.58) would go back to commercials they liked (see Chart 2). The majority of respondents avoid advertising by changing the channel, or by doing something else until the commercial break is over (See Table 2).

![Chart 1. If you had a DVR how often do you think you would fastforward or skip through commercials?](chart.png)
Table 2. Television commercial viewing behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewing Behavior</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I change the station to see what's on the other channels when a commercial comes on.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get annoyed when a commercial comes on.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do something else until the commercial break is over.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watch the commercials.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make a point of seeing a commercial that I like.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R2: What are the reasons potential users buy DVRs?

The data shows that with 61.5 percent of the responses, time shifting would be the first reason potential users would buy a DVR (see Chart 3). Following time shifting is to record an entire season of a program (18 percent), to avoid advertising (12.2 percent), to watch programs with my favorite actor or actress (4.8 percent), and to have my DVR suggest programming for me (1.3 percent). These results are consistent with the results found in the Ferguson (2004) study, that showed fast-forwarding and time shifting to be the most popular functions on the DVR.

Programming that respondents would potentially record the most often were movies followed by primetime TV series (see Table 3). Male respondents indicated they would potentially record sports, children’s shows, and other programming more than women respondents. Women respondents indicated they would record soap operas more than male respondents.

![Chart 3. If money wasn’t an issue, what would be your primary reason for purchasing a DVR? (select only one)](chart3.png)
**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

According to the data shown here these participants fit into the “early adopter” category of the diffusion theory because they don’t have the money yet to be innovators but aren’t the most numerous of today’s population. When analyzing the responses concerning “technologies owned” the researchers saw the least popular technologies with this population are those with ongoing paid services. This population enjoys storage devices and is beginning to adopt storage devices that are portable. The researchers hypothesizes ongoing fees may be the strong barrier to those who haven’t purchased a DVR, because they don’t have a stable income and aren’t sure they can continue the service.

The researchers conclude from the data from RQ 1 that if this population of consumers did own a DVR they would use it readily to avoid advertisements. The results concerning fast forwarding through commercials are consistent with the Nielson (1989) study that showed about 66 percent of U.S. VCR owners fast forwarded through taped commercials (Gilmore, 1993).

The researchers results concerning going back to re-watch commercials disagrees with the InsightExpress (2004) study that reported 54 percent of their sample have rewound to commercials. The researchers hypothesizes this might be attributed to the different populations participating in the surveys, and that the Insight Express participants were actual DVR owners.

Movies and primetime television series are the forums most often recorded by this population. The researchers hypothesizes this is because these types of programs are not time sensitive. They have a stronger possibility of being watched repeatedly than other programming. For example, soap operas aren’t sold in stores on DVDs but movies and primetime television series are.

The researchers concludes that once the target population has a reliable income and if the price of the DVR and its services becomes less expensive many will purchase a DVR and its services and most will use it to avoid advertising.
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NEW INTERFACE FOR YAHOO!

When Yahoo! first appeared on the Web scene in the 1990s, it was primarily designed as a Web directory that provided users with links to various sites. Over the years, the directory has morphed from a simple search tool to a site that provides a variety of information and news, shopping and e-commerce features, and interpersonal communication such as Instant Messenger, chat, and email.

Recently, the people at Yahoo! have provided users an opportunity to test a new iteration of the directory’s home page. Compared with the previous edition of the interface, the newly revised Yahoo! provides some interesting design features, as well as content and an interface that appears to indicate some new directions for the company’s online offerings. Consolidation, grouping, simplification, and enhanced information are keys to the new home page design.

One feature that users will immediately notice is the prominence of news on Yahoo!’s opening page. In the previous design, news links were placed in one box in the upper section of the right-hand column. The new interface, by comparison, makes news more prominent through two boxed sections which feature tabbed menu items. The site also groups news items, such as placing entertainment as a tab in the section with sports and life rather than in a separate box.

Personal information resources and communications, including email, messenger, and weather, have been brought together into one area. This section provides large buttons that are easily located on the screen, and that feature rollovers with drop-down details.

Simplification is accomplished by reducing the redundancy of certain links. For example, finance and music, which were formerly located both at the top of the page and with a series of links in a box, are now located in a group of links. Consolidation and grouping has also reduced the overall number of individually boxed sections on the home page.

Yahoo! users will also find more flexibility in the home page interface. Rather than simply a two-column format, users can select either two or three columns. This provides more options depending upon whether the user would like a wide or narrow format. The differences in the column options largely revolve around the placement of sections. Also, users who like more control over their Web environments are able to select the tint of the page from among five colors. Gradient colored section titles with white section backgrounds also helps to create a more open feeling that assists in eye movement through the page.

Although not a specific characteristic of the revised home page, the enhanced map feature is worth noting. The map, which already has been available for users to test, provides the traditional address locator, as well an option for a satellite view or a hybrid viewing. Selecting the hybrid feature overlays street names over the satellite image.

In addition to the prominent changes listed above, there are several cosmetic changes that should be noted. One is that the logo has been moved from the center of the page to the upper left corner. From a design standpoint, this places the company’s name in the place that is typical for corporate identity on Web sites. Another change is that the search field has been moved to the top center of the page to the right of the logo.
In review of the new Yahoo! home page interface, there are several items that make the new design a positive experience. First is the increased focus on news and information as evidenced in the addition of enlarged sections and increased options with tabs. Second, segmenting the page by type and grouping similar features and elements makes it easier to locate material of interest. Along with that are the colored boxes that pull together categories of links. Third is user control, which includes flexibility in column layout and interface colors.

