BEA
BROADCAST EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Educating for Tomorrow's Media

FEEDBACK

VOLUME 50 • NUMBER 1 • JANUARY 2009

[FEEDBACK]

January 2009 (Vol. 50, No. 1)

Feedback is an electronic journal scheduled for posting six times a year at www.beaweb.org by the Broadcast Education Association. As an electronic journal, Feedback publishes (1) articles or essays— especially those of pedagogical value—on any aspect of electronic media: (2) responsive essays—especially industry analysis and those reacting to issues and concerns raised by previous Feedback articles and essays; (3) scholarly papers: (4) reviews of books, video, audio, film and web resources and other instructional materials; and (5) official announcements of the BEA and news from BEA Districts and Interest Divisions. Feedback is editor-reviewed journal.

All communication regarding business, membership questions, information about past issues of Feedback and changes of address should be sent to the Executive Director, 1771 N. Street NW, Washington D.C. 20036.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

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

REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

SUBMISSION DEADLINES

Feedback is scheduled, depending on submissions and additional material, to be posted on the BEA Web site the first day of January, March, May, July, September and November. To be considered, submissions should be submitted 60 days prior to posting date for that issue.

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

Feedback receives support from Ball State University's College of Communication, Information and Media.

[CONTENTS]

Click on title to view page.

[ARTICLE]

IS RADIO EDUCATION DEAD IN TODAY'S BROADCAST CURRICULUM?

A PILOT STUDY OF BROADCAST EDUCATORS AND OKLAHOMA RADIO PROFESSIONAL'S ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF RADIO EDUCATION IN TODAY'S BROADCAST CURRICULUM

Dr. David Nelson
Assistant Professor of Mass Communication
University of Central Oklahoma
Department of Mass Communication
Mass Communication Building, Box 197
100 North University Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034
Email: Dnelson7@ucok.edu
Phone: (405) 974-2584
Fax: (405) 974-3837

The work was orally presented for the Courses, Curricula and Administration Division Paper Competition at the Broadcast Education Association Convention 2008

ABSTRACT

Some believe the once symbiotic relationship between radio education and the radio profession is slowly deteriorating. Some have suggested the relationship is being negatively affected by broadcast education's push to consolidate their broadcast programs by shrinking and deleting radio courses for today's converged curriculums. As radio course work fades, many fear the wrong message is being sent to the radio industry that the university's role as a feeder program is a thing of the past.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this experimental pilot study is to understand what affect the perceived national trend may have on the perceptions and attitudes of broadcast educators and the local radio broadcast professionals regarding radio education in the state of Oklahoma. The pilot study will help generate some data to assist broadcast educators in understanding what radio professionals' attitudes and perceptions are regarding radio education. It will also expose broadcast educators to the presumably negative attitudes surrounding the new converging curricula. And, most importantly, it will add to the very limited literature regarding the attitudes and perceptions broadcast faculty and radio professionals have of radio education and its role in today's broadcast programs.

The paper will begin by briefly examining the history of radio education, the changing landscape of today's broadcast curriculum, the results of two sets of interviews examining the attitudes and perceptions of broadcast educators and radio broadcasters, and the results from the surveys administered to Oklahoma broadcast educators and radio professionals. The paper will end with a discussion section and the pilot study's limitations and suggestions.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF RADIO IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Colleges and universities have always played an important role in the development of radio broadcasting. Journalism education, a precursor of radio broadcast education, began in the U.S. in 1869 at Washington College (Sterling, 2004). Since then, broadcasting undergraduate education has grown into a viable and respectful discipline of research and theory. For the last 100 years higher education has provided an abundance of data for the broadcast industry in the areas of radio broadcast technology, management and programming.

EDUCATIONAL RADIO: THE 1920S AND 1930S

By 1925, higher education institutions had 124 radio stations on the air (Rinks, 2002). The majority were operated by college departments and schools to research new radio technologies, provide distance learning courses, and experiment with various theories (Thompsen, 2001). The data provided from the research became a valuable resource for commercial broadcasters that was often adopted if financially practical.

Although, 13 percent of the radio stations in 1923 were owned by universities, second only to radio manufactures, the creation of the Federal Radio Commission (FRC) and many of its new governing policies had a huge impact on the number of stations operated by educational institutions (Barnouw, 1966; Thompsen, 2001). Technological demands and changes in the structure of how licenses were granted all affected the growth of educational broadcasting (Albarran & Pitts, 2001). By 1929 college courses began slowly sprouting up on American college campuses with the University of Southern California (USC) leading the way. USC created the first regular radio course in higher education with many more institutions soon to follow (Sterling, 2004).

By the early 1930s, a gradual thinning of stations owned by institutions in higher education was inevitable. Caught by the crush of the great depression and the technological demands by the FRC many stations went commercial and others ceased all together (Rinks, 2002). However, a 1933 survey indicated 16 universities and colleges had added at least one radio course to their curriculum. From there, radio course development in higher education increased rapidly with 300 institutions boasting at least one radio course and at least eight institutions providing a bachelors degree in radio broadcasting (Sterling, 2004).

THE DECLINE AND RESURRECTION OF RADIO EDUCATION THE 1940S

The 1940s was a changing period for radio education. Fewer universities had radio stations but more radio courses were present on U.S. campuses. With the popularity of Edward Murrow's WW II radio reports and the growth of media research a rebirth of radio was taking place on college campuses. The academic community responded by establishing more radio broadcasting courses in higher education curricula. By the end of the decade, 420 colleges and universities offered radio courses. Of those, 30 offered bachelors, 15 masters, and three doctoral degrees (Sterling, 2004). With these curricula changes, the mission and goals of many educational radio stations transitioned from an experimental facility to a training facility for broadcast students (O'Donnell, Housman & Benoit, 1989).

THE MID TO LATE 20TH CENTURY

By the 1950s radio faced its biggest threat—television. Television's popularity so affected radio's role in future broadcast curricula that radio courses began to dwindle at higher education institutions (Head & Martin, 1956; Kang, Wolf & Kang, 2002). Some announcer courses were able to survive because of the relatively high demand for new radio talent but television's powerful presence on campus made it difficult for radio research and course curricula to develop any further (Head & Martin).

In the 1960s nearly 90 broadcasting programs were available to students in the U.S. (Kang, et al., 2002). Nevertheless, it wasn't until the 1970s and 1980s that radio education began to resurface in higher education (Sterling, 2004). At this juncture, higher education reverted back to viewing radio more as a liberal arts education than a professional field (Sterling, 2004). Many were drawn to the study of broadcasting as a "compelling, significant economic and cultural enterprise that impacted the quality of social life" (Becker & Kosicki, 1996). By the mid 1990s, the number of broadcast programs increased to 464 with most institutions having at least one radio station or a variation of one (Kang, et al.). The winds of change appeared to be blowing in favor of radio's resurgence; however, a new challenge was on the horizon.

THE 21ST CENTURY: THE CONVERGENCE MODEL

According to Kang, et al. (2002), by the early 21st Century most U.S. broadcast programs incorporated a balance of practical and theoretical courses with theoretical courses outnumbering the practical course offerings. Eventually the word convergence slowly crept into the broadcast education vernacular. Andrew Nachison of the *American Press Institute's Media Center* described convergence as the strategic, operational, and cultural union of print, audio, video and interactive media (as cited in Criado & Kraeplin, 2005, p.48). With the increased use of the Internet as an alternative to disseminate information and news, many broadcast departments had to reassess their curriculum in order to fit the convergence model evolving in the marketplace (Becker, Daniels, & Lowery, 2005). In a national study conducted by Criado and Kraeplin (2005), 85 percent of the universities studied, big and small, had altered, or begun to adapt their *curriculum* to reflect the industry trend toward convergence (p.51).

A converged curriculum reflects an interdisciplinary approach to instruction (Keith, 2004). This normally will include course work combining the use of audio, video and text formats with the intention to produce content for a web-based platform. The relationship between broadcast, print, and new media is often perceived as being harmonious in the interdisciplinary approach; however, many have criticized its lack of balance in today's converged curricula (Keith, 2004; Becker, Daniels and Lowery, 2005). A converged curriculum is strongly needed to reflect today's media landscape, but it is not a true interdisciplinary approach to teaching that is taking place at most programs, but a multi-disciplinary approach (Criado & Kraeplin, 2005).

In a multi-disciplinary approach, one discipline will generally dominate the course content and literature. Unfortunately, radio has often been the loser in the attempt to converge programs. According to Keith (2004), the multi-disciplinary approach to building a converged curriculum has greatly impacted radio's presence in today's curricula and is often mentioned only in passing.

A Criado and Kraeplin (2005) study of converged curriculums suggests 90 percent of all the universities trained all or some (emphasis added) of their students in print. In contrast, it was noted only 7.9 percent of the universities had a (emphasis added) radio course in their converged curriculum to train all or most of their students, and 92.1 percent had a radio course to train some or none (emphasis added) of their students. These results support the assumptions many critics have always suspected— radio education has very little presence in most of today's converged programs.

A SUMMARY OF THE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF RADIO BROADCASTERS

To generate survey questions for the pilot study and to better understand the radio industry's attitudes and perceptions of radio education an interview was conducted with 12 radio professionals from various markets. After coding and aggregating the responses, a common attitude and perception continued to appear in the majority of the responses— radio education is slowly dwindling in higher education. This theme prevailed throughout the interviews and strongly correlates with what some critics say is a slow decline in radio education in today's curriculum that may be eroding the long-time partnerships between radio education and the radio industry.

THE SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF BROADCAST EDUCATORS

It has been suggested that the biggest predictor in whether a fully embraced, true convergence program can take place will need to start first with a change in the attitude of the faculty (Becker, et al., 2006). To better understand if this negative attitude and perception prevailed with broadcast educators an interview/focus group was conducted with a group of broadcast educators at the November 2006 International Radio and Television Society (IRTS) Conference held at the CBS and WCBS studios in New York City.

After gathering and aggregating the data, several interesting themes appeared from their responses. Three themes gained the most attention were: 1) the majority of participants say they are seeing less radio emphasis in their programs; 2) very few radio professionals have a college degree, and; 3) they are less likely to choose higher education as a second career. The second and third theme was particularly interesting. A Stone (2002) survey supported this observation by indicating more television personnel have college degrees than radio, and secondly, when television reporters end their news careers most choose a career in public relations or pursue a career in teaching (emphasis added). If this is the case, it can be reasoned that non-radio faculty are making most of the curriculum decisions consequently negatively affecting the radio portion of an evolving curriculum. This may explain why critics and researchers have suggested curriculum changes, deletions, and consolidation of course work in new developing programs have left radio education out in the cold (Becker & Kosicki, 1996; Becker, Daniels, & Lowery, 2005), consequently affecting the university's role as a feeder program.

ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF OKLAHOMA BROADCAST EDUCATORS AND RADIO PROFESSIONAL

Quantitative- Survey Method

To better understand if the national attitudes and perceptions negatively affect the educators and broadcasters of Oklahoma an attitude survey was administered.

Research Questions

The five research questions posed for this pilot study were:

RQ1: (EDUCATORS) How significant is radio education in your mass communication (broadcasting, journalism, etc) curriculum?

RQ1: (BROADCASTERS) How significant should radio education be in a mass communication curriculum (broadcasting, journalism, etc)?

RQ2: (BOTH) How important is it to have a college degree for a career in radio broadcasting (news, on-air personality, producing, programming, etc.)?

RQ3: (EDUCATORS) How well is your school doing in preparing students for a career in radio broadcasting (news, on-air personality, producing, programming, etc,)?

RQ3: (BROADCASTERS) How is higher education doing in preparing students for a career in radio broadcasting (news, on-air personality, producing, programming, etc,)?

RQ4: (EDUCATORS) Overall, how important is your relationship with the radio broadcast industry professionals?

RQ4: (BROADCASTERS) Overall, how important is your relationship with the broadcast faculty at your community's colleges and universities?

RESULTS

Research Question 1

The results indicated 80 percent of the educators believe radio education should be a very important part of the curriculum. The majority of the broadcasters, or 75 percent, believe radio should be a very important part of the curriculum, while the remaining 25 percent of broadcasters believed radio should be somewhat important. (fig. 1).

Research Question 2

In response to whether a degree is important for a radio career, 85 percent of educators believe it is very important to obtain a college degree. The radio professionals responded differently to the survey with only 5 percent saying a college degree is very important for a career in radio and 95 percent responding it was somewhat important (fig. 2).

Research Question 3

As to whether schools and universities were doing a good job of preparing students for a career in radio, 85 percent of educators believe they were doing very well. Seventy-five percent of radio broadcasters agreed the broadcast programs were doing very well in preparing students for a career in radio (fig.3).

Research Question 4

The relationship between broadcast educators and radio broadcasters appears to be in good standing with 95 percent of the educators indicating they believe their relationship with broadcasters is very important and 75 percent of the broadcasters saying their relationship with the educators is very important (fig .4).

Figure 1

ATTITUDES REGARDING RADIO EDUCATION'S ROLE IN TODAY'S MASS COMMUNICATION CURRICULUM		
	Educators	**Broadcasters**
Very Important	80 percent	75 percent
Somewhat Important	20 percent	25 percent
	100 percent	100 percent

Figure 2

ATTITUDES REGARDING HOW COLLEGES ARE DOING IN PREPARING STUDENTS FOR A CAREER IN RADIO		
	Educators	**Broadcasters**
Very Well	85 percent	75 percent
Well	15 percent	25 percent
	100 percent	100 percent

Figure 3

ATTITUDES REGARDING WHETHER A COLLEGE DEGREE IS IMPORTANT FOR A CAREER IN RADIO		
	Educators	**Broadcasters**
Very Important	85 percent	5 percent
Somewhat Important	15 percent	95 percent
	100 percent	100 percent

Figure 4

RELATIONSHIP STATUS BETWEEN EDUCATORS AND RADIO BROADCASTERS		
	Educators	**Broadcasters**
Very Important	95 percent	75 percent
Somewhat Important	5 percent	23 percent
Neutral	0 percent	2 percent
	100 percent	100 percent

DISCUSSION

Though the early interviews with educators and radio professionals outside Oklahoma suggest a gloomy future for radio education, the results of this pilot study suggest a positive attitude exists between Oklahoma broadcast educators and Oklahoma radio professionals. Though radio education is dwindling in some programs, as suggested in some studies (Kang, Wolfe & Kang, 2002) , the groups surveyed in this study have the attitude that radio education still has a role in educating students for a career in today's media.

The results suggests Oklahoma universities are doing well in preparing students for a radio career, thus countering some of the observations that were expressed in the earlier interviews conducted for this pilot study. It may be reasoned that certain universities in larger markets may have been involved in the convergence process long before Oklahoma universities made curriculum changes, therefore these programs were likely to experience some of the negative effects ahead of Oklahoma broadcast educators.

The fear that the relationship and partnership between educator and broadcaster will erode as radio education slowly dwindles in today's curriculum is still a rational assumption. However, in this pilot study, the positive relationship between the two

groups and the positive attitudes regarding the role of radio education were reflected in their relationship. If the opposite is true, then you would assume a negative relationship would consist between the two groups.

Limitations and Suggestions

It is important to mention the educators sampled are only responding to their current curriculum conditions, that may or may not be truly converged programs. Each program should be viewed in advance to better assess which programs are truly converged and which are not. This will help to understand if the attitudes and perceptions are connected in any way to their current program status. It should also be noted the pilot study was limited to Oklahoma, therefore to better understand the attitudes of broadcast educators and radio professionals in other regions a larger sample is suggested.

Conclusion

As noted, radio is still an important component that should be taught, but it must first begin with a change in the attitude of the faculty (Becker, 2002). In an attempt to make sure a program reflects a true interdisciplinary program the course content must reflect a merging and balance of all involved (Keith, 2004).

In conclusion, some have suggested that educators are overestimating the extent to which employers in the media industry value convergence training in their new hires (Criado & Kraeplin, 2005). One radio manager from the pilot study supported this theory when he said, "… I'm not looking for a "converged" employee; I can train them. I look to hire someone that has a good attitude, initiative, and a love for radio."

References

Albarran, A.B., and Pitts, G.G. (2001). *The radio broadcasting industry*. Needham Heights, MA: Ally and Bacon, 29-30.

AM radio becomes the ultimate niche player. (2006, July 25). *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved on July 25, 2006 at: www.latimes.com.

Barnouw, E. (1966) *A Tower in Babel: A history of broadcasting in the United States to 1933*. Oxford University Press.

Becker, L.B., Daniels, G.L., and Lowery, W. (2005, Spring). Predictors of convergence curricula in journalism and mass communication programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 32-46.

Becker, L.B., & Kosicki, G.M. (1996). *Broadcast journalism education trends and comparisons.* Pauley Task Force Report. Ohio State University. Retrieved on October 11, 2006 at www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/PauleyReport01.htm.

Birge, Elizabeth (2004, Spring), Teaching convergence: What is it? *Quill, 92*, (4), 10-13. Bridge study says new music still found first on terrestrial radio, (2006, July 24). *FMQB.* Retrieved on July 25, 2006 at: http://www.fmqb.com/Article.asp?id=248485.

Criado, C.A., & Kraeplin, C. (2005, Spring). Building a case for convergence journalism curriculum. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 60*, 47-56.

Head, S.W. & Martin, L.A. (1956, Winter), Broadcasting and Higher Education: A new era," *Journal of Broadcasting, 57*. Jacob study shows that iPod users want FM tuners. Retrieved on April 7, 2007 at: http://news.radio-online.com/cgi-bin/$rol.exe/headline_id=b9777

Kang, S., Wolfe, A., & Kang, J. (2002, Winter), A three nation comparative analysis of broadcast curricula, *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator, 56*, (4), 40- 45.

Keith, Michael (2004). A review of radio studies teaching: A debate point: Radio in the curriculum in the United States of America. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcasting and Audio Media, 2*, (2), 17-18.

O'Donnel, L., Hausman, C, & Benoit, P. (1989). *Radio station operations: Management and employee perspective,* 1st edition, Wadsworth Publishing, Belmont, California.

Rinks, W. (2002, December). Higher education in radio: 1922-1934, *Journal of Radio Studies, 9*, (2), 303-331.

Sicklos, Richard. (February 14, 2007) "Is radio still radio if there's video?" *New York Times.* Retrieved at: www.nytimes.com/2007/02/14/business/media14radio.html

Sterling, C.H. (2004). Education about radio, *Education of Museum of Broadcast Communications Encyclopedia of Radio, 1*, 530-531.

Stone, Vernon (2002). Television and radio news careers, Missouri School of Journalism. Retrieved on September 8, 2006 at: www.missouri.edu/~jourvs/careers8.html.

Thompsen, P.A. (2001) Noncommercial Radio Broadcasting in Albarran and Pitts' *The radio broadcasting industry*. Needham Heights, MA: Ally and Bacon, 137.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

[ARTICLE]

BRIDGING THE ABYSS WHY A LOT OF NEWSPAPERS AREN'T GOING TO SURVIVE

From American Journalism Review, June/July 2008

Charles Layton
charlesmary@hotmail.com is an AJR senior contributing writer.

Mark Potts is a consultant, based in Washington, D.C., who hires out to newspaper Web sites, dotcoms and the like. He was a reporter and editor (Chicago Tribune, Washington Post, San Francisco Examiner) in the '70s and '80s, that golden age for newspapers before the Internet came along to spoil the party. Ad revenue — four-fifths of a daily paper's income — grew by double digits during many of those years.

Last summer, Potts and some friends were having the same conversation we all have now about the future of newspapers. Will they die out? Will they always be around but in a sad, vestigial form? Or, as the print paper shrivels, will its online counterpart finally pull in enough cash to keep the journalistic enterprise alive? And how long might that take?

Contemplating such questions, Potts imagined himself standing at the rim of a canyon, peering toward the other side where a magical world of online journalism — profitable online journalism — beckoned. "It sounds very Indiana Jones — standing on the cliff with this rickety wooden bridge across the chasm," he says.

But if our side of the chasm is the blighted world of print and the other side is our online salvation), how do we get there? Where is that rickety bridge?

Potts found an answer in three small columns of numbers, which he published last fall on his blog in the form of a chart (see Scenario #1).

Scenario #1: Future Newspaper Ad Revenue

YEAR	PRINT	ONLINE	TOTAL
2007	$45.0	$3.5	$48.5
2008	$42.8	$4.2	$47.0
2009	$40.6	$5.0	$45.7
2010	$38.6	$6.0	$44.6
2011	$36.7	$7.3	$43.9
2012	$34.8	$8.7	$43.5
2013	$33.1	$10.5	$43.5
2014	$31.4	$12.5	$44.0

2015	$29.9	$15.0	$44.9
2016	$28.4	$18.1	$46.4
2017	$26.9	$21.7	$48.6
2018	$25.6	$26.0	$51.6
2019	$24.3	$31.2	$55.5
2020	$23.1	$37.2	$60.5

(Numbers in billions)
Source: Mark Potts, at recoveringjournalist.com

At the time Potts made his chart, print ad revenue for newspapers was thought to be falling at about 5 percent per year, while online revenue was growing at nearly 20 percent per year. Potts simply extrapolated those percentages into future years.

His conclusions: By the year 2020 print ad revenue will be about half what it is today, and online ad revenue will be more than 10 times what it is today. The far right-hand column in Potts' chart combines earnings from both those sources. It shows total ad revenue falling and falling until 2012, staying flat in 2013 and then slowly turning around, as online growth equals and then surpasses the losses in print.

By this scenario, newspapers would be in for six more years of economic pain — continued cuts in staff, newshole and newsgathering resources — before they even start to turn a corner. (For Potts' own analysis, look up his blog, recoveringjournalist.com, and click on "Crossing the Chasm.")

Sadly, however, Potts seems to have overestimated the likely revenue gains from the Internet. No one expects online newspaper advertising to keep rising at a 20 percent clip. In fact, that 20 percent increase for 2007 (it turned out to be less than 19 percent, actually) represents a dramatic decline; online revenue had been growing by more than 30 percent in previous years.

As for Potts' assumption of only a 5 percent per year drop in print ad revenue, that seems wildly optimistic now. The actual rate of decline for 2007 turned out to be not 5 percent but 9.4 percent. Analysts expect something similar in 2008.

But the scariest problem — which Potts himself points out — is that many papers won't share in the online growth. There will be winners and losers. And even as the industry as a whole survives, we may begin seeing, pretty soon, big American cities with no daily newspaper.

"It's going to be really bloody, incredibly devastating," Potts predicts. "And I think there are going to be a lot of major metros that don't make it."

If this sounds like hyperventilation, consider the findings of a report by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics & Public Policy called "Creative Destruction: An Exploratory Look at News on the Internet." This report, published last August, examined trends in Internet-based news. One of its findings was that although readership of the Web sites of national "brand-name" papers (such as the New York Times and Washington Post) is increasing, that isn't the case for many other newspaper sites. Many, in fact, are losing ground.

"Unlike the brand-name sites, the typical site of a large-city daily is not growing," the report says. "The average traffic level in April 2007 was nearly identical to the level in April 2006."

And, says the report, newspaper sites in midsize cities had substantially fewer visitors in 2007 than in 2006. “Of the nine sites included in the average, two had modest growth, one had flat growth, and six had negative growth,” the study says.

The study also sampled the Web sites of nine small-city dailies and found that they, too, were losing ground. “Although two of the nine sites we sampled had a traffic increase of 20 percent or more from the previous April, five sites suffered a decline, including one that lost 20 percent of its Web audience.”

If newspapers’ future is on the Internet, and many newspapers are losing rather than gaining Internet traffic, what does that mean? Mark Potts believes that the daily paper — whether in print or online — is simply losing its relevancy. “If a big newspaper in a metropolitan area dropped dead right now,” he says, “nobody under 30 would care.”

And this guy is a friend of newspapers.

Peter Appert of Goldman Sachs, who has been analyzing newspaper company stocks for 25 years, uses a more sophisticated method than Potts. He works with quarterly as well as yearly numbers and separates ad revenue into national, retail and classified. He believes national will continue to decline over time. “Retail is tricky,” he says, “because the numbers are weak now,” but he thinks this category won’t plummet as dramatically as the others.

But classified advertising, which accounts for 30 percent to 40 percent of a newspaper’s ad base, “may not exist in print at all at some future point,” Appert says, “because from an advertiser’s standpoint, the online alternative is a better way to reach your target audience.” While papers have traditionally had a monopoly on classified ads in print, the competition is fierce online at such venues as craigslist.org, where most job postings are free, and Yahoo! and other sites where advertisers can focus on readers with specific interests, and at a cheaper rate than they have to pay for print ads.

So Appert agrees that the outlook is generally grim — so grim, he says, that some of his fellow stock analysts have turned away from newspapers as a specialty. Who wants to stake a career on a business with such poor prospects? Appert spends much of his own time analyzing non-newspaper firms — information service companies, electronic database companies and the like. “If I was covering only the newspaper industry, I would have to kill myself,” he says.

His overall 2008 forecast for newspapers is this: Print will be down 9.3 percent, online up 10 percent and total ad revenue down 7.9 percent. “Frankly,” he tells me, “I think people might say that my projections are not cautious enough.”

If one plugs Appert’s “not cautious enough” percentages into Potts’ model and replaces Potts’ revenue numbers with the actual numbers for 2007, as compiled by the Newspaper Association of America, the result is disaster.

Scenario #2: Future Newspaper Ad Revenue

YEAR	PRINT	ONLINE	TOTAL
2007	$42.2	$3.2	$45.4
2008	$38.3	$3.5	$41.8
2009	$34.7	$3.9	$38.6
2010	$31.5	$4.3	$35.8
2011	$28.6	$4.7	$33.3
2012	$25.9	$5.2	$31.1

2013	$23.5	$5.7	$29.2
2014	$21.3	$6.2	$27.5
2015	$19.3	$6.9	$26.2
2016	$17.5	$7.5	$25.0
2017	$15.9	$8.3	$24.2
2018	$14.4	$9.3	$23.7
2019	$13.1	$10.0	$23.1
2020	$11.9	$11.0	$22.9

(Numbers in billions)

Source: Charles Layton, extrapolating from Newspaper Association of America revenue figures for 2007 and Goldman Sachs newspaper revenue percentage predictions for 2008.

By this projection, print ad revenue for the newspaper industry would plunge from $42.2 billion in 2007 to $31.5 billion in 2010 to $19.3 billion in 2015, and on down from there.

Online revenue would rise from $3.2 billion in 2007 to $4.3 billion in 2010 to $6.9 billion in 2015 — not nearly enough to cover the stupendous losses in print.

This chart basically shows Potts' rickety bridge collapsing and dumping us into the chasm.

If you read analysts' reports on newspaper companies, you'll see frequent expressions of doubt as to how well newspapers' basic strategy — to become a hybrid print-and-online business — can work. For instance, of Gannett's 24 percent growth in online ad sales for 2006, stock analyst Tom Corbett of the investment research firm Morningstar wrote that "even with that growth, there's not much to convince us that revenue from Gannett's online advertising is enough to make up for the protracted decline in the sale of print ads." This, everyone acknowledges, is the crucial problem for newspaper companies. (See The Online Frontier, in AJR's June/July issue.)

So I thought I would try my hand at making a projection in the manner of Mark Potts. I decided to look at the Washington Post, because it is a leader in the transition to online news, with more visitors to its Web site than any other paper except the New York Times, but also because it is one of the few companies that clearly separates, in its annual report, its print and online ad revenue.

The Post reported a 13 percent decline in print ad revenue for 2007 and an 11 percent increase in online revenue. So plotting that into the future, Scenario #3 gives us these results:

Scenario #3: Washington Post Future Newspaper Ad Revenue

YEAR	PRINT	ONLINE	TOTAL
2006	$573.20	$102.70	$675.90
2007	$496.20	$114.20	$610.40
2008	$431.69	$126.76	$558.45
2009	$375.57	$140.70	$516.27
2010	$326.75	$156.18	$482.93

2011	$284.27	$173.36	$457.63
2012	$247.32	$192.43	$439.75
2013	$215.17	$213.60	$428.77
2014	$187.20	$237.09	$424.29
Total Revenue Increase Begins			
2015	$162.86	$263.17	$426.03
2016	$141.69	$292.12	$433.81
2017	$123.27	$324.25	$447.52
2018	$107.24	$359.92	$467.16
2019	$93.30	$399.51	$492.81
2020	$81.17	$443.46	$524.63

(Numbers in millions)

Source: Charles Layton, extrapolating from figures in the Washington Post Co.'s 2007 annual report

- The Post's total ad revenue would be 29 percent lower in 2010 than in 2006.
- By 2015, it would be 37 percent lower than in 2006.
- Online revenue wouldn't start to make up for the losses in print until 2015.
- Even after that, it would take many years for the total to get back to current levels.

In his introduction to the company's 2007 annual report, CEO and Chairman Donald E. Graham writes that an economically successful outcome for the Post in future years "is not at all certain, but we have a much greater opportunity than most newspapers do."

If Graham thinks the Post, with its online advantages, isn't certain to succeed, where does that leave the Los Angeles Times, with less than half as many Web site visitors as the Post, or the Miami Herald, with less than one-tenth as many?

Industry-wide, newspapers pull in 7 percent of their ad revenue from their Web sites. For the New York Times, the figure is 11 percent. The Post brings in 19 percent, partly because the paper, unlike most local dailies, is able to sell in the national as well as the local ad market.

Newspaper companies at the opposite end of the spectrum have a very long way to go.