For Web design and development instructors, the new Yahoo! interface offers good examples of grouping and placement, prominence, simplification, visual weight, and the use of color both to enhance aesthetics and to guide the user through page contents. Comparing the previous and new home pages provides an opportunity for students to analyze evolving iterations in design, interactivity and the overall effectiveness of site communication.

Reviewed by:
Clark Greer
Associate Professor
Communication Arts Department
Cedarville University
greerc@cedarville.edu
DAVID BYLAND, PRESIDENT OF BEA 2006-07

Dr. David Byland, Associate Professor of Communication Arts, has been teaching since 1983, and joined the Oklahoma Baptist University faculty in 1991. He served as president of the Oklahoma Broadcast Education Association from 2000-2001. He has been a member of BEA for nearly twenty years and has served the Association in various capacities over the years. Byland was elected to the BEA Board of Directors as the District V representative in 2001, and to the Executive Committee of the Board in 2004.

Byland teaches classes in computer graphics for video, writing for the mass media, television production, audio and multimedia production. He also has taught classes in public relations, web page design and development, communications law and regulation, and radio and television announcing. In addition to his duties at OBU, Byland is the president of Red Lion Video Productions, which produces corporate and nonprofit video.

Byland’s wife, Laura, is director of OBU Theatre and an assistant professor of theatre. They have three daughters: Sarah, an OBU senior; Hannah, a sophomore at William Jewell College; and Rebekah, a sophomore at Liberty High School in Shawnee.
KATHLEEN KEEFE BIO VICE PRESIDENT, SALES

Kathleen Keefe is Vice President, Sales, for Hearst-Argyle Television, overseeing sales efforts at the Company’s 28 television stations.

Keefe previously was Vice President, Sales and Marketing for Post-Newsweek Stations, Inc. the television station group of the Washington Post Company. During a 14-year career at Post-Newsweek, she served in sales positions at WFSB-TV, Hartford and KPRC-TV, Houston, before becoming general manager of WKMG-TV, Orlando. Among her accomplishments at the Post-Newsweek group, she oversaw the creation, development and implementation of a major television environmental campaign, “Get Down to Earth,” which was nominated for a national EMMY Award.

Prior to joining Post-Newsweek, Keefe served as an Account Executive and then as a Sales Manager for MMT Sales, Inc., a leading television ad-sales rep firm. She began her career at Young & Rubicam, rising to the position of spot broadcast buyer.

Kathleen is a graduate of Trinity College in Washington, D.C. She currently serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Television Bureau of Advertising, the International Radio and Television Society (IRTS) and the Media Ratings Council. She also serves as the Vice Chairman for the IRTS Foundation Board. She also has served as a director or advisor for numerous civic, charitable and industry organizations including Give Kids the World, Florida Hospital, American Red Cross, United Way, Galleria (Houston) Chamber of Commerce, Houston Advertising Federation, Ronald McDonald House, Greater Hartford Club and New England Broadcasters Association.
KIM ZARKIN CHAIRING BEA 2007 CONFERENCE

Kim Zarkin is an associate professor in the Communication and Masters of Professional Communication programs at Westminster College in Salt Lake City. She teaches traditional Electronic Media courses like Intro to the Mass Media and Communication Law and Ethics as well as classes in Visual Communication, Advertising, and Public Relations. Despite coming from a purely broadcasting background, and with much trepidation, Kim recently took over as advisor for The Forum, Westminster’s student newspaper.

Kim’s research is centered on the regulation of sexually explicit media. At BEA, she regularly appears on the popular Annual Telecom Act Update, keeping everyone informed as to what you can and can’t say on broadcast television.

Kim has published two books. The first was based on her dissertation and looked at the impact of religious right groups on the FCC. Anti-Indecency Groups and the Federal Communications Commission: A Study in the Politics of Broadcast Regulation was published by The Edwin Mellen Press in 2003. Her second book was co-authored with her husband, Westminster Political Science Professor Michael Zarkin. The Federal Communications Commission Front Line in the Culture and Regulation Wars was published by Greenwood Press in April of 2006. It is the first book on the Commission to detail the regulatory history of both broadcasting and telephony.

Before coming to Westminster in the fall of 2003, Kim taught for two years at Texas Woman’s University in Denton, TX and three years at LaSalle University in Philadelphia.

Kim has a Ph.D. from the University of Florida, a M.A. in Radio from Emerson College in Boston, and a B.A. in Mass Communications from James Madison University.

Go Gators!
CMU STUDENTS WIN PRESTIGIOUS BAYLISS RADIO SCHOLARSHIPS

MOUNT PLEASANT - Two students from Central Michigan University’s School of Broadcast and Cinematic Arts have been selected to receive competitive national scholarships from The John Bayliss Broadcast Foundation.

Senior Bryan Carr of Gaylord and junior Harrison “Harry” Van Dort of Zeeland are among 14 undergraduate and graduate students nationwide to receive $5,000 Bayliss Radio Scholarships. CMU is one of only two institutions to have more than one scholarship recipient in 2006.

“BCA is the only program nationally to have multiple Bayliss Scholarship winners two years in a row,” said School of Broadcast and Cinematic Arts Director Peter Orlik. “This is a testament to the character and hard work of the students in our program and the dedication of the faculty in honing their skills.”

In an e-mail message to Orlik, Bayliss Foundation Executive Director Kit Hunter Franke praised the caliber of the scholarship recipients throughout the program’s 21-year history.

“Since 1985, over 300 exceptional candidates have been selected to become Bayliss Broadcasters, our radio scholarship recipients,” wrote Hunter Franke. “These ambitious students were selected to receive the Bayliss Radio Scholarship because of their academic achievement and extracurricular radio activities, their passion for radio, and their desire to contribute to the overall advancement of the radio industry.”

The John Bayliss Broadcast Foundation was created in 1985 in memory of radio executive John Bayliss. The foundation awards up to 15 Bayliss Radio Scholarships annually. The highly competitive scholarship is given to junior, senior or graduate-level college students who have maintained a grade point average of 3.0 or better and are preparing for a career in radio.
STUDENT TELEVISION NEWS COMPETITION SHOWS GREAT DEPTH OF TALENT

By Dana Rosengard

For the fifth year in a row, the News Division coordinated a national student television news competition in conjunction with the BEA national convention in Las Vegas. Once again this year the number of entries went up: 219 tapes from 31 schools across the seven television categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>newscast (individual)</th>
<th>hard news reporting</th>
<th>feature news reporting</th>
<th>sports news reporting</th>
<th>anchor NEWS</th>
<th>anchor SPORTS</th>
<th>anchor WX</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young U.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon State College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marist College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State U.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morris University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Cloud State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois U.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Miami</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Montana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of No. Carolina-C. Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oklahoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

totals 39 48 56 20 26 14 16 219
Once the entries were all opened, categorized and catalogued, the judging process began. Again this year, due to the sheer number of entries, a 2-step judging process was used: the best in each category following preliminary judging were sent back out for a second round of judging. After that first round of evaluation, 63 entries remained in consideration for top News Division student television awards. Certificates of congratulations were presented to all the finalists at the awards session in Las Vegas in April.

**NEWSCAST (individual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>School Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>Kristine Johnson</td>
<td>ASU NewsWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brigham Young U.</td>
<td>Dorian Cundick</td>
<td>Best of BYU (11/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois U.</td>
<td>Kate Henderson</td>
<td>NewsWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elon University</td>
<td>Jason Boyer</td>
<td>Phoenix14News (9/26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lyndon State College</td>
<td>Amanda Wheeler &amp; Matt Bradford</td>
<td>News 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Paula Atallah</td>
<td>Centre County Report (4/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Saint Cloud State U.</td>
<td>Bob Pfeilsticker</td>
<td>UTVS News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sam Houston State U</td>
<td>Ashley Goudeau</td>
<td>News 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Brynne Tuggle</td>
<td>Carolina Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Kristi Keck</td>
<td>Carolina Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>Jason Donner</td>
<td>Annenberg TV News (11/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>Arielle Wolin</td>
<td>Annenberg TV News (10/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Western Kentucky U.</td>
<td>Aron Pryor</td>
<td>WKU NewsChannel 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HARD NEWS REPORTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Reporting Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>Jeff Stensland</td>
<td>Adderall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>Elizabeth Herrgott</td>
<td>Meth Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>Ian Schwartz</td>
<td>Airport Parking Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harding University</td>
<td>Kim Frizzell, Anna Brinley</td>
<td>Eminent Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lyndon State College</td>
<td>Kevin Jacobsen</td>
<td>Double Fatal Reax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penn State U.</td>
<td>Jessica Woiner</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Southern Illinois U.</td>
<td>Lindsey Morone</td>
<td>Seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td>Jake Carpenter</td>
<td>Lucky Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U of Maryland</td>
<td>Andrew Williamson</td>
<td>Bad Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U of Montana</td>
<td>Stan Pillmna, A. Atkins</td>
<td>Meth on Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Sean Maroney</td>
<td>Tulane Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Lydia Garlikov</td>
<td>County Wealth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEATURE NEWS REPORTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona State Univ</td>
<td>Zahid Arab</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime Scene Cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arizona State Univ</td>
<td>Lauren Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coupon Sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arizona State Univ</td>
<td>Ian Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arizona State Univ</td>
<td>Monique Griego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tattoo Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elon University</td>
<td>David Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting the Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ithaca College</td>
<td>Ray Villeda &amp; Christoper C</td>
<td>Ithaca is Drugged? (part 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lyndon State College</td>
<td>Andy Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>NH Cross Country Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Penn State U.</td>
<td>Matt Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Southern Illinois Uni</td>
<td>Lindsey Morone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td>Kendra Clawson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trick or Treat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>U. of Montana</td>
<td>TiffanyToepper, T. Gary</td>
<td>Ski Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Ross Weidner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maple View Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Natasha Vukelic</td>
<td></td>
<td>World Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Elizabeth Crumpler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPORTS REPORTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brigham Young U</td>
<td>Jason Tang</td>
<td></td>
<td>BYU Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colorado State U</td>
<td>Zach Borg</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Walk-on’s Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ithaca College</td>
<td>Nathan Lindberg/Colin B</td>
<td>The Cortaca Jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Penn State U.</td>
<td>Mark Loucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Excitement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U. of Alabama</td>
<td>John Huddleston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hillcrest Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U. of Montana</td>
<td>Eli Bierwag, K. Farmer</td>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>Heather Catlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEWS ANCHOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>Wyatt Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Tara Higgerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Shaheen Syal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Lydia Garlikov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Philip Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Rachael Kahne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Trina Orlando</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEATHER ANCHOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
<td>Jenni Ketchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harding University</td>
<td>Andrew Leeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Robb Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Carrie Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Scott Kegley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPORTS ANCHOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brigham Young U.</td>
<td>Jason Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elon University</td>
<td>Brian Formica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U. of Alabama</td>
<td>John Huddleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>Dan Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>Rob McPherson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These finalists represent 23 different colleges and universities, reflecting a wide spectrum of strong programs across the country. After the second round of judging, the first, second and third place entries represented 13 different schools and each of the seven categories of competition was won by students from different program. Talk about a wealth of talent from a wide collection of curriculum! These final placements were announced during a very exciting awards program on Wednesday, April 26th, at the BEA national convention in Las Vegas. Many of the finalists had gathered to see clips of the finalists’ work and learn where in the top ranks they had placed in the competition. In all, 80 working television journalists at 19 stations in 12 states evaluated the work of our students. And the winners are:

**NEWSCAST (individual)**

1st  Elon University  Jason Boyer  Phoenix14 News (9/26)
2nd  Arizona State U.  Kristine Johnson  ASU NewsWatch
3rd  U. of North Carolina  Brynne Tuggle  Carolina Week
3rd  U. of North Carolina  Kristi Keck  Carolina Week

BEA News Division student television national awards competition chair Dana Rosengard, University of Oklahoma, congratulates Linda Lashendock, Elon University, on that school’s individual newscast win — it’s second individual newscast win in two years!
Denise Dowling, center, University of Montana, shows off her students and the first place plaques in sports reporting awarded to Eli Bierwag and Kevin Farmer plus an impressive collection of finalist certificates!

NEWS ANCHOR
1st  U. of North Carolina   Lydia Garlikov
2nd  U. of Southern California   Trina Orlando
3rd  Southern Illinois U.   Wyatt Wallace

WEATHER ANCHOR
1st  Eastern Illinois University University   Jenni Ketchmark
2nd  U. of North Carolina   Robb Ellis
3rd  Harding University   Andrew Leeper

(from WEIU website)
SPORTS ANCHOR
1st U. of Alabama John Huddleston
2nd U. of Southern California Dan Page
3rd Brigham Young University Jason Tang

Once again this year, the BEA News Division competition fed into the Festival for Media Arts, the association-wide recognition program for students and faculty sponsored by the Charles & Lucille King Family Foundation and Avid. At the grand awards ceremony produced by a team from Elon University, the News Division presented its best of festival student television award to Ian Schwartz, Arizona State University, for his work across two competition categories: hard news reporting (“Airport Parking Fees”) and feature news reporting (“Drifting”). The student newscast team award went to “Carolina Week,” the student newscast produced at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This is the first time the student newscast team award had been part of the Festival.

The “Carolina Week” team from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, featuring Kristi Keck and Brynne Tuggle, front row-center, accepting the debut newscast team Festival award.

Dana Rosengard is the McMahon Centennial Professor in the College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Oklahoma. A co-founder of this News Division student awards program and a board member of the BEA Festival of Media Arts, he stepped down from both posts following the 2006 BEA convention.
NAB/BEA ANNOUNCE FUTURE CONFERENCE DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NAB Show</th>
<th>BEA Show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>April 16-19</td>
<td>April 18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>April 14-17</td>
<td>April 16-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>April 20-23</td>
<td>April 22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>April 12-15</td>
<td>April 14-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>April 11-14</td>
<td>April 13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>April 16-19</td>
<td>April 18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>April 8-11</td>
<td>April 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>April 7-10</td>
<td>April 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>April 13-16</td>
<td>April 15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April 18-21</td>
<td>April 20-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>April 24-27</td>
<td>April 26-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>April 9-12</td>
<td>April 11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>April 15-18</td>
<td>April 17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>April 20-23</td>
<td>April 22-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEA INTEREST DIVISIONS

BEA’s interest divisions are a great opportunity to become an active member in the Association. Each division offers newsletters, paper competitions with cash awards and networking for research, curriculum and job opportunities. Leadership in the divisions provide visibility for your own work to other BEA members and to the electronic media industry. The following links take you to a information about each division and a listing of leadership you can contact if you would like more information.

Visit [http://www.beaweb.org/divisions.html](http://www.beaweb.org/divisions.html) to see information on each division.

Interest division bylaws (requires PDF reader):

- Courses, Curricula and Administration
- Gender Issues
- History
- International
- Law and Policy
- Management and Sales
- Multicultural
- News
- Production, Aesthetics & Criticism
- Radio & Audio Media
- Research
- Student Media Advisors
- Two Year/Small College
- Writing
Got a syllabus to share with BEA? Send it to Joe Misiewicz at jmisiewicz@bsu.edu.