As an economist for the Newspaper Association of America, Miles Groves was a notable presence in the newspaper game throughout the 1990s. He left the NAA in 1999, partly in frustration over the industry's failure to address the nascent challenge of the Internet and changing readership. Today he runs his own Washington, D.C.-based firm, MG Strategic Research, which advises businesses on research and marketing issues.

As early as the mid-'90s, Groves published research warning the newspaper industry of the growing challenge to its monopoly on classified advertising. "Newspapers had time to take control of the digital world and be the owner of that franchise," he says, "and we didn't do it."

Now, he thinks, "that opportunity has come and gone."

Groves can still see a future for small local newspapers — those with circulation under 25,000. And he thinks a few large ones with special advantages — the Post, the

New York Times and some others — will make the transition to a digital news product, with print as a supplemental business. "But a lot of other major metros won't do that," he says. "Papers like the Chicago Tribune, the Boston Globe, the Dallas Morning News — some of them will make the transition to the digital world. Some of them will not."

So where will people get their news?

"What you'll see fill in the gap is more and more free distribution papers that will also have a digital tie-in. You'll see stronger growth of neighborhood weeklies in urban communities. I see a world where you're going to have a paper like the New York Times, with its digital piece, and then you get the local news elsewhere."

He mentions, as an example, the neighborhood blog Penn Quarter Living (pqliving.com) in Washington, D.C. "They're covering things like the arts, things going on in the neighborhood, or new restaurants or crime," he says. "You get these instant reviews going on, so you almost have to check it at least once a week. I don't think that experience is anywhere near unique.

"They don't have a revenue model because they don't need a revenue model. These are neighborhood volunteers. So how does a newspaper on a local-local level — which has always been its strength — compete against what's going on online?"

I had a similar conversation with Conrad Fink, a former journalist who teaches newspaper management at the University of Georgia. "The early hope that online growth would cover the losses of the print paper isn't coming true," he says. "Online revenue seems to be plateauing. There isn't that rapid growth anymore."

When I ask which of the major metro dailies might be the first to shut down, he immediately suggests the San Francisco Chronicle, which has been losing $60 million a year. He also thinks Tribune Co., with its crushing burden of debt, is "in jeopardy," although he finds it hard to imagine that the Chicago Tribune would ever just disappear.

Fink reels off a list of reasons why online advertising isn't paying off as it should for newspapers. To start with, many visitors to a newspaper's Web site are useless to local advertisers, because they don't live in the area. Fink cites the example of his own town, Athens, Georgia. The local paper, the Banner-Herald, draws a large number of online visitors, "but the publisher figures only 25 percent of those hits come from the Athens geographic market. Which is to say, 75 percent of the visitors to that Web site are of no relevance to local retailers. A national newspaper like the New York Times can sell those eyeballs to advertisers. Regional newspapers cannot."

Furthermore, consumers spend just seconds per visit to a newspaper Web site page. And, the ads on those pages are often intrusive and annoying in a way that print ads aren't.

Perhaps most of all, Fink laments the failure of newspapers to target specific customers — to say to the retailer, we'll deliver your ad to people who play tennis. "That kind of focusing isn't very strong in newspaper advertising," he says.

Fink can't understand why papers haven't copied some of Amazon.com's methods. "You call up a book on Amazon and you get names of books by the same author, and a list of other books you'd probably like if you like this one. Newspapers are nowhere near having that degree of sophistication on their Web sites."

For these reasons and more, he says, online ads are much cheaper than their print counterparts.

Which brings us back to Mark Potts and his rickety bridge.

When Potts posted his chart last fall, he didn't get as many negative comments as he might have expected. In fact, no one came forward to challenge his numbers. In fact, no one paid him that much attention at all. He tried to get his observations and his chart mentioned on Romenesko, but it wasn't picked up there — or much of anywhere.

In other words, the conversation Potts hoped to spark really didn't happen. Maybe people don't want to contemplate such unpleasant numbers.

A personal afterthought:

The dire predictions you have just read gave me no joy to compile and write. If these predictions are anywhere near true, it's hard to see how newspapers can keep supporting the kind of journalism that sustains a democracy. Clearly, we need smart, bold solutions — something that can shake the earth! — something beyond the knee-jerk bromides consultants have dished up since the 1980s. (Remember when shorter stories and fewer jumps off of page one were the answer?)

But however newspapers respond now, Conrad Fink tells me, "We're going to have to be damn fast about it. We're behind the curve now. We've been talking, talking, talking for years. I don't think we can delay any longer."

Charles Layton (charlesmary@hotmail.com), a former editor at the Philadelphia Inquirer, wrote about news organizations' use of online video in AJR's December/January issue. This article was reprinted with permission from AJR.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

[ARTICLE]

HD RADIO IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN WEST: KUER BUILDS FOR THE FUTURE

Robert K. Avery and
Beth C. Fratkin
Department of Communication
University of Utah
Salt Lake City
Utah

Submitted
to Feedback
Broadcast Education Association
July 7, 2008

It is now a well-established fact that the development of Digital Audio Broadcasting (DAB) as it is called in Europe and Hybrid Digital Radio (HD Radio) as it has become known in the United States has not progressed as rapidly as originally predicted (Rudin, Huff, Lowe, Mytton, 2004). This slow progression is tied to a number of technological, structural and economic factors that have now begun to receive increased scholarly attention within the academic community, though its understanding within the general public remains limited (Barboutis, 1997; Ala-Fossi & Stavitsky, 2003; O'Neill, 2007). The purpose of this paper is provide a case study of how one public radio station – KUER, Salt Lake City -- has successfully capitalized on the adoption of this new digital technology as a means to increase listener awareness and involvement, generate new revenue for capital and personnel expansion, explore the potential impact of multicasting services, and to build its public image as an innovator and regional public radio leader.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Work on the European DAB system began experimentally in 1981, but was not formally launched as a multi-country initiative until 1985. This European digital broadcasting standard, dubbed "Eureka 147," has been shown to have a variety of important features, including CD quality sound, the capacity for high speed data transmission, and inherent compatibility with multiple broadcast platforms, both terrestrial and satellite. Despite its demonstrated technical superiority to other competing digital audio transmission systems, adoption of the technology by both broadcasters and listeners has been slower than envisioned. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) began test transmissions as early as 1995, and DAB radio receivers became available to United Kingdom consumers by the summer of 1998. Yet, the sale of DAB receivers fell far below market expectations as UK listeners found the several hundred pound price-tag to be well beyond their means, given the limited value-added appeal of the new broadcast service. What was originally conceived as a replacement technology for analog broadcasting has to date failed to materialize across Europe, even though a wide range of DAB services are in place and the cost of receivers has started to drop dramatically. According to WorldDMB, an organization that is devoted to promoting the adoption and utilization of digital media worldwide, the sale of digital radio receivers in the UK has now reached 25,000 each day and DAB listeners far exceed the numbers for Internet radio or radio delivered via digital television channels (www.worlddab.org). But except for the most optimistic advocates, observers of digital radio's deployment across Europe and elsewhere characterize the progression as a "chicken or egg" dilemma. The advent of competing delivery technologies including satellite, Internet and emerging hand-held and mobile devices that are morphing computer and cellular technologies encourage a "wait and see" attitude on the part of many broadcasters and listeners alike. And without a well-defined market emerging, there is little incentive for full-scale investment and service expansion.

Not too surprisingly, the development of digital broadcasting in the United States followed its own unique path. The early experimentation with the Eureka 147 standard in Europe led some U.S. broadcasters to advocate the adoption of the same digital standard stateside. The conversion of domestic AM and FM analog transmission to a new DAB standard was seen by some as a way to level the technological playing field that existed between the two services that favored FM's high fidelity superiority. In August of 1990, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued a *Notice of Inquiry* into the matter of digital audio broadcasting. At the annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters in 1991, the NAB made an initial recommendation that favored adoption of Eureka 147. But this was not well received by industry leaders who had no intention of allowing the deployment of a replacement digital service that would make the existing analog service obsolete (Ala-Fossi & Stavitsky, 2003). Before year's end, the industry had responded with a limited partnership between Westinghouse Electric Corporation, CBS and Gannett called USA Digital Radio (USADR) whose objective was to create an alternative digital delivery system that would permit both digital transmission and the preservation of the existing AM and FM analog frequencies. Other competing stakeholders such as AT&T and Amati Communications also entered the alternative digital delivery fray. By 1993, the NAB formally endorsed the recommendations of USADR that called for a different digital audio standard – In Band, On Channel (IBOC) – that enabled the hybrid digital signals to be wedded to the existing AM and FM analog signals without disrupting their reception on existing radio receivers.

During the next six years, testing of the IBOC system continued and the competing commercial stakeholders figured out how to carve up the potentially lucrative pie. Unlike their U.S. television counterparts that were moving toward digital conversion and the advent of High Definition Television (HDTV), along with the eventual release of their analog allocations, digital radio was under no pressure to move quickly. But as all the necessary industry agreements and mergers were falling into place, it was time for the FCC to take action. In November of 1999 the Commission issued its *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (FCC 99-327) as a way to encourage consensus on a technical standard for digital radio. On October 10, 2002 the FCC gave its provisional approval to the technical standards that had been proposed by iBiquity Digital Corporation, the commercial entity that had emerged as the single IBOC provider, owned by more than a dozen of the radio industry's leading stakeholders. iBiquity introduced its first IBOC digital radio receiver the following summer, but as in the case of Europe and elsewhere there was no early market demand. While terrestrial broadcasting was trying to enter the digital market with IBOC, two U.S. satellite companies – XM Satellite Radio and Sirius Radio – had commenced operation of direct satellite to home and satellite to car subscription services, each offering more than100 audio channels. But even these value-added subscription services appeared to be meeting with consumer resistance. Clearly, the general public was not moving to embrace digital technology nearly as quickly as investors had hoped.

PUBLIC RADIO'S DIGITAL EXPERIENCE

Leaders within the public radio system were directly involved in the digital technology debates of 1990s, and were making preparations for securing federal funding for expanding into HD Radio once the FCC had settled on the technical standard. On October 9, 2003, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) awarded more than $3 million in its first round of station grants to a total of 42 public radio stations in some thirteen "seed markets" (CPB, 2003). By the end of 2006, grants totaling $41 million had been awarded to 548 stations across the nation, but some 319 stations had yet to take advantage of the $75,000 seed grants (Janssen, 2006). Those who resisted the funding offer explained that the CPB monies represented only a fraction of the estimated $177,000 cost per station to mount an HD Radio service. Despite the multicasting potential of the new digital system, many station managers were reluctant to allocate precious dollars for digital expansion when it was such a low priority, given the absence of listener demand. Yet, other station managers argued that the move to multicasting was essential, given public radio's mandate to meet the diverse programming needs of multiple audiences not being served by the analog signal. In an effort to build a loyal core audience, public radio stations had largely abandoned their earlier "checkerboard" or "block" programming philosophy – something for everyone at different times of the broadcast day -- during the 1990s. The opportunity to offer multiple channels via HD Radio meant the chance to win back listeners who had felt disenfranchised when public radio stations began following the advice of consultants who knew how to generate audience numbers, even if it meant angering small specialized audiences. By September of 2007, National Public Radio (NPR) reported that 310 public radio stations were broadcasting in digital, with 78 stations multicasting. Of those 78, 56 were offering two channels and 22 were offering three (Janssen, 2007).

THE CASE OF KUER FM 90 IN SALT LAKE CITY

As early as 1995, KUER General Manager John Greene was meeting with his Chief Engineer, Lewis Downey, to begin laying the groundwork for taking advantage of digital audio broadcasting once the standards were in place and the FCC commenced awarding digital transmission authorization. Greene and Downey closely followed the developments at the national level and were very much aware of NPR's engineering leadership in moving the HD Radio initiative forward. Well before technical standards were approved and the first CPB seed grants were made, Greene began brainstorming about what the forthcoming delivery system might mean for local public radio stations, and specifically for his own station, licensed to the University of Utah (Greene, 2008a). Although the adoption of digital technology was still a long way off for KUER, the long gestation period that followed would enable Greene to begin the process of imagining digital radio, not only as a opportunity for providing multiple radio services, but as a means to enhance the local station in the broadest sense of the word.

Early in 2006, it was time to bring the full staff together to initiate a multifaceted two-year strategic planning process that would lead up to mounting a multi-channel HD Radio service before January 2008. Looking ahead to the launching of the University of Utah's

next capital campaign, Greene wanted to seize the adoption of HD Radio as a means to do far more than simply broadcast additional program channels from the main transmitter site in Salt Lake City. With the largest (geographically) translator system in the nation, KUER's network of translators was aging and in ever-increasing need of repair and refurbishment. Greene knew that the FCC was planning to open the window for new noncommercial educational FM applications in 2007, and KUER needed to take full advantage of this rare opportunity. There were still "white" areas within Utah that met the FCC's and CPB's definition for "first service," thus allowing new construction permits and funds from the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP). KUER's studios and control rooms also needed full digital conversion to make them state of the art and compatible with incoming and outgoing distribution feeds. In addition, KUER had established itself as the radio news leader in the Intermountain West, but the station was seen as being at a crossroads. As the producer of RadioWest, the widely acclaimed award winning public affairs feature distributed nationally on XM Satellite Radio, the station was properly positioned to expand its news and public affairs staff, thus moving the entire station to a new level of operation.

While the Development staff was writing grant proposals and lining up foundations and corporate donors, Engineering was preparing FCC applications for digital broadcasting and construction permits for five new Class A transmitters in the rural Utah communities of Monroe, Monticello, Roosevelt, La Verkin, and Castle Valley. The over-arching goals that were guiding the well-orchestrated flurry of activity were three-fold: 1) Improve and expand KUER's statewide distribution system; 2) Ramp up HD Radio while rebranding KUER with a new logo and marketing campaign that positions the station as the digital media leader; and 3) Generate new revenue to expand the station's News and Public Affairs Department. The station's capital campaign prospectus, titled *Broadcasting for the Future*, outlined a vision for where KUER would be in 2010 with the support of $2.1 million. The station's commitment to local, original programming that explores the boundaries of the new digital media landscape was central to that vision:

If much is uncertain in the current media environment, one thing is eminently clear: the future of public radio will be more than just radio. Public radio stations across the country are progressively evolving into public service media companies: multi-platform, multi-delivery content providers and producers that engage their communities in a multiplicity of ways. As we look to the future, we see two major opportunities to expand KUER's capacity to engage and serve our growing community. KUER will invest in its capacity to tell the stories and express the aspirations of our community and our region through locally-created programming that we take out across the state in remote broadcasts and events. KUER will strategically build its capacity to create locally-informed and locally-inspired programming for use across its delivery platforms and outside the broadcast studio… Through story and art, sound and creativity, KUER will continue to invite members of our community to imagine, not only who we are now, but who we might become. (Greene, 2007, pp. 4-5)

The $2.1 million budget needed to achieve KUER's vision for the future had three major components: 1) Technology-Statewide Service Expenses: $1,004,287; 2) HD/Digital Conversion & Two New Music Services: $540,141; and 3) News & Information Growth: $550,000.