Herman Howard-Instructor
Spring 2006 semester
Office Hours: TBA
704 330 1481-OFFICE
hhoward@jcsu.edu
Special Topics: COM 439 Media Coverage of Space flight

Course Description: This is a special topics course. This course will feature the media coverage of the American space flight program from 1961-present. Particular attention will be given to the actual Television/Media coverage of the American missions with study of broadcasters coverage and the scientific missions involved. Open to majors of Communication Arts, Mathematics and Physics and Natural Sciences.

Objectives/Competencies: In this course, students will:
1) Provide a Mission Report to their peers on a completed American space mission with a scientific objective.
2) Write and present on a Book Report that focuses on the life of an American astronaut or NASA Engineer.
3) Write weekly re-action papers from the broadcasts shown in class.
4) Take a MID-TERM and a FINAL EXAM from the course textbook.

Requirements and Criteria:

Methods of Teaching: Class sessions will involve lectures/discussions of course content relating to the media coverage of space flight. Classes will include weekly video sessions containing broadcast coverage of the space flights. In fairness to all, there will be no “extra credit,” options in this course.

Evaluation and Weights:
25% Mission Report
25% Book Report
25% Weekly reaction papers
25% Tests

University Grading Scale
90-100=A
80-89=B
70-79=C
60-69=D
BELOW 60=F

The lowest grade will be dropped at the end of the semester. Each class project is worth 100 points.

Resource Materials: Internet and library access, computer, JCSU laptop, dictionary,

WEEKLY SCHEDULE
Week 1: Introduction to the course
Week 4: Lecture: “Project Gemini,” VIDEO: The Legacy of Gemini and File footage of Gemini 8
Week 5: Lecture: “The Apollo Program,” VIDEO: Apollo One
Week 6: VIDEO: “From the Earth to the Moon, Parts 1 and 2,”
Week 7: “The DISH,”
Week 8: Mid-term exam from course material
Week 9: CBS and NBC Coverage of Apollo 11 (taped 7/16/69)
Week 10: Mission Reports are due/speeches
Week 11: VIDEO: Apollo 13 documentary “To the Edge and Back,”
Week 12: Lecture on the History of the Space Shuttle Program; VIDEO: “Challenger,”
Week 13: Lecture on the STS-114 Return to Flight Mission; VIDEO: STS-114, Eileen Collins and Mike Griffin on Meet the Press (taped 7/31/05)
Week 14: Book Reports are due
Week 15: VIDEO SHOWING: Meet The Press (taped 7/13/69), and the scientific missions from Apollos 15, 16, 17
Week 16: FINAL EXAM

SPECIAL VIEWINGS TO BE SHOWN IN CLASS:
Walter Cronkite and the CBS EVENING NEWS from 7/15/69-the day before Apollo 11, and 7/16/69, launch day
Cronkite’s coverage of the Apollo 8 launch from 12/21/68
*Mission reports from the Mercury/Apollo flights
*Edited reports from the early space shuttle launches from April 1981

MISSION REPORTS
For this project, each student will complete a 10-15 minute presentation of a completed space mission from 1961-present. You can research any flight from the
Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, Skylab, and space shuttle era. In your class report, provide information to your peers as follows:

1) Describe the actual mission and flight?
2) Provide the dates of the mission.
3) Crew members
4) Discuss/explain the overall mission and scientific objectives.
5) Describe the amount of media coverage devoted to this mission.
6) Tell us “Did this flight enhanced the scientific/educational/media community as a result?”
7) Ideas of future research as a result of this mission.

Submit a one-page outline to each member of the class prior to your presentation. Power Point can be used for this project. You can also obtain information on any specific mission via the NASA website. Or by reading the MISSION REPORTS found at the Books-a-Million bookstore at the Concord Mills in the Science section.

MOST WELL KNOWN AMERICAN MISSIONS


BOOK REPORTS

This is a two-part project; first write a 5-7-page essay on any American astronaut/NASA engineer (dead or alive). Write a detailed story on the life of this individual. Second, on the due date, present your findings to the class. You can use Power Point to showcase any visual effects from your research. While writing your paper, focus on these major details:

1) Who is this astronaut/engineer? Why did you decide to study this individual?
2) Analyze the major milestones of this person’s career, such as educational background, flight training, scientific research, special awards, leadership and etc.
3) Describe the missions this person has flown or the flights this person has engineered, provide detailed information of the specific activities conducted by this person, focus on the engineering and scientific duties.
4) What has this person achieved after his/her space flight or NASA career? Provide information on how this person has carried his/her legacy for others.
5) Provide your overall opinions to this person’s contributions to the science/engineering industry.

EXAMPLES OF BOOK REPORT TOPICS

Mae Jamison: first African-American female astronaut
Ron McNair: African-American astronaut from Lake City, SC, completed his undergraduate work at North Carolina A&T, you may research the school to find out his professors and etc.
Eileen Collins: First woman commander
Alan Shepard: First American into space
John Glenn: first American to orbit the earth, and oldest human to fly into space at age 77 in 1998.
Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin; first men to walk on moon. 

www.buzzaldrin.com is Aldrin’s current website

Walter Cronkite, Miles O’Brien, Jules Bergman, David Brinkley= were (and are) major media players who covered these flights and astronauts

Ed White: first American to “walk,” in space
Sally Ride: first American woman in space
Guy Bluford: first African-American in space
John Young: only man to fly in the Gemini, Apollo and space shuttle series
Leroy Chaio: first Asian American to command the International Space Station (ISS)
Fred Gregory: first African-American to command a space shuttle flight

RECOMMENDED BOOKS TO REVIEW FROM THE INSTRUCTOR

Frank Borman COUNTDOWN-This is written more from a management’s perspective of Borman’s life. Commander of Apollo 8
Alan Shepard and Deke Slayton MOONSHOT-This was co-written with MSNBC Reporter Jay Barberee, not much on personal reflections, but a nice historical review of the Apollo program.
Mike Collins CARRYING THE FIRE-Perhaps one of the better-written books by an astronaut, Collins writes more like poet, than an observer. Pilot of Apollo 11
Jerry Lingerer MISSION TO MIR and LETTERS FROM MIR. Lingerer writes about his background in MISSION but compiles a daily journal in LETTERS to his son. Lingerer is a Space Analyst for NBC and completed his graduate work at UNC-Chapel Hill.
Walt Cunningham THE ALL AMERICAN BOYS-A very critical, hard-slapping point of view from Cunningham who even rates his co-workers and criticizes NASA in this book. A must read.
Walter Cronkite A REPORTER’S LIFE-The autobiography of Cronkite, but provides only a few chapters on his coverage of the flights. His writing is fair, but not as eloquent as David Brinkley’s writing.
John Glenn MY LIFE STORY-Interesting tale on how he battled personal and weight problems, but as American and proud, was “unsaid leader,” among Mercury 7 astros. The text had some minor grammatical errors that the editor did not catch.
Buzz Aldrin’s RETURN FROM EARTH (1973), -A very poignant and personal tale of Aldrin’s life after his NASA career. This text is hard to obtain, but well worth it. Aldrin’s personal bouts of alcoholism and marriages highlight this book.
Charlie Duke- MOONWALKER- Another interesting tale from an Apollo astro, Duke writes about his life-changing experience and becomes a devout Christian after his Apollo 16 moonwalk. Duke was born in Charlotte. His wife also writes a chapter.
Gordon Cooper-KEEPING THE FAITH- story about Cooper’s NASA career, but the book takes a swing to the dull and drab as he writes about sea diving and the after-life. Not overall organized, but the first half of the book is enlightening.
Chris Craft MY LIFE IN MISSION CONTROL- Craft is the first ever Flight Director at NASA and writes an interesting tale of engineering and flight dynamics. Easy to read.
However, Gene Kranz’s book is very technical and the layman can get lost digesting this information. Though highly intelligent, Kranz, I feel, does a poor job in “connect-
ing," to the average reader.

REACTION PAPERS

Each week, we will watch actual broadcasts/documentaries/movies from the topics discussed in class. Students will submit a reaction paper (1-2 pages), from the previous week’s viewing. In writing your reaction paper, address the following concepts:

1) Discuss the viewing you have seen in detail.
2) Provide your overall analysis, what did you like or dislike from the viewing.
3) What does this mean to the study of media and science?
4) What overall recommendations do you have in regards to this viewing, and grade this broadcast from a scale of 1-10 and why?
Ball State University graduate student Michelle Calka compiled this list of authors for past Feedback issues.
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Ratemyprofessor.com: Managing Student Feedback of Faculty in an Age of Instant Gratification. May 2005.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bohn, Tom</td>
<td>The Life Cycle of an Administrator or Tales From the Dark Side. May 2002.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Participation of Women in the 2001 Annual Convention of NAB and BEA. May 2002.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck, Christine</td>
<td>Planning For Growth in Years of Restricted Resources. September 2003.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Chandra</td>
<td>Interactive Broadcast Classes: Teaching the Basics Should Not be Boring. March 2005.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone, Stacey</td>
<td>From CNN to PhD: The Experience of Expectations. August 2002.</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
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Diary of a Digital TV Studio Conversion: Or How a Department Chair Learned to Stop Worrying and Love His Contractor. November 2003.
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Edwards, Dale L.
How Do We Select Them, and What Do We Teach Them? March 2005.


Engstrom, Erika.
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From Concept to Screen: An Overview of Film and Television Production. [Review]. May 2002.


Farina, Tony.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Which is the Better for Learning?</td>
<td>Garon, Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So Where's the Luster in Your Cluster?</td>
<td>Garner, Genie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcasters-in-Residence Program: A Review</td>
<td>Gerberding, Joan E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining the Glass Ceiling.</td>
<td>Giroux, Valerie Manno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimenting with Video Streaming Technology in Public Speaking.</td>
<td>Godfrey, Donald G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Festival Premiers Creative Works! The International BEA Festival of Film, Video and Media Arts.</td>
<td>Ha, Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense-Making and the Personal Video Recorder.</td>
<td>Goldbaum, Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open vs. Closed: Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>Gutenko, Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in Digital Production Course Instruction.</td>
<td>Hanson, Jarice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ideal Teaching TV Studio.</td>
<td>Hardenbergh, Margot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accuracy in Local Television News – Revisited: Are Things Any Different 25</td>
<td>Harmon, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Commercial Broadcaster Choices Under the New Rules for Political Time.</td>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**BEA Representatives**  
Joe Foote  
Doug Boyd