On December 4, 2007, KUER launched its four-day on-air fund drive, titled "The Drive to Digital," and raised more than $100,000 from listeners who just weeks earlier had contributed some $325,000 during the station's regular biannual fundraising appeal. John Greene explains that the on-air drive was every bit as much about raising public awareness of HD Radio and KUER's image as a new media provider as it was about raising money. Greene utilized the on-air breaks to educate the audience about digital audio broadcasting and to promote the new KUER:

KUER 1 – broadcast on both analog FM and HD Channel 1 – NPR news and public affairs, PRI and APR programs, local jazz at night, and expanded local news coverage throughout the broadcast day

KUER 2 – broadcast on HD Channel 2 – NPR delivered *XpoNential Radio*, a 24/7 Triple A (adult album alternative) service produced by WXPN in Philadelphia.

KUER 3 – broadcast on HD Channel 3 – *Classical Public Radio Network* also delivered by NPR is a 24/7 hosted classical music service that is a joint venture of KUSC in Los Angeles and Colorado Public Radio (KCFR, Denver)

Greene encouraged listeners to email their questions, comments and concerns to him, and then not only responded to the emails directly but also used the questions as a way to provide clarification to listeners during subsequent pledge breaks. During the four-day pledge drive he responded to dozens of email messages that ran the gamut from enthusiastic congratulations for KUER's leadership to passionate indignation for management messing around with the existing public radio service. On December 20, 2007, KUER formally inaugurated its highly publicized HD Radio service, following more than a year of on-air service testing. The $2.1 million capital campaign had already reached the midpoint with $435,000 in Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) grants requiring a 75/25 awaiting final confirmation. And over 100 new HD Radios requested as pledge drive Thank You gifts were now in the homes of KUER listeners.

DISCUSSION

Although it is still too early to accurately gauge the relative success of KUER's *Broadcasting for the Future* campaign, it is certainly significant as a case study of local public radio's deployment of HD Radio. Of equal significance is the strategic use of HD Radio as a technological innovation to provide a public fundraising campaign context to raise new revenue for both transmitter/translator expansion and additional news personnel that really have nothing to do with the introduction of HD Radio itself.

To our knowledge, this is the first public radio station capital campaign that has positioned HD Radio as a case statement centerpiece where three-quarters of the campaign goal is unrelated to digital conversion and HD program-related costs. Indeed, over $550,000 is earmarked for the hiring of news and public affairs staffers whose long-term employment will be dependent upon their own success at building audience numbers and corresponding revenue base.

Greene readily admits that the future of HD Radio as the preferred digital delivery platform is still very much in doubt. Evidence of this uncertainty was the announcement in March, 2008 that the Classical Public Radio Network was to suspend its service for HD Radio use on July 1, 2008, when CPRN was planning to move exclusively to the Internet. How KUER and the other public radio stations were going to fill the classical music service void became an immediate challenge, though programmers at both NPR and the local stations began working to find a solution. Speculation about options available to local stations included Classical 24, produced by American Public Media and distributed by Public Radio International, and Beethoven Satellite Network, produced by WFMT in Chicago (Janssen, 2008). As it turned out, however, Greene was among six station managers who worked out an agreement with CPRN to permit a continuation of the classical music service for KUER's HD channel beyond the July 1, 2008 deadline (Greene, 2008b).

While KUER was far from the first radio station – public or commercial -- in Utah to deploy HD Radio channels, it is currently the only station in the Beehive State to offer two HD signals in addition to its HD Channel 1 that simulcasts the analog service. Whereas competing HD channels in the metropolitan Salt Lake market appeared on the dial in what might be described as a public awareness vacuum, KUER's deployment of HD Radio took center stage. It was surrounded by a carefully executed marketing campaign that was not only tied to the station's broad based development initiative but to a newly designed station logo that positioned KUER as an innovator within the new media landscape. Without sustained public awareness and growing enthusiasm for KUER's HD Radio services it is uncertain if the current campaign will have lasting historical significance as a benchmark for technological innovation for public radio in the Intermountain West or remembered as a bold rhetorical ploy to cultivate station enhancement dollars. But for the short term, at least, KUER's excursion into HD Radio is clearly reaping financial, technological and promotional rewards that otherwise might not have materialized. The current crop of HD Radio doomsayers who argue that advertisers would be better advised to stand at the bottom of their driveways passing out flyers than placing spots on HD Radio (Mills, 2008) might want to remember the slow, sluggish adoption of an earlier radio technology -- called FM. Should HD Radio finally stir the public imagination in the United States as it would seem to be doing in the United Kingdom, KUER will be better positioned than ever before to fulfill its mandate to broadcast in the publics' interest.

REFERENCES

Ala-Fossi, M. & Stavitsky, A.G. (2003). "Understanding IBOC: Digital Technology for Analog Economics," *Journal of Radio Studies*, *10:*1, 63-79.

Barboutis, C. (1997). "Digital Audio Broadcasting: The Tangled Webs of Technological Welfare," *Media, Culture & Society*, *19*, 687-691.

CPB (2003). "Corporation for Public Broadcasting Awards First Funds to Usher in New Digital Public Radio Era." Press Release, October 9, Washington, DC.

FCC. (1999). *Notice of Proposed Rule Making.* FCC 99-327. "In the Matter of Digital Audio Broadcasting Systems and Their Impact on the Terrestrial Radio Broadcast Service." MM Docket No. 99-325. Released November 1, 1999.

FCC. (2002). *First Report and Order.* "Digital Audio Broadcasting Systems and Their Impact on Terrestrial Radio Broadcast Service." MM Docket No. 99-325. Released October 10, 2002.

Fisher, Marc (2005). "With HD Sound, the Future is Becoming a Lot Less Fuzzy." *Washington Post*, July 10, N01.

Greene, John (2007). *KUER 1/2/3: Broadcasting for the Future.* KUER Campaign Prospectus, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Greene, John (2008a). *Personal interview*, March 19, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Greene, John (2008b). *Personal telephone interview*, June 23, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Janssen, Mike (2006). "CPB grants don't persuade stations cool to HD radio." *Current*, Volume 25, December 18, 1,14.

Janssen, Mike (2007). "Multicasts: betting to build HD Radio audience." *Current*, Volume 26, September 24.

Janssen, Mike (2008). "Partners to close classical net for radio but see chance for growth online." *Current*, Volume 27, March 24, 8.

Mills, Ken (2008). "Black Friday for HD Radio." Posted on Mark Ramsey's Blog, and distributed by the Public Radio Listserv, March 14.

Rudin, R., Huff, W.A.K., Lowe, G.F., & Mytton, G. (2004). "Digital Audio Broadcasting: Replacing Analog Radio Stations." In Sterling, C.H. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Radio,* Volume 1, 456-462.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

[ARTICLE]

THE $2.5 MILLION BARGAIN: SUPER BOWL ADS AND ADDED VALUE

Paper submitted to:
Feedback – Broadcast Education Association
November, 2008

Stuart L. Esrock, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Louisville
stuart.esrock@louisville.edu
(502) 852-8161
FAX (502) 852-8166

Max Utsler, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Kansas
utsler@ku.edu
(785) 864-0608

This paper was originally presented at the first Ad Bowl Symposium, The University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC on January 26, 2007

The $2.5 million price tag for a 30 second Super Bowl TV ad may *sound* outrageous. But it may be the best advertising bargain in this message-saturated world.

With a 30 second Super Bowl spot, advertisers potentially get an array of added exposure that magnifies the impact of their message. In this day of rising media costs, fragmenting audiences, media proliferation, and commercial avoidance behaviors, marketing managers are especially conscious of return on advertising investment. Super Bowl advertisers have become an important example of maximizing exposure beyond the mere 30 seconds of airtime.

For example, in 2006 MasterCard promoted its planned Super Bowl advertising to the national media, building awareness well in advance of the event (Lindeman, 2006). The credit card conglomerate sent news releases promoting their use of actor Richard Dean Anderson reprising his TV role as "MacGyver" in the company's newest ad for its award-winning "Priceless" campaign.

Beyond hype for the game itself, this type of promotion has also helped sustain an unmatched, expectant atmosphere for the advertising. Super Bowl advertising creates a tremendous amount of hype in the national news media (Lindeman, 2006). News stories before and after the game focus on advertisers and their outlandish creative approaches, critiques of advertising effectiveness, and tests of memorability and likeability. Some ads are pre-played before the game on news and entertainment shows on both cable and network television. Following the game, news media will write about and often replay the best and least liked ads for additional exposure.

But the added value of Super Bowl advertising is not just accrued through news stories. In 2006, organizations like America Online and *USA Today* asked viewers to vote for their favorite Super Bowl ads (Lindeman, 2006). The National Football League made ads available for replay immediately after the game on its cable network, Web site, and mobile phones. In 2004, CBS-TV aired a special program devoted to Super Bowl ads including some judged as the greatest of all-time (http://www.cbs.com /specials/2004_superbowl_commercials/). In 2007, CBS aired "Super Bowl's Greatest Commercials 2007" two days before the game. One can also find a number of specialized Web sites devoted to Super Bowl advertising (Ad-Bowl, Ad-rag, and Superbowl-ads). Many sites even carry the actual spots years after their broadcast, allowing visitors the opportunity to pretty much view the history of Super Bowl advertising online. In 2006 alone, Google showed 21 million links related to Super Bowl advertising.

The cumulative effect of this exposure leads many observers and even participants to believe that a 30 second Super Bowl ad may be one of the best media buys available, even with its hefty list price. The vice-president of global communications for Bayer Healthcare, Tricia McKernan, said of multi-million dollar Super Bowl ads, "It's almost a bargain to some extent" (Lindeman, 2006).

In this paper we will review some tactics that marketers have employed and media coverage that was generated of Super Bowl advertising, yielding advertisers added value for their investment. The paper focuses on Super Bowl advertising for 2006, 2007, and 2008. In an era when television advertising is coming into question in some circles and "Return on Investment" has become a mantra for marketers, we believe this research will call attention to another perspective that advertisers and media should utilize in gauging the effectiveness of Super Bowl expenditures.

SURROUND SOUND, SYNERGY, ADDED VALUE, AND BUZZ

A typical advertiser in the Super Bowl broadcast today is gaining exposure on television through more vehicles than just the exposure during the game. That ad might also appear in news and entertainment programs around the nation. Beyond television, additional exposure may build from publicity in print media and radio, the posting of ads and discussions on Web sites and blogs, replay of ads on cell phones, and more. The effort to maximize reach and impact via multiple media and multiple marketing communication tools has support in the literature. Part of the necessity for this approach lies in the confluence of media and technology.

As media and information options grow, so too does the need to attempt to reach audiences via multiple vehicles. One size simply does not fit all anymore. Kaplan (2003) suggests that most major marketers today employ what he calls a "surround-sound strategy," because they understand that consumers utilize a wide variety of media. Consumers today rely upon and are influenced by TV, print media, radio, the Internet, cell phones, and more. Organizations that wish to generate significant impact on individuals must take this into account as they plan campaigns to surround target audiences with information from a variety of sources.

By employing multiple marketing communication channels, companies try to create a snowball effect that gathers momentum. Some researchers have found that employing multiple communication vehicles builds a synergy to magnify persuasive impact (Caywood, Schultz, and Wang; 1991). In these situations, the interaction of messages from multiple sources has a greater effect than the sum of the impact from the individual message. For example, Chang and Thorson (2004) found a synergy between television ads and exposure on the World Wide Web that resulted in higher attention, higher credibility, and more positive associations/thoughts.

Accordingly, advertisers have a wide array of choices to make when deciding on communication channels to employ in a more synergistic mix than just relying on TV alone. Briggs, Krishnan, and Borin (2005) found that Ford was much more successful in employing a media mix of television, magazine and online advertising than just TV.

For other organizations, synergy is achieved by supplementing advertising with other tools in the communication effort. One of the keys in this regard is generating news coverage of the marketer. In fact, many practitioners believe that synergy for a campaign is heightened if publicity can be generated for the ads themselves. According to former BBDO advertising agency chair Phillip Dusenberry, ads that receive coverage in the news have more value than the ads alone, because they are being communicated in a non-advertising context. "Anytime you release a new advertising campaign, you would be wise to bring in your PR people and ask: Is there anything in this that can stretch it beyond our media expenditure?" (Rothenberg, 1990).

Research also supports this notion. One study indicates that the use of publicity and then advertising provides an effective means of persuading potential customers (Loda and Coleman, 2005). Another research work (Stammerjohan et. al, 2005) suggests that a synergy between publicity and advertising may be particularly effective for new or less familiar brands. In a study of Super Bowl advertising, Jin (2003-004) detected a synergy between advertising and pre-campaign publicity. His experiment indicated that pre-advertising publicity about an advertising campaign induces significantly better recall of the messages than those ads that did not receive pre-campaign publicity. Jin, Shao and An (2006) found that media impressions delivered via publicity about an ad campaign have a significant positive effect on recall of the ads. Furthermore, they suggest that advertised brands that had more campaign publicity are more memorable brands. These authors conclude that ad campaign publicity not only helps a marketer's brand, it also works against competitors' brands. "In a highly competitive advertising environment, publicity can become the nail to guide the hammer of advertising" (Jin, Shao and An; 2006).

Against this backdrop and the realities of today's media environment, most brands now rely on a wide variety of means and media to disseminate their message. And it is not just national mega-brands that have become sophisticated in their approach to using an array of media and marketing communication tools. In so doing, both national and local advertisers are working toward generating extra value for their advertising investments that extends the reach and impact of messages. For example, a Chicago restaurant operation that was opening its first location outside of Illinois worked with "media partners" to also secure PR, Internet exposure, and sales promotion opportunities for what they spent on television advertising alone (Dominiak, 2005). Such value-added media elements don't necessarily have a large impact by themselves but instead can be viewed as "…sometimes the final nudge that consumers need to take action in the marketplace" (Dominiak, 2005).

If marketers do a good enough job of employing multiple media and marketing tools, they can create a "buzz" about their ads or their brand that extends the message even further. Buzz has become a catchphrase in marketing as large and small companies jump on the bandwagon to try to get consumers talking about their brands (Bernard, 2006). These campaigns employ traditional media and/or sometimes non-traditional media (text messaging) and occasionally subversive means (i.e. disguised identities on the Internet) to build a self-sustaining and even expanding dialogue about the product within the consumer community. Viral marketing campaigns have been useful in launching the (film) "Blair Witch Project," the Harry Potter book series, and

Razor scooters (Khermouch, 2001). As marketers orchestrate what they hope will be a gathering chatter about their brand or ad, they hope consumers will then also spread the word for them in a virus-like manner.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF SUPER BOWL ADVERTISING

So just how do Super Bowl advertisers build synergy, buzz, and added value when they plunk down their multi-million dollar investment for a 30 second spot. Kelley and Turley (2004) suggest Super Bowl ads themselves have become "must-watch TV" with intense media interest both before and after the game. Indeed, newspaper, television, and magazines have come to see the Super Bowl of advertising as a great story in and of itself, thereby providing additional free reach (McAllister, 1999). For example, in the month leading up to Super Bowl XXXIII, traditional media in the country mentioned Super Bowl advertising more than 1,600 times (Yeklur, et al., 2004).