### Council of Communications Associations (CCA)

David Byland  
Tom Berg  
Heather Birks

### Council of National Journalism Organizations

David Byland  
Heather Birks

### Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media

Don Godfrey, Editor, Year 1

### Journal of Radio Studies

Doug Ferguson, Editor, Year 1

### Feedback Electronic

Joe Misiewicz, Editor, Year 6

### BEA Membership Directory

Rebecca Ann Lind, Editor, Year 4
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berry@wmar.com

Erica Farber  
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efarber@RadioAndRecords.com

Kathleen Keefe  
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### [ BROADCAST ASSOCIATIONS ]

| Alaska Broadcasters Association                  | New Jersey Broadcasters Association                        |
| Arizona Broadcasters Association                | New Mexico Broadcasters Association                        |
| California Broadcasters Association             | New York Association of Broadcasters                       |
| Connecticut Broadcasters Association            | North Carolina Association of Broadcasters                |
| Florida Association of Broadcasters, Inc.       | North Dakota Broadcasters Association                      |
| Georgia Association of Broadcasters             | Ohio Association of Broadcasters                          |
| Idaho Broadcasters Association                  | Oklahoma Association of Broadcasters                       |
| Illinois Broadcasters Association               | Oregon Association of Broadcasters                         |
| Kansas Association of Broadcasters              | Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters                  |
| Kentucky Broadcasters Association               | South Carolina Broadcasters Association                    |
| Louisiana Association of Broadcasting          | Tennessee Association of Broadcasters                     |
| Maine Association of Broadcasters               | Texas Association of Broadcasters                          |
| Maryland Broadcasters Association               | Utah Association of Broadcasters                           |
| Massachusetts Broadcasters Association          | Virginia Association Of Broadcasters                       |
| Michigan Association of Broadcasters            | Washington State Association of Broadcasters              |
| Minnesota Broadcasters Association              | West Virginia Broadcasters Association                     |
| Missouri Broadcasters Association               | Wisconsin Broadcasters Association                        |
| Nebraska Broadcasters Association               | Wyoming Association of Broadcasters                       |
| Nevada Broadcasters Association                 |                                                           |
| New Hampshire Association of Broadcasters       |                                                           |

### [ MEDIA PUBLICATIONS ]

| Broadcasting & Cable                               | http://www.broadcastingcable.com/ |
| Cable Connect (Cable In the Classroom)             | http://www.ciconline.com/default.htm |
| Cablevision                                        | http://www.reedtelevision.com/ |
| College Music Journal (CMJ)                        | http://www.cmj.com/ |
| Editor & Publisher                                 | http://www.editorandpublisher.com/eandp/index.jsp |
| EQ Magazine                                        | http://www.eqmag.com/ |
| Mix Magazine                                       | http://www.mixonline.com/ |
| Multichannel News                                  | http://www.multichannel.com/ |
| Production Weekly                                  | http://www.productionweekly.com/site.html |
| Pro Sound News                                     | http://www.prosoundnews.com/ |
| Radio & Records                                    | http://www.radioandrecords.com/ |

### [ MEMBERS ]

| Academy of TV Arts & Sciences Foundation               | California Broadcasters Association                     |
| Anton/Bauer, Inc.                                     | Chicago Vocational Career Academy                      |
| Arizona Broadcasters Association                       | Illinois Broadcasters Association                      |
| Automated Data Systems                                | Indiana Broadcasters Association                       |
| Broadcasting Development Fund Program Distributor     | Indiana University Libraries                           |
|                                                           | Intercollegiate Broadcasting System                    |
|                                                           | Iowa Broadcasters Association                           |

### [ ASSOCIATE ]

| Broadcasting & Cable                               | http://www.broadcastingcable.com/ |
| Cable Connect (Cable In the Classroom)             | http://www.ciconline.com/default.htm |
| Cablevision                                        | http://www.reedtelevision.com/ |
| College Music Journal (CMJ)                        | http://www.cmj.com/ |
| Editor & Publisher                                 | http://www.editorandpublisher.com/eandp/index.jsp |
| EQ Magazine                                        | http://www.eqmag.com/ |
| Mix Magazine                                       | http://www.mixonline.com/ |
| Multichannel News                                  | http://www.multichannel.com/ |
| Production Weekly                                  | http://www.productionweekly.com/site.html |
| Pro Sound News                                     | http://www.prosoundnews.com/ |
| Radio & Records                                    | http://www.radioandrecords.com/ |
Kansas Association of Broadcasters
Lee University
Michigan Association of Broadcasters
Minnesota Broadcasters Association
Missouri Broadcasters Association
Montana Broadcasters Association
National Association of Media Brokers
Nebraska Broadcasters Association
Ohio/Illinois Centers for Broadcasting
Oklahoma Association of Broadcasters
Oregon Association of Broadcasters
Post Newsweek Stations
RPSB

Saga Communications
Sage Publications
San Jose State University
South Carolina Broadcasters Assoc
Tennessee Association of Broadcasters
Texas Association of Broadcast Educators
Del Mar College
Texas Association of Broadcasters
The British Library
University of Connecticut
Virginia Association of Broadcasters
WGVU - TV
WNSB

[ INSTITUTIONS ]

Aims Community College
Alabama State University
Allegheny College
American Intercontinental University
American University
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University
Arkansas State University
Arkansas Tech University
Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale
Ashland University
Augusta State University
Austin Peay State University
Azusa Pacific University
Ball State University
Barry University
Baylor University
Belmont University
Bergen Community College
Berry College
Bethany College
Bethany Lutheran College
Bloomsburg University
Bob Jones University
Bossier Parish Community College
Boston University
Bournemouth University
Bowling Green State University
Bradley University
Brigham Young University
Brooklyn College
Buffalo State College
Calhoun Community College
California State, Chico
California State University - Fresno
California State University at Fullerton
California State University at Los Angeles
California State University at Northridge
California University of Pennsylvania
Cameron University
Cardiff University
Cayuga Community College
Cedarville University
Central Michigan University
Central Missouri State University
Christchurch Polytech Inst of Techn
City College of San Francisco
City University of New York
Clover Park Technical College Radio Broadcasting
Columbia College at Chicago
Community College of Southern Nevada
Del Mar College
Delaware State University
DePauw University
Drake University
Duquesne University
Eastern Connecticut State University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Illinois University
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Eastern Michigan University
Elizabeth City State University
Elizabethtown College
Elon University
Emerson College
Evangel University
Ferris State University
Finger Lakes Community College
Flagler College Communication Department
Florida A&M University
Florida Community College
Franciscan University of Steuenville
Frostburg State University
George Fox University
Golden West College
Graduate Theological Foundation
Grambling State University
Grand Valley State University
Green River Community College
Harding University
Hastings College
Hawaii Pacific University
Henry Ford Community College
Hillsborough Community College
Howard Community College
Howard University
Hudson Valley Community College
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Inter American University
International College of Broadcasting
Isothermal Community College
Ithaca College
James Madison University
John Carroll University
John Carroll University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Kutztown University
Liberty University
Long Island University
Louisiana State University
Loyola University - New Orleans
Lyndon State College
Madison Media Institute
Manchester College
Marist College
Marshall University
McNeese State University
Meridian Community College
Messiah College
Miami Dade College
Mississippi State University
Missouri Southern State University-Joplin
Missouri State University
Montclair State University
Montgomery College
Montgomery Community College
Morehead State University
Morgan State University
Mt. Wachusett Community College
Mudra Institute of Communications
Murray State University
Muskingum College
Nanyang Technological University
New England School of Communication
Ngee Ann Polytechnic
Normandale Community College
North Central College
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Kentucky University
Northwestern College
Northwestern University
Northwestern University
Ohio Northern University
Ohio University
Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma State University
Onondaga Community College
Oral Roberts University
Otterbein College
Pacific Lutheran University
Palomar College
Parkland College
Pennsylvania State University
Piedmont College
Pittsburg State University
Plattsburgh State University of NY
Purdue University Calumet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quinnipiac University</th>
<th>Thiel College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regent University</td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland College</td>
<td>Towson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morris University</td>
<td>Trinity University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology School</td>
<td>Truman State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Film &amp; Animation</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin at River Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockport College</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers State University</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt University</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers-The State University</td>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Xavier University</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury University Communication &amp; Theatre Arts</td>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University School of Theatre,</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television &amp; Film</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>University of Hawaii, Manoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana/Santiago Canyon College</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Community College</td>
<td>University of Illinois, Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
<td>University of Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale Community College</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shippensburg State University</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock University</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Suburban College</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td>University of Louisiana, Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University at Carbondale</td>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bonaventure University</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud State University</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's University</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire University</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>University of Missouri, St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens College</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Brockport</td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Oswego</td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suny Alfred WETD</td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna University</td>
<td>University of Nevada at Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>University of Nevada at Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Univ/Dept of Broadcasting, Telecom. &amp; Mass Media</td>
<td>University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University of Television &amp; Mass Media</td>
<td>University of North Carolina Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University - San Marcos</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Akron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of San Francisco
University of South Carolina
University of South Dakota
University of Southern California
University of Southern Indiana
University of Southern Mississippi
University of St. Thomas
University of Tennessee - Martin
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at El Paso
University of the Incarnate Word
University of the Ozarks
University of Utah
University of Western Ontario Faculty of Info & Media Studies
University of Wisconsin - Madison
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh

University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire
University of Wisconsin at La Crosse
University of Wisconsin at Platteville
University Politecnico Grancolombiano
Utah State University
Valdosta State University
Vincennes State University
Virginia Polytechnical Institute & State University
Wake Forest University
Washburn University
Washington State Community College
Washington State University
Wayne State University
Western Illinois University
Western Kentucky University
Westminster College
Wilkes University
William Jewell College
Winthrop University

2006-07 BEA OFFICERS
President, Dave Byland, Oklahoma Baptist University
V.P. Academic Relations, Tom Berg, Middle Tennessee State University
V.P. Industry Relations and Strategic Alliances, David Muscari, WFAA-TV/Dallas Morning News
Secretary-Treasurer, Mark Tolstedt, University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point
Immediate Past President, Joe Misiewicz, Ball State University

BEA DIVISION WEB SITES
Communication Technology Division: http://www.bea-commtech.com/
Course, Curricula and Administration Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/cca/
Gender Issues Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/genderissues/
International Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/international/
Law and Policy Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/lawpolicy/
Management and Sales Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/managementssales/
Production, Aesthetics and Criticism Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/pac/
Research Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/research/
Two year/Small Colleges Division: http://beaweb.org/divisions/twoyearsmallcolleges/
Writing Division: http://www.marquette.edu/bea/write/