Part of the reason the Super Bowl advertising story appeals to the media is because the story also appeals to the public. One poll suggests that more than two-thirds of the Super Bowl audience pays attention to the ads and more than half talk about the ads the next day (Freeman, 1999). This type of acceptance of advertising is, indeed, rare. According to Mike Hess, director of global research and consumer insights for Omnicom Group's OMD, it is this quality of the exposure, as opposed to the sheer amount of reach, that is key in a Super Bowl media buy. "… The Super Bowl is virtually the only forum left where consumers watch ads for fun and talk about them rather than trying to avoid them" (Neff & Halliday, 2005, p. 4).

Public reaction to Super Bowl advertising has also become something of a media sport. For example, *USA Today* has published a ranking of Super Bowl advertising since 1989. The AdMeter ratings are generated through a volunteer sample that is representative of the Super Bowl audience (Kelley and Turley, 2004). Participants register their real-time feelings about ads while watching the Super Bowl and the scores are printed in the paper on the Monday morning after the game. The AdMeter ratings from *USA Today* have become an industry-accepted standard for judging Super Bowl advertising winners and losers after the game (Kelley and Turley, 2004). *USA Today* uses the data as the basis for articles about the most popular Super Bowl commercials. The newspaper puts all of the ads online and invites readers in both the print version and online to vote for both their favorite and least favorite ads. *USA Today* also has a link to its Hall of Fame, all of its Ad Meter winners since 1989. The list includes six commercials from Pepsi and five from Anheuser-Busch, the two most prolific Super Bowl advertisers. The publication even conducts an online forum and Q&A the day after the game to further gauge public reaction. The *USA Today* ratings have become so prominent that at least one online sportsbook accepted bets on the 2006 ratings *(TV Newsday*, 2006).

As the discussion grows, the Super Bowl advertising dialogue becomes something of a living, self-sustaining entity that gathers a life of its own. The result is considerable public interest before the ads air, a nationwide discussion forum of the ads after the game, and ultimately a circle of communication that continues forward to the following year's Super Bowl advertising. Peter Blackshaw, the chief marketing officer of research firm Nielsen BuzzMetrics, suggests Super Bowl ads carry the potential for creating an extended conversation and a "word of mouth multiplier" that adds to the campaign impact (Spain, 2006). Blackshaw's research firm monitors consumer discussion of

Super Bowl ads across 40 million blogs, message boards and other Web sites (Nielsen BuzzMetrics, 2007). In past years, the results have been mixed. For example, in 2005, Blackshaw reports that some ads had great "traction" while others fell short on brand recognition. Also the controversy over the censoring of GoDaddy.com ads slowed the building buzz about other Super Bowl ads. In 2004, the post Super Bowl ad dialogue was overwhelmed by the conversation about Janet Jackson's bare breast while in 2003, Reebok's Terry Tate-Office Linebacker ads generated an on-going dialogue among people who continued to watch and spread the ad online for days and even weeks after the game (Nielsen BuzzMetrics, 2007).

But all of the media coverage/attention and buzz is, at least partially, prompted by the additional efforts of Super Bowl advertisers themselves to garner attention for what they are doing. The coverage of the Super Bowl ads today by media may have become something of a self-sustaining news story that requires no prompting. Nonetheless, marketers actively do their part to sell their stories to news media and also employ a variety of other tactics to extend the reach of their Super Bowl messages.

SUPER BOWL ADVERTISER EFFORTS
2006 SUPER BOWL XL

Internet domain provider GoDaddy.com provides an excellent case study of an ad's reach going way beyond the 30 seconds of time allotted in the actual telecast of the game. GoDaddy actually ran two 30's in the 2006 Super Bowl, but the buzz it created before the game likely drove a number of viewers to review the in-game spots online (comScore, 2006).

GoDaddy had taken full advantage of Janet Jackson's "wardrobe malfunction" of 2004 by creating a spoof of that incident for 2005. The ad showed a censorship panel questioning an attractive GoDaddy spokeswoman. And surprise--the GoDaddy actress, Candice Michelle, had her own "wardrobe malfunction." Remember, the FCC had heavily fined the CBS Network and several of its affiliates for the Jackson incident. Fox approved the 2005 GoDaddy ad, but when it attempted to run the spot a second time in 2006, ABC turned it down. Thus began the "real story" of GoDaddy commercials.

GoDaddy went back to its in-house production department and had it produce a different ad, this one called "Steamy Carwash." One could easily argue it was even racier than the previously denied commercial. ABC also turned it down so GoDaddy produced another ad, and another ad, and so on. Finally, on version number 14, ABC approved the spot. Lest the reader suspect this to be inadvertent or just plain bad luck, consider this statement by CEO Bob Parsons on his blog; "As usual for both commercials, we produced two versions - one for television, the other an extended "Internet-only" version. As you can imagine, my favorites are the Internet-only commercials" (Parsons, 2006). ("Steamy" and all of the other GoDaddy commercials are available online at: http://www.godaddy.com/gdshop/superbowl05/landing.asp?se=%2B&ci=4637&display=&stateTestimonials). The 13 denied spots created news on an almost daily basis in the days leading up to the Super Bowl. A Google search of "GoDaddy censored ads" a week before the 2006 Super Bowl turned up 22,800 hits, many of them news stories.

While it would be impossible to draw a direct causal relationship between GoDaddy's two Super Bowl spots and an increase in business, it is important to note GoDaddy did not do any other advertising during that time frame and at that time did little advertising during the rest of the year. Furthermore, the exposure continues from that 2006 Super Bowl investment; one year later readers could view a large number of GoDaddy commercials, including the ones that never ran during the Super Bowl, at Youtube.com and Yahoo Video. Another measure of GoDaddy's advertising success, however, is a bit more tangible.

Super Bowl Sunday 2006 saw 880,000 more visitors to the GoDaddy Web site than normal. The Monday following the Super Bowl saw an increase of 910,000 more visitors (Vaughan, 2006). Research from comScore Media Metrix, an Internet research firm, showed GoDaddy with a 1,564 percent change in unique visitors on Super Bowl Sunday as compared to the previous four Sundays. (comScore, 2006).

To estimate a value on the increased Web traffic, it is instructive to look at Cheaphostingdirectory.com, which displays a list of its Top 10 Web Hosts. Those 10 hosts charge an average of slightly more than $6.75 per click. Multiplying the 1.8 million new GoDaddy visitors (over the two day period alone) by $6.75 yields more than $12 million worth of exposure. When compared to the $4.8 million GoDaddy paid for its two 30's, the spots can look like a real bargain.

Parsons provided a bit of foresight as well as insight in his May 8, 2005 blog.

"It was the NFL and Fox who made our Super Bowl commercial a classic that will be talked about forever. This happened when they decided — after the first showing of the commercial in the first quarter — to censor it and not allow the second airing of the commercial, scheduled to run in the 4th quarter" (Parsons, 2005).

Also consider this exchange between Parsons and an Indiana University business student.

"What concerns me is that every rejected commercial must cost money. (Potential) customers are responsible for those costs. It seems wasteful and unwise to develop commercials that fall short of their target. The only people who are getting rich are the marketing executives, actors, and production crews.

Alex Baker, Business Student
Indiana University

Alex Baker ((n/a)) on Jan 15 2007, 00:41

Dear Alex,

While those commercials may not air during the Super Bowl, it doesn't mean that we've wasted our money. The commercials that are rejected by CBS will show on cable and also on our website. Trust me. We'll get our money's worth.

Appreciate your post,

Bob

bob parsons on Jan 15 2007, 01:44"

In 2006, GoDaddy was not the only company that capitalized on a synergy between their Super Bowl TV ads and visits to Web sites. ComScore Networks conducts ongoing research in Internet usage and maintains databases that improve the measurement of the effectiveness of online activities. A 2003 study by the company concluded, “The analysis revealed that several marketers that invested in Super Bowl television advertising drew significantly higher audiences to their respective Web sites not only on game day, but also into the following Monday as consumers compared notes on favorite commercials and the brands that produced them.” ComScore provided the following 2003 cases as evidence:

*Cadillac ran five ads between 8:30 p.m. and 11:00 p.m., and visitors to cadillac.com jumped more than tenfold over this period.

* Warner Brothers ran one ad for “The Matrix” sequels between 6:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. and one for “Terminator 3” between 7:30 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. Consumers were clearly interested in learning more about these upcoming films, with traffic jumping more than 300 percent at their respective sites.

* H&R Block ran seven ads between 3:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m.; traffic more than doubled at the site during this time period (comScore Networks, 2003).

And, this was clearly not a new phenomenon. ComScore cited 2000 research from Media Metrix that showed Super Bowl advertisers increased the number of unique visitors by an average of 38.7 percent over the three-week average preceding the game (comScore, 2000).

Com Score’s 2006 research continued the trend. The company studied percent change in unique visitors, comparing Super Bowl Sunday to the average of the previous four Sundays. GoDaddy.com led the way with its 1,564 percent increase. Budweiser.com was next with a 503 percent increase. Pepsi.com was third at 285 percent while Cadillac.com checked in at 256 percent. Nationwide, Ford, and Pizza Hut also all registered more than 100 percent gains (comScore, 2006).

Dove’s Super Bowl ad from 2006 offers another revealing example of buzz beyond the game itself (Neff, 2006). For two years, Dove had run a campaign called “Real Beauty.” Dove had noted the large Super Bowl audience was usually around 45 percent female. Their 45 second ad in the 2006 Super Bowl showing girls’ doubt about their looks generated an entire Oprah Winfrey Show on the subject. Due to a wave of pre-game promotional efforts, Dove Real Beauty yielded 1,390,000 hits on Google two weeks prior to the Super Bowl and many news stories. In the following months Dove gained market share in four of its five major categories (Neff, 2006).

The purpose of Dove’s many faceted campaign is, obviously, to extend the impact of the ad past the time window when it shows during the game. According to Nicole Bradley of Pepsi, when the soft drink giant executes a strategy like creating a Web site (www.brownandbubbly.com) to key off of their 2006 Super Bowl media buy, “The goal is to engage audiences beyond a 30-second ad” (Howard, 2006). In so doing, NFL spokesman Seth Palansky notes, “It’s a better way to amortize the cost of Super Bowl ads. The goal is more places to get your ad seen” (Howard, 2006). Accordingly, other highlights of marketers’ 2006 Super Bowl ad-related efforts included:

* Emerald Nuts ran national newspaper ads for 10 days leading up to the game, promoting their Super Bowl ad and a “play on words and letters” contest on their Web site (Howard, 2006).

* Degree Deodorant sent its 30 second “action film” Super Bowl ad to 250,000 men on their email list the morning of the game. Degree director of marketing Kevin George said, “Guys are consuming media in many different ways. This is a great opportunity to start to take advantage of that” (Howard, 2006).

* Sprint made its two humorous Super Bowl ads available to its subscribers for free download to their cell phones. The company also encouraged subscribers to vote for their favorite ad and for their favorite song by the Rolling Stones during their halftime performance. Mary Nell Westbrook of Sprint said, "It's a way to extend the brand during what is one of the most enormous viewership days in TV" (Howard, 2006).

* Disney aired pre-Super Bowl ads featuring a host of NFL players practicing the familiar "I'm going to Disney World" refrain that had aired after past games. The company also actively promoted the fact that it would reveal its player spokesman for the first time ever immediately following the game (Lindeman, 2006).

* Even the National Football League itself got into the act. For the first time, it aired Super Bowl ads on its own NFL Network, and also promoted the ads on nfl.com and its NFL mobile phone system (Howard, 2006).

Another area of opportunity for Super Bowl advertisers in 2006, and indeed for several years prior, has stemmed from the growth of Web sites that are either entirely devoted to, or at least featuring a significant section on, Super Bowl ads. The past several years have seen a growth in Web sites that offer some combination of Super Bowl ad playback, previews, evaluation, news, message boards and other interactive elements.

For example:

* Superbowl-ads.com features a home page with a large window called "Latest News." The site offers a toolbar with links back to 1998 plus a link titled "All Time." It also has links to research from Multivision and Intelliseek.

* Adbowl.com offers viewers the chance to vote on their favorite Super Bowl commercials. Page one features registration for this year's competition plus links to past results. Visitors can search past years with the top five listed in different demographic categories.

* Ad-rag.com was once a free-standing Super Bowl site, but is now merged with Adland, "the beyond-a-blog, commercial-laden delirium of heaven and hell for advertising addicts 'round the world" (http://commercial-archive.com/). The Super Bowl is still a prominent link from the left-hand column.

2007 SUPER BOWL XLI

In the seemingly expanding effort to draw attention to the actual Super Bowl ads, companies developed some novel approaches for 2007. Much of the pre-game publicity revolved around viewer-generated ad concepts for at least three advertisers.

Chevrolet kicked off the idea in September, 2006 when it proposed a contest for college students. Parent company General Motors invited students to submit ideas for ads that would tout the Chevrolet lineup, specifically the Aveo, Cobalt, HHR, and Equinox cars targeted to a younger demographic. GM reported more than 820 student teams registered from more than 230 schools in 46 states and the District of Columbia (General Motors, 2006). Five finalists received all-expense paid trips to Detroit to present their ideas to GM and ad agency personnel. The CBS Early Show presented mock-ups of the ads on the first two Wednesdays in January and invited viewers to vote on their favorite (CBS News, 2007). The winning team participated in the actual production of the spot.

Frito-Lay jumped into the user-generated fray by inviting consumers to create and shoot their own Super Bowl ad touting Doritos. The snack marketer partnered with Yahoo to serve as host for the contest. Yahoo Video accepted 1,308 submissions (Yahoo, 2007). Frito-Lay touted the promotion as open to everyone and while some thought it might provide a breakthrough for an advertising professional, a glance at the submissions suggests otherwise (www.doritos.com). Page one of the thumbnails showed spots submitted at awkward times including 46 seconds, 36, 42, 1 minute and 13 seconds, and another that clocked in at 2 minutes 28 seconds. Frito-Lay chose five finalists, then invited Yahoo Video users to vote for their favorite. The company announced the winner Super Bowl night.

The National Football League implemented a similar campaign, choosing a fan's idea for its Super Bowl spot. The league used advertisements during its own games in November and December to generate interest. The NFL received more than 1,700 submissions from fans (Thomaselli, 2007). The NFL hosted "pitch" events for quarter-finalists in Dallas, Denve,r and New York/New Jersey, selected 12 finalists, and then posted these entries on NFL.com/SuperAd. Fans could then view the spots and vote for a favorite. The NFL selected the winning ad, "It's Hard For Us, Too," through a combination of online voting and a panel of judges. For his efforts, the winner won a trip to the set for the filming of the spot and a free trip to the Super Bowl.

While it may be random happenstance that leads multiple marketers to this viewer-generated ad strategy, some observers suggest other factors including technology and evolving e-communities are at play. According to one columnist, the consumer-created Super Bowl ads are inspired by the success of social networking sites such as YouTube and MySpace. "Marketers like the idea of letting the public help make ads, in hopes of creating spots that resonate more with their audience—particularly young people who tend to be turned off by slickly produced spots." (Steinberg, 2007).

Other marketers returned to the tried and true idea of contest-oriented promotions for the 2007 Super Bowl. Pepsi provided a pre-Super Bowl Blitz with its contest for a chance to win $100,000 diamond, sapphire and ruby-studded Pepsi can plus Super Bowl tickets for life (www.pepsi.com). "The ability to run a promotion where you can get names and e-mail addresses is a very powerful way for a company to strategically get closer to their customers," says Pamela Danziger, president of the consulting firm Unity Marketing (Petrecca, 2007). But the campaign and its pre-game promotional efforts yielded additional benefits. Just prior to the 2007 Super Bowl, a Google search of "$100,000 Pepsi can" yielded 789,000 hits, again many of them news stories. Pepsi announced the winner during the halftime show sponsored by—Pepsi. Though a long-time Super Bowl advertiser, the halftime sponsorship was Pepsi's first venture of that type.

Financial conglomerate Nationwide worked hard to generate attention for its Super Bowl advertising investment in 2007. Its announcement that pseudo-celebrity Kevin Federline would appear in the company's Super Bowl ad drew widespread and swift media coverage. For example, 50,000 watt AM news-talk station WHAS in Louisville, Kentucky devoted 1:30 of its afternoon drive time coverage of January 17 to a discussion of the ad, Nationwide, and the merits of having "K-Fed" as a spokesperson. According to a station producer, that airtime would have sold for more than $400 (I. Vertrees, personal interview; January 18, 2007). The following morning, the station used another 30 seconds to again discuss the ad during its drive-time program, yielding another $150 worth of free coverage. Also that day, the *Louisville Courier-Journal* devoted about a 4-column inch space to an oversized pull quote, headline, and story about Nationwide and K-Fed on the front page of its entertainment section, providing several hundred dollars of additional publicity. Beyond Louisville, a search on Google on the morning of January 18 for "Nationwide Kevin Federline 2007 Super Bowl Ad" yielded 60,000 links including news stories in noted national media outlets such as Web sites for the *Chicago Sun-Times* and *Baltimore Sun* (suggesting additional newspaper publicity as well), popular culture sites like TMZ, and ad/business publications like Ad Age.

The cumulative effect of Nationwide's efforts suggest it received far more exposure than what it purchased on the 2007 Super Bowl. The added value is difficult to measure, particularly since Nationwide also built a synergy between its Super Bowl ad, publicity, and its own Web site. The company actively promoted the fact that its Super Bowl ad would premier on its Web site on drawing additional traffic. While $850+ of free media coverage in Louisville may not sound like much, if one also accounts for the widespread publicity in newspapers and on other radio and television stations around the country (many of them larger than Louisville, the nation's 50th largest media market) plus the added Web site traffic, the monetary value provided by the increased reach has the potential to expand far beyond the company's $2.5 million Super Bowl ad investment.

Finally, no Super Bowl 2007 review would be complete without a word about GoDaddy. Apparently the company was not generating quite the buzz it had expected by hiring Indy Car driver Danica Patrick as one of its spokespersons. So CEO Bob Parsons took a page out of his 2006 playbook and submitted spots to CBS that were likely to be turned down for being too racy (Parsons, January 13, 2007). Those spots starred GoDaddy poster girl Candice Michelle, not Ms. Patrick. Sure enough CBS turned down the spots, which helped the GoDaddy public relations machine shift into high gear.

On January 13, 2007, Parsons wrote in his blog he had just received word CBS had turned down his second spot and that he had posted the third on the Web site.

> **"CBS has been good to work with.**
>
> Even though they have yet to approve anything we have submitted, the Program Practices group at CBS have been good to work with. They are quick to respond and to the point.
>
> **That leaves us with one candidate.**
>
> As I reported to you earlier, we have filmed a total of three commercials for the Super Bowl. Since the first two have now been rejected, we are left with just one commercial that has a chance of airing during the Super Bowl. This remaining commercial is the one we recently filmed in Los Angeles. It includes an all star cast including our one and only Go Daddy Girl, Candice Michelle, Indy Car Driver Danica Patrick, Harley Davidson Drag Racer Valerie Thompson, the Teutuls from Orange County Choppers, Kevin Rose and Alex Albrecht from Diggnation, Cali Lewis from Geekbrief.tv, yours truly, and many others.
>
> **I'm hopeful, but have my doubts.**
>
> It is my sincere hope and belief that this remaining commercial will be approved

by CBS. But given the puritanical standards that were applied to our first two submissions, I'm not so sure it will be approved" (Parsons, January 13, 2007).

2008 SUPER BOWL XL

Super Bowl advertising in 2008 included storylines of pre-game buzz, celebrity appearances, viewer-generated spots, and ramped-up tactics to extend message life beyond the game day broadcast. Some advertisers were particularly successful in the latter, while others received criticism for not maximizing the value of their 2.7 million dollar ad buy. A failure to supplement the Super Bowl TV ad with the Internet, video sharing and social networks made up the brunt of the criticism (Reprise Media, 2008). Nonetheless, the efforts of some Super Bowl advertisers before the game were particularly notable in 2008.

Audi provided advanced publicity for its commercial that featured a take-off of the *Godfather* movie. The company also hosted a forum for VIP's, guests and the media in an area near the Super Bowl site in Glendale, Arizona. The forum included information about Audi's new, clean diesel cars and featured a driving area. Audi put on a similar forum near a Los Angeles nightclub. The company also launched a website on the eve of the Super Bowl and showed footage of the making of the commercial (Halliday 2008).

Korean automaker Hyundai, on the other hand, generated publicity for *not* pulling its ad from the Super Bowl. Some observers even suggested the automaker's on-again, off-again decision to advertise might have been a ploy to generate extra publicity (Steinberg and Halliday, 2008).

Victoria's Secret made a highly promoted foray into Super Bowl advertising in 2008 and generated widespread pre-game notice, thanks in no small part to an eye-catching picture of one of the lingerie company's models striking an alluring pose, wearing part of the product line and holding a football. The Associated Press distributed the photo throughout the land (Mann, 2008). A Victoria's Secret vice-president noted the company had experienced a slow holiday season and was feeling the effects of an overall downturn in underwear, sleepwear, and beauty categories. The president of the company cited the approach of Valentine's Day as a major reason for making the Super Bowl buy. The company was likely also spurred by the success of their previous venture into Super Bowl advertising. Their 30 second spot in the late 90's promoted a fashion-show webcast viewed by so many people it crashed the company Website (Zmuda 2008).

Frito-Lay repeated their previous Doritos promotion by sponsoring another build-your-own ad contest. The winners of the 2007 competition, hardly amateurs but the founders of a startup production firm, used their success to build their company. Frito-Lay went down a different path in 2008, asking consumers to produce a music video and again heavily promoted its advertising venture.

The efforts of all the Super Bowl advertisers, as usual, drew extensive media coverage, both before and after the game. According to one study, broadcast coverage of Super Bowl ads alone reached an incredible 750 million-plus viewers from December 1, 2007 to February 10, 2008 (Reuters, 2008a). Most of that coverage came from local television stations, perhaps providing marketers/brands with added credibility. In the print media, *USA Today*, as normal, devoted the front page of their Friday *Money* section before the game to highlights of the past 20 years of Super Bowl advertising, a rundown of the ads scheduled to appear in the broadcast, and a sidebar promoting additional coverage that would be coming in Monday's post-Super Bowl edition (Horovitz 2008a).

The 2008 Super Bowl advertising itself brought a mixed bag of results and critiques. Super Bowl ads featured more than 20 celebrities (Horovitz, 2008b). For the 10th consecutive year, an Anheuser-Busch beer ad was the winner of the *USA Today* Ad Meter competition (Horovitz, 2008b). Doritos, on the other hand, was not quite as critically acclaimed for its consumer-produced ad. One would have to believe the old adage of "even bad publicity" is good to call the taco chip brand's 2008 campaign a success. *USA Today's* Ad Meter poll ranked the Doritos music video spot 57th out of 57 (Horovitz, 2008b).

Interestingly enough, not one of the celebrity ads finished in the top five favorite ads in the Ad Meter rankings. Those celebrity ads included Carmen Electra in an Ice Breaker's gum spot and Justin Timberlake (he, of "wardrobe malfunction" fame) in a Pepsi spot. Richard Simmons and Alice Cooper had cameos in the Bridgestone Tire "Unexpected Obstacles" ad. Danica Patrick again starred in a GoDaddy commercial. Still many observers were unimpressed. One ad critic opined, "In most cases the sole purpose of some celebrities seemed to be to show how much humiliation they could endure" (Horowitz 2008b).

Celebrities or not, a couple of Super Bowl advertisers were highly successful in 2008 in generating media coverage and public discussion about their ads. Pepsi's Justin Timberlake ad drew the most broadcast news stories before or after the game (Reuters, 2008a) and the most online buzz (The Nielsen Company, 2008). Likewise, Anheuser-Busch and its Budweiser and Bud Light brands generated the second most broadcast news stories discussing their ads before or after the game (Reuters, 2008a), as well as the second most blog posts of any Super Bowl advertiser (Watershed Publishing, 2008b).

Other Super Bowl advertisers used sex appeal to draw viewers to the Internet to see streaming video. Victoria's Secret used its aforementioned ad to direct traffic to their Web site, thereby boosting visitors by 86% between Super Sunday and the following day (Nielsen Company, 2008). And GoDaddy combined pre-game publicity and its in-game ad to its advantage. Fox again banned the company's planned ad for the game so the company used its Super Bowl spot to invite viewers to their Web site to see the censored piece (Watershed Publishing, 2008b). By the time the game ended, 1.5 million viewers of the ad were recorded on the GoDaddy Web site (Reuters, 2008b).

Beyond Web site visits, the value of a Super Bowl buy must include other post-game opportunities to extend the life of the ad. Even those brands that did not direct traffic to the Internet in 2008 often benefited from a Super Bowl ad with additional exposure on their Web sites. Overall Web traffic of Super Bowl advertisers increased from Sunday of the game to Monday by 24% (Nielsen Company, 2008). Word of mouth about Super Bowl advertisers on the Internet was also frequent. About one-third of all online discussion about the Super Bowl was about the ads (Nielsen Company, 2008). Furthermore, 13% of respondents to a national survey reported visiting an advertiser's Web site and another 13% said they watched a Super Bowl ad online after the game (Watershed Publishing, 2008a).

Super Bowl ads indeed garnered extensive playback in 2008. The Fox network set up a MySpace.com Web site to replay ads (Nielsen Company, 2008). Fox even ran two promotional announcements during the game promoting the website. AOL, MySpace, and cable television networks MSNBC and Spike all offered computer users the opportunity to view commercials after the game (and sometimes before the game) on their Web sites. Even the Huffington Post got into the act at www.huffington post.com (Elliott, 2008). A YouTube Ad Blitz site recorded more than 20 million views of Super Bowl ads in the week after the game (Cymfony, 2008). And amazingly, commercials got a higher audience than the game itself in homes with TiVo video recorders, due to multiple views from rewinding the ads (Elliott, 2008).

CONCLUSION

The annual televised broadcast of the Super Bowl offers an atypical advertising venue for marketers. After all, where else can companies today expect that their ads will not only be watched but also discussed? Still the type of synergistic activity that is potentially fostered through Super Bowl television advertising is exemplary of what marketers increasingly must achieve in today's oversaturated communication environment if they are to wring every true bit of value out of their advertising investments.

This paper provides a starting point for study of the efforts of Super Bowl advertisers to create a synergy and buzz, and it is in no way a definitive statement of what has been accomplished. Future research should attempt to clearly quantify the value that is accrued through placing Super Bowl ads, actively working to generate buzz, and taking advantage of a media and public atmosphere that is receptive to the messages. In addition, some attempt should be made to move beyond the value of exposure to gauging the impact and success of such campaigns. For marketers today who must answer to demands for proving the return on advertising investment, particularly in the expensive medium of television, this research can help to provide a foundation upon which campaigns should be analyzed.

REFERENCES

A. C. Nielsen. (2007). Nielsen BuzzMetrics To Track Buzz Around 2007 Super Bowl Ads. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://nielsenbuzzmetrics.com/release.asp?id=169

Adland. (2007, January). Corporate Web site. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://commercial-archive.com/

Bernard, T. S. (2006, February 20). A little buzz goes a long way. *The Courier-Journal* (Louisville), pp. D1, D2.

Briggs, R., Krishnan, R., & Borin, N. (2005, Summer). Integrated multichannel communication strategies: Evaluating the return on marketing objectives – the case of the Ford F-150 launch. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 19* (3), 81-90.

CBS News. (2007, January). *Chevy Super Bowl Ad Challenge, Week 2.* Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/01/09/earlyshow/main2341201.shtml

Caywood, C. L., Schultz, D. E., & Wang, P. (1991). *A survey of consumer goods manufacturers*. New York: The American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Chang, Y. and Thorson, E. (2004, Summer). Television and web advertising synergies. *Journal of Advertising*, *33* (2), 75-84.

comScore Networks. (2006, February 7). Super Bowl ad campaigns spike Web traffic. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://www.comscore.com/press/release.asp?id=742

comScore Networks. (2003, January 31). Super Bowl advertisers score points well past game day, comScore reports. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://www.comscore.com/press/release.asp?id=288

comScore Networks. (2000, February 2). Dot.com Super Bowl television ads drive major increases in unique visitors according to Media Metrix. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://www.comscore.com/press/release.asp?id=175

Cymfony. (2008). You Tube viewers choose Tide To Go. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://cymfony.blogs.com/superbowl/

Dominiak, M. (2005, November 7). The idea exchange for planning TV spots. *Television Week*, *24* (45), p. 31.

Elliott, S. (2008, February 5). For marketing, the most valuable player might be YouTube. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 5, 2008 from: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/05/business/media/05adco.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=for%20marketing%20the%20most%20valuable%20player%2might%20be%20youtube&st=cse&oref=slogin

Freeman, M. (1999). Media wire. *Media Week*, *9* (6), pp. 4-6.

General Motors Corporation. (2006, October 10). Chevy gets overwhelming response to Super Bowl ad challenge. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from: http://www.gm.com/company/gmability/edu_k-12/news/superbowl_101006.html

Halliday, J. (2008, January 14). Audi Super Bowl spot to feature "Godfather" motif. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved January 15, 2008 from: http://adage.com/print?article_id123078

Horovitz, B. (2008a, February 1). 20 Highlights in 20 years. *USA Today.* Section B, p. 1.

Horovitz, B. (2008b). Budweiser's dog and pony show takes top Ad Meter spot. *USA Today*. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.usatoday.com/money/advertising/admeter/2008admeter.htm

Howard, T. (2006, January 29). Bowl marketers think small. *USA Today*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://www.usatoday.com/tech/news/2006-01-29-bowl-ads-smaller_x.htm

Jin, Y. S. (2003-04, Winter). Compounding consumer interest: effects of advertising campaign publicity on the ability to recall subsequent advertisement. *Journal of Advertising*, *32* (4), 29-41.

Jin, H. S., Zhao, X, & An, S. (2006). Examining effects of advertising campaign publicity in a field study. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *46* (2), 171-182.

Kaplan, D. (2003, October 27). Masses still tuned into mass media advertising. *Editor and Publisher*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://www.editorandpublisher.com/eandp/news/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=2011087

Kelley, S. W. & Turley, L. W. (2004). The effects of content on perceived affect of Super Bowl Commercials. Gordon Ford College of Business Working Paper Series, Western Kentucky University. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://www.wku.edu/gfcb/papers/Turley2.pdf

Khermouch, G. (2001, July 30). Buzz marketing: Suddenly this stealth strategy is hot—but it's still fraught with risk. *Business Week*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/01_31/b3743001.htm

Lindeman, T. F. (2006, February 1). Advertisers adore Super Bowl telecast. *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=979557561&sid=2&Fmt=3&clientId=9580&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Loda, M. D. & Coleman, B. C. (2005, December). Sequence matters: A more effective way to use advertising and publicity. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *45* (4), 362-372.

Mann, J. (2008, February. 2). Watch out for the tease. *Kansas City Star*. P. C1.

McAllister, M. (1999). Super Bowl as commercial celebration. *Communication Review, 3,* 403-426.

Neff, J. (2006, October 29). Better ROI from Youtube Video than Super Bowl Spot. *Advertising Age.* Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://adage.com/article?article_id=112835

Neff, J. & Halliday, J. (2005, January 31). Great value at $80,000 per second. *Advertising Age*, *76*, pp. 4-5.

Nielsen Company. (2008). Nielsen's recap of 2008 Super Bowl advertising.

Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=109&STORY=/www/story/02-07-2008/0004751824&EDATE=

Parsons, B. (2007, January 13). Personal blog on corporate Web site. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from: http://www.bobparsons.com/HannityColmes2ndRejection.html?serendipity[searchTerm]=super+bowl

Parsons, B. (2007, January 4). Personal blog on corporate Web site. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from:http://www.bobparsons.com/2007riproaringstart.html?serendipity[searchTerm]=super+bowl#c17203

Parsons, B. (2006, October 21). Personal blog on corporate Web site. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from: http://www.bobparsons.com/OutofAfrica.html?serendipity[searchTerm]=super+bowl

Parsons, B. (2005, May 8). Personal blog on corporate Web site. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from: http://www.bobparsons.com

TheGoDaddyGirlWhoseideawassheSeeourfournew commercialshereWarning2arecontroversialWeinterviewtheworldsmostfamoushacker-Radio GoDaddys8thshow.html?serendipity[searchTerm]=super+bowl

Petrecca, L. (2007, January 11). Jeweled Pepsi can bows as bowl bling. *USA Today.* Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://money.aol.com/news/articles/_a/jeweled-pepsi-can-bows-as-bowl-bling/20070111080009990001

Reprise Media. (2008). Super Bowl advertisers fumble in search and social media. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.reprisemedia.com/pressreleases/2008/release_scorecard08_post.aspx

Reuters. (2008a). In spite of Fox, Go Daddy's 'Beaver' builds tremendous Web traffic. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS53189+04-Feb-2008+BW20080204

Reuters. (2008b). Broadcast news coverage of 2008 Super Bowl ads reaches more than 750 million viewers. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS153086+22-Feb-2008+PRN20080222

Rothenberg, R. (1990, January 8). Commercials Become News and the Airtime is Free. *The New York Times*, p. D1.

Spain, W. (2006, January 25). Super Bowl ads cutting the sleaze. *Market-watch*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from: http://www.marketwatch.com/News/Story/Story.aspx?guid= %7BE264C6C5-EEBF-4954-8569-B9C3CD847989%7D&siteid=google

Stammerjohan, C., Wood, C. M., Chang, Y., & Thorson, E. (2005, Winter). An empirical investigation of the interaction between publicity, advertising, and previous brand attitudes and knowledge. *Journal of Advertising*, *34* (4), 55-67.

Steinberg, B. (2007, January 12) Super Bowl Advertisers Hand Amateurs the Ball. *Wall Street Journal,* B1.

Steinberg, B. & Halliday, J. (2008, January 17). Hyundai decides to keep its ad in Super Bowl. *Advertising Age.* Retrieved January 18, 2008 from: http://adage.com/print?article_id+123159

Thomaselli, R. (2007, Jan. 9). NFL picks winner of Super Bowl viewer-created ad contest. *Advertising Age.* Retrieved January 17, 2007, from: http://adage.com/superbowl07/article?article_id=114195

TV Newsday. (2006, January 27). Now you can bet on the Super Bowl commercials. *TV Newsday*. Retrieved January 3, 2007 from: http://www.tvnewsday.com/articles/2006/01/27/daily.2/

Vaughan, D. (2006, March 10). Web hosting Super Bowl advertising—Does it work? *Cheap Web Hosting Directory*. Retrieved January 3, 2007 from: http://www.cheaphostingdirectory.com/art-web-hosting-super-bowl-advertising-36.html

Watershed Publishing. (2008a). A-B king of Super Bowl ads; Hyundai improves - SalesGenie damages image. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.marketingcharts.com/television/a-b-king-of-super-bowl-ads-hyundai-improves-salesgenie-damages-image-3382/comscore-super-bowl-ads-affect-on-brand-imagejpg/

Watershed Publishing. (2008b). Traffic spikes for Hyundai, Paramount, GoDaddy on Super Bowl sunday. Retrieved September 20, 2008 from: http://www.marketingcharts.com/television/traffic-spikes-for-hyundai-paramount-godaddy-on-super-bowl-sunday-3400/

Yahoo!, Inc. (2007, January 5). Doritos and Yahoo! Video invite you to create a Super Bowl commercial. Retrieved on January 5, 2007, from: http://video.search.yahoo.com/search/ video?p=doritos+&fr=yfp-t-501&toggle=1&cop=mss&ei=UTF-8

Yeklur, R., Tomkovick, C., & Traczyk, P. (2004). Super Bowl advertising effectiveness: Hollywood finds the games golden. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *44* (1), 143-159.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

[ARTICLE]

HEADS UP: WHAT DEANS EXPECT OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

HERE ARE WAYS TO THE TOUGHEST JOB IN THE UNIVERSITY A LITTLE EASIER

Gary A. Olson
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Illinois State University
golson@ilstu.edu

Recently I served on a panel of deans who were asked to discuss our expectations of department chairs. The session was meant to help new chairs understand their role as academic administrators. The panelists exhibited a surprising amount of unanimity on the subject and I would like to share some of their advice.

It has become a cliché in higher-education literature to asset that the toughest job at the institution is department head, and for good reason: As chair, you have a foot in two very different worlds. You are the chief advocate for your faculty both to the administration and externally. In that role, you are kind of a prime minister—the first among equals—and a stalwart champion of your department's interests. Within the department, however, you are the frontline administrator, the supervisor of all personnel, and the primary fiscal agent. In that role, you serve as the chief representative of the institution to your faculty and staff members.

A key to becoming an effective department head is the ability to balance those two very different roles. Ineffective chairs foster a them versus us climate within the department: "You'll never guess what they are going to make us do now," such chairs say, where "they" means all university administrators above the department level lumped into one. Adopting that stance may ingratiate you to department members in the short term, but it also demonstrates a lack of leadership.

Effective chairs understand as a part of the institution's administrative team, they will be expected to interpret and even sell new initiatives, policies, and procedures to their department on behalf of the institution. Leadership involves stepping up and accepting that role, even when you personally do not support the new policy.

As someone with a foot in two worlds, you will need to follow proper protocol scrupulously and guide your faculty to do so as well. Nowadays, perhaps more than ever before, professors, staff members, students, and even parents feel empowered to leap over several administrative layers in an attempt to get their way. Why follow the process when you can appeal directly to the provost or president? But violating protocol, or allowing others to do so, disrupts the orderly conduct of university business.

For example, you would not want to be blindsided by one of your faculty members who went directly to the dean to pitch a new program rather than starting with you as the department head. Similarly, if you were to take a departmental initiative first to the provost rather than to your dean, you would risk embarrassing the dean and perhaps losing his or her support.

Following protocol invariably works to your benefit. Maybe the timing is not right for your proposal and the dean could potentially prevent you from making a strategic error in proposing the plan prematurely. Alternatively, your timing might be perfect and the dean could be your best advocate. Either way, you win by working through proper channels. In short, always keep your dean in the loop and train faculty members in your department to follow basic protocol as well.

An effective department head works closely with the dean and the dean's staff members. The people in the dean's office are there to help you be successful as a chair and should be seen as your greatest support network. Do not isolate yourself and feel you must solve every problem on your own: "I don't want to trouble the dean with this one." Most deans would rather be bothered early before a minor brush fire mushrooms into a major conflagration.

A key skill of a good department head is the ability to reserve judgment in a dispute until all parties have weighed in. Everyone who appeals for your support has a compelling story. Unsophisticated administrators assume the first story they hear is the truth or the prevailing narrative about someone or some incident is accurate. Sophisticated administrators wait patiently to hear all sides before arriving at an option or rendering a verdict.

As the department's chief administrator, you are expected to maintain the highest standards of ethical behavior. No matter how close you are to certain colleagues in the department you must do all you can to avoid showing favoritism when evaluating faculty and staff members, making recommendations about raises, or scheduling courses.

The best department heads develop a healthy balance among their teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. As the chief academic officer of your department, you should serve as a role model to your faculty by being a lauded teacher, an active scholar, and a skilled administrator. Sure, that balance is difficult to effect and you are not going to have the time to devote to your teaching and research you used to have. But keeping up your own work as much as possible is an important way to build credibility within the department and beyond.

One department head in my own college consistently teaches more courses than he is required to and recently won a university-wide award for outstanding teaching. Another chair regularly assigns himself to huge lecture courses enrolling hundreds of students so he can justify providing course releases to active researchers. A third has garnered global attention for his research, including television documentaries, and a lengthy story in *The New Yorker*. All three have found a way to balance their many duties and to gain the respect of colleagues in the process.

That said it is important that you not subordinate the management of your department to your teaching or research. Stories abound of department heads neglecting the nuts and bolts of administration to concentrate on their own scholarship. Balance is the watchword.

Not everything we talked about at our panel will apply in every institutional context. Practices and campus cultures vary but the issues I summarized here are those every chair will face on a daily basis. The job of department head may well be the toughest in the university but you can make the job considerably harder by ignoring this good advice.

To read his previous columns, see http://chronicle.com/jobs/news/archives/heads_up. This essay first appeared in The Chronicle of Higher Education's Careers section and the Chronicle granted reprint permission to Feedback.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

2009-2010 BEA SCHOLARSHIP WINNERS ANNOUNCED

Fifteen students from fourteen different campuses were awarded scholarships in the Broadcast Education Association's 2009-2010 competition. The winners were selected by the BEA Scholarship Committee at its Fall meeting in Washington, D.C., announced Pete Orlik, committee chair. They include:

Abe Voron Scholarships
Mark Long, Illinois State University
Raymond Nelson, Central Michigan University

Walter Patterson Scholarships
Gabrielle Boward, Cedarville University
Michael Houchin, University of Montana

Harold Fellows Scholarships
Adriana Fletcher, Pacific Lutheran University
Alysha Mendez, Texas State University
Shea Northcut, Elon University
Laura Beth Ward, Elon University

Vincent Wasilewski Scholarship
James Wallace, California State University/Northridge

Alexander Tanger Scholarship
Michael Valerio, George Washington University

Helen Sioussat/Fay Wells Scholarships
Colin Greene, James Madison University
Suyun Hong, University of Texas/Austin

Vision /VCI Solutions Scholarship
Christi Ann Mitchell, Oklahoma Baptist University

BEA Two Year/Community College Scholarships
Mary Wilkins, Isothermal Community College
Yeiber Cano, City College of San Francisco

BEA scholarships are awarded to outstanding students for study on campuses that are institutional members of the organization. The 2010/2011 competition begins on January 20, 2009.

<< RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

DR. ROBERT L. SNYDER DIED EARLY IN THE MORNING OF MARCH 27.

In 1964, "Doc" Snyder was hired by the then Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh to develop a program in Radio-Television-Film. He, and a class of students, would later obtain the license for and put on the air WRST-FM. The call letters stand for "Radio Station of the Titans" and not "Robert Snyder's Toy."

Doc's accomplishments are many. Besides building a program of no small reputation for media education, he was the biographer of Pare Lorentz. Lorentz made documentary films for the FDR Administration. Doc also served on the education committee of the Wisconsin Broadcasters Association and was the treasurer for the BEA. He was inducted into the WBA Hall of Fame in 2001. He received the highest honor granted by UW-Oshkosh, the Rosebush Award, in 1986.

Snyder's teaching philosophy was two-fold, students must come first and secondly, one must approach their work with a commitment to merit. He adopted the latter from Pare Lorentz.

He took great pride in the successes of his students, including: Gordon Jump, actor; Larry Klein, Dick Clark Productions; Dr. Tim Meyer, UW-Green Bay; Steve Boettcher, Emmy-nominated documentary producer; Dennis Krause, WTMJ Radio and winner of the WBA Sportscaster of the Year Award; Mark Schiefelbein, executive, Green Bay Packers; Lori Burns, four-time National Sports Emmy winner; Kristofer Brown, screenwriter and Michael Sajbel, film director.

Snyder loved radio and jazz. He combined these two passions on his radio program "Doc's Jazz City." The program aired for over 40 years. Students always served as his engineers.

He taught a subject that, in our culture, is driven by consumerism and hype, and yet he gave his best to serve as an example for future communicators that others, not self, should come first.

A scholarship in Dr. Snyder's memory has been established at the UW-Oshkosh Foundation.

2008-2009 NATIONAL SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

Following are the results of the sixteenth annual BEA national salary survey conducted in Fall, 2008. Respondents encompassed all types of institutions ranging from small, private, 4-year liberal arts colleges to major public universities offering the doctorate in the field.

Please note the following:

1. All salaries are base salaries -- they do not reflect fringe benefits.
2. All have been adjusted to an academic year (9/10 mos.) basis.
3. Only faculty teaching electronic media courses are included.
4. The survey includes only full-time faculty -- both temporary and tenure-track.

RESPONDING	LOW	HIGH	MEDIAN	MEAN	SCHOOLS
Instructor	31,000	70,300	43,692	49,034	28
Asst. Prof.	36,000	72,500	53,500	58,705	41
Assoc. Prof.	45,782	100,000	65,952	68,855	40
Full Prof.	50,000	183,600	80,000	90,721	35

*Average of means compiled by each respondent for each rank

Salary most likely to be paid to an incoming INSTRUCTOR without prior full-time teaching experience (mean of those responding):

$41,873.76 (37 schools)

Most likely salary for an incoming ASSISTANT PROFESSOR who has just completed the terminal degree (mean of those responding):

$51,641.59 (46 schools)

Data compiled and reported by Peter B. Orlik, Central Michigan University, under authority of the Broadcast Education Association Board of Directors.

[COMMITTEES & TASK FORCES]

Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication (ACEJMC)
BEA Representatives
Joe Foote
Doug Boyd

Convention Porgram Committee
2008 Convention Chair
Stan LaMuth
2009 Convention Chair
Anthony Moretti
Members
Louise Benjamin, Festival Chair
Bob Avery, Publications Chair
Sam Sauls, Interest Divisions Rep
Scott Davis, Webmaster
Kim Zarkin, 2007 Convention Chair
Mark Tolstedt, Vice President for Academic Relations

Distinguished Education Service Award (DESA) & Lifetime Member Committee
Chair
Mark Tolstedt
Members
Dave Muscari
Max Utsler

Committee on Scholarship (DSA)
Chair
Bob Avery
Vice chair
Alan Rubin
Members
Donald Browne
Joseph Dominick
Susan Tyler Eastman
Don Godfrey

Research Promotion
Chair
Mark Tolstedt
Members
Steven Dick
Fritz Messere
Greg Newton

Diversity Committee
Chair
Lena Zhang
Members
Gary Corbitt
Greg Pitts

Long Range Planning and Membership Committee
Chair
Fritz Messere
Members
David Byland
Dave Muscari
Max Utsler

Finance Committee
Chair
Joe Bridges
Members
Greg Pitts
Mark Tolstedt
Glenda Williams
Lena Zhang

Nominations Committee
Chair
David Byland
Members
Greg Newton
Dex Allen

Publications Committee
Members
Robert Avery
Members
Glenda Balas
Allison Alexander
Paul Haridakis
Michael Keith
Rebecca Ann Lind
Joe Misiewicz

Festival Committee
Chair
Vic Costello
Louise Benjamin, Ex-Officio

Scholarship Committee
Chair
Peter Orlik
Members
Marilou Johnson
Bill Parris
Marianne Barrett

Council of Professionals
Chair
Gary Corbitt

Strategic Alliances Committee
Chair
Joe Misiewicz

Members
Gary Corbitt
Dex Allen
Drew Barry
Erica Farber
Ric Harris

District Conference Planning Committee
Chair
Glenda Williams
Members
Lena Zhang
Sam Sauls
Gary Corbitt (ex-officio)

Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC)
BEA Representatives
Joe Foote
Doug Boyd

Council of Communications Associations (CCA)
Thomas Berg
Mark Tolstedt
Heather Birks

Council of National Journalism Organizations
Thomas Berg
Heather Birks
Mark Tolstedt
Steven Dick

Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media
Don Godfrey, Editor

Journal of Radio Studies
Doug Ferguson, Editor

Feedback
Joe Misiewicz, Editor

BEA Membership Directory,
Rebecca Ann Lind, Editor

[2009 BEA FESTIVAL]

Festival Chair
Vic Costello
Elon University
vcostello@elon.edu

Festival Competition Chairs
Faculty Audio Competition
Melanie Stone
Georgia Southern University
mstone@georgiasouthern.edu

Student Audio Competition
Tony DeMars
Texas A&M University-Commerce
tony.demars@tamu-commerce.edu

Faculty Interactive Multimedia Competition
Mary Schaffer
California State University-Northridge
mary.c.schaffer@csun.edu

Student Multimedia Competition
Richard Cawood
University of Cincinnati
richard.cawood@uc.edu

Faculty Scriptwriting Competition
Dennis Conway
Marist College
dennis.conway@marist.edu

Student Scriptwriting Competition
Michael McAlexander
Frostburg State University
mcmcalexander@frostburg.edu

Faculty Video Competition
Lowell Briggs
York College of Pennsylvania
lbriggs@ycp.edu

Student Video Competition
Warren Koch
Azusa Pacific University
wkoch@apu.edu

Faculty and Student News Competitions
Ken Fischer
University of Oklahoma
kfischer@ou.edu

Two-Year and Small Colleges Competition
Tom McDonnell
Parkland College
tmcdonnell@parkland.edu

Faculty Documentary Competition
Jay Rosenstein
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
jrosenst@uiuc.edu

Student Documentary Competition
Ralph Beliveau
University of Oklahoma
beliveau@ou.edu

Festival Committee
In addition to the Festival Competition Chairs the Festival Committee includes: Steve Anderson, James Madison University; Robert Avery, University of Utah; Louise Benjamin, University of Georgia; Dennis Conway, Marist; Vic Costello, Elon University; Jan Dates, Howard University; Bill Davie, University of Louisiana; Pam D. Tran, University of Alabama; Todd Evans, Drake University; Joe Foote, University of Oklahoma; Don Godfrey, Arizona State University; Rustin Greene, James Madison University; Ken Harwood, University of Houston; Price Hicks, emeritus, ATAS Foundation; Scott Hodgson, University of Oklahoma; Robert Jacobs, Bradley University; Evan Johnson, University of Wisconsin-River Falls; Andy Lapham, United Kingdom; Thomas McHardy, James Madison University; Patricia Phalen, George Washington University; Gary Wade, Drake University; John Woody, James Madison University.

Review Board
Mary Beadle, John Carroll University; D'Artagnan Bebel, KRIV; Barbara Cloud, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; John Craft, Arizona State University; Michael Keith, Boston College; Judi Moore Latta, Howard University; Elizabeth Leebron, Temple University; Larry Lichty, Northwestern University; Paula Matabane, Howard University; Fran Matera, Arizona State University; Norm Medoff, North Arizona University; Nikos Metallinos, Concordia University; Michael Monty, Seneca College; Mike Murray, University of Missouri, St. Louis; Peter Orlik, Central Michigan University; David Reese, John Carroll University; William Slater, University of Nevada, Reno; Max Utsler, University of Kansas; Herbert Zettl, San Francisco State University.

The Review Process
Working with the Festival Chair, Festival Committee and the Competition Chairs, the Review Board serves much like an Editorial Board would for a scholarly, refereed journal. The Review Board constitutes a large group of nationally recognized professionals and professors, who are organized into panels, which assist in judging individual full time faculty entries in specific categories. This blind review focuses on the following criteria: professionalism, the use of aesthetic and/or creative elements, sense of structure and timing, production values, technical merit and overall contributions to the discipline in both form and substance. The Festival Committee targets an acceptance award rate of twenty-percent within full time faculty awards.

Faculty Award Categories

BEA Best of Festival King Foundation Award - this award is given at the discretion of the competition chair to the best overall entry in the following faculty competitions: Audio, Interactive Multimedia, Scriptwriting, Video, News, and Documentary.

BEA Best of Competition Award - this award connotes superior quality work, parallel in idea to research accepted for publication in a refereed journal. This award is generally given to the first-place submission within a faculty competition subcategory.

BEA Award of Excellence - this award connotes superior quality work and is generally given to the second or third place finisher within a faculty competition subcategory.

Student Award Categories

Student award categories are established individually for each competition. They are generally designated as first, second, and third place awards.

BEA Best of Festival King Foundation Award - this award is given at the discretion of the competition chair to the best overall entry in the following student competitions: Audio, Interactive Multimedia, Scriptwriting, Video, Two-Year/Small Colleges, Radio News, Television News, Television News Team, and Documentary.

[DIRECTORY]

[STAFF, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD MEMBERS]

Staff

Broadcast Education Association
1771 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-2891
(202) 429-3935
Fax: (202) 775-2981

Heather Birks
Executive Director
HBirks@nab.org

Traci Bailey
Office Manager
TBailey@nab.org

J-D Boyle
Director of Sales and Marketing
jdboyle@nab.org

2008-2009
Board of Directors

PRESIDENT
Mark Tolstedt
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Division of Communication
1101 Reserve Street - CAC 219
Stevens Point, WI 54481
715.346.3920
715.346.3998-Fax
mtolsted@uwsp.edu

VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC RELATIONS
Glenda Williams
The University of Alabama
4328 Phifer Hall
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487
205.348.8661
205.348.5162-Fax
glenda.williams@ua.edu

VICE PRESIDENT for INDUSTRY RELATIONS
Erica Farber
Radio & Records
2049 Century Park East, Suite 4100
Los Angeles, CA 90067
310.788.1616
310.203.8754-Fax
efarber@radioandrecords.com

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Max Utsler
University of Kansas
2066 Dole Center
1000 Sunnyside Drive
Lawrence, KS 66045
785.864.0608-office
913.829.9754-home
785.864.0614-Fax
utsler@ku.edu

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Thomas R. Berg
Middle Tennessee State University
Electronic Media Communication Department
MTSU PO Box X025
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
615.898.5867
615.898.5682-Fax
tberg@mtsu.edu

2008-2009 District Division Directors

District 1
(Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Western Europe including Britain)
Fritz J. Messere
(2nd year, 1st term)
SUNY Oswego
Communications Studies
2 Lanigan Hall
Oswego, NY 13126
(315) 312-2357
Fax (315) 312-5658
messere@oswego.edu

District 2
(Alabama Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Caribbean and Africa)
August Grant
(1st year, 1st term)
University of South Carolina
25 Corssbow Lakes Court
Columbia, SC 29212-1654
803.749.3578
augie@focus25.com
augie@sc.edu

DISTRICT 3
(Delaware, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, DC, West Virginia, the Middle East and Eastern Europe including Russia)
Greg Newton
(1st term, 2nd year)
Ohio University
School of Telecommunications
9 S. College
Athens, OH 45701
740.597.1882
740.593.9184-Fax
newtong@ohio.edu

DISTRICT 4
(Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Canada, and Scandinavia)
Barry Umansky
(1st term, 1st year)
Ball State University
BC201-L Ball Building
Muncie, IN 473016-0001
765.285.9077
765.285.9278-Fax
bdumansky@bsu.edu

DISTRICT 5
(Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Mexico, Central America, South America and Australia)
Max Utsler
(2nd term, 1st year)
William Allen White School of Journalism and Mass Communications
2066 Dole Center
1000 Sunnyside Drive
Lawrence, KS 66045
(785) 864-0608
Fax: (785) 864-0614
ulster@ku.edu

DISTRICT 6
(Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Asia and Pacific)
Mary Schaffer
(1st term, 1st year)
California State University
20905 Abalar Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91364-4502
818.887.3351
818.883.3737-Fax
mary.c.schaffer@csun.edu

DISTRICT 7
(All two-year schools in the USA)
Gwin Faulconer-Lippert
(1st term, 1st year)
Oklahoma City Community College
7777 S May Avenue
Oklahoma City, OK 73159-4419
405.682.1611 x7254
405.682.7559
gfaulconer@occc.edu

DISTRICT 8
(BEA Interest Divisions)
Sam Sauls
(2nd year, 1st term)
University of North Texas
3700 Cooper Branch West
Denton, TX 76209
(940) 565-3222
Fax (940) 369-7838
sauls@unt.edu

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE CHAIR
Robert K. Avery
University of Utah
Department of Communication
225 S. Central Campus Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
801.581.5343
801.585.6255-Fax
rka@utah.edu

2008-2009 Electronic Media Professionals

Dex Allen
California Communications
P.O. Box 9077
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
califcom@pacbell.net

Erica Farber
Radio & Records
2049 Century Park East, Suite 4100
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 788-1616
efarber@RadioAndRecords.com

Dave Muscari
WFAA-TV/The Dallas Morning News
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 977-6490
Fax: (214) 977-6590
dmuscari@wfaa.com

Ric Harris
NBC Universal
30 Rockefeller Plaza
26th Floor
New York, NY 10112
eric.harris@nbcuni.com

[BROADCAST ASSOCIATIONS]

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

[MEDIA PUBLICATIONS]

Broadcasting & Cable	http://www.broadcastingcable.com/
Cable Connect (Cable In the Clasroom)	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]

[ASSOCIATE]

Academy of TV Arts & Sciences Fndtn
Anton/Bauer, Inc.
Automated Data Systems
Broadcasting Development Fund /
Program Distributor
Intercollegiate Broadcasting System
Lee University
Michaels Media, Inc
Montana Broadcasters Association
Nagle Hartray Architects
Ohio/Illinois Centers for Broadcasting
Post Newsweek Stations

Public Broadcasting Partners
Saga Communications
Texas Association of Broadcast Educators / Del Mar College
WGVU - TV

[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
Azusa Pacific University
Ball State University
Barry University
Baylor University
Belmont University
Bergen Community College
Bethany College
Bloomsburg University
Bob Jones University
Bossier Parish Community College
Boston University
Bournemouth University
Bradley University
Bridgewater State College
Brigham Young University
Brookdale Community College
Brooklyn College
Butler University
California State, Chico
California State University - Fresno
California State University at Fullerton
California State University at Northridge
California State University, Dominguez Hills
Cameron University
Cardiff University
Cayuga Community College
Cedarville University
Central Michigan University
Central Missouri State University
Chattahoochee Technical College
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
Cosumnes River College
Cuesta College
Delaware State University
DePauw University
Drake University
Duquesne University
East Tennessee State University
Eastern Connecticut State University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Michigan University
Elizabethtown College
Elon University
Emerson College
Evangel University
Ferris State University
Fielding Graduate University
Finger Lakes Community College
Flagler College / Communication Department
Frostburg State University
Georgia College & State University
Georgia Southern University
Golden West College
Grambling State University
Green River Community College
Harding University
Henry Ford Community College
Howard Community College
Howard University
Hudson Valley Community College
Illinois State University
Indiana State University

Indiana University
International College of Broadcasting
Iowa Western Community College
Isothermal Community College
James Madison University
John Carroll University
John Carroll University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Kingsborough Community College
Kutztown University
Lamar University
Long Island University
Louisiana State University
Lyndon State College
Madison Media Institute
Madonna University
Manchester College
Marist College
Marshall University
McNeese State University
Meridian Community College
Michigan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Mississippi State University
Missouri Southern State University-Joplin
Missouri State University
Montclair State University
Montgomery College
Montgomery Community College
Morehead State University
Mt. Wachusett Community College
Mudra Institute of Communications
Murray State University
Muskingum College
Nanyang Technological University
New England School of Communication
Normandale Community College
North Central College
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Kentucky University
Northwestern College
Northwestern University
Northwestern University
Oglala Lakota College
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
Regent University
Richland College
Rogers State University
Roosevelt University
Rowan University
Saddleback College
Saint Xavier University
Salisbury University
Sam Houston State University
San Antonio College
San Diego State University / School of Theatre, Television & Film
San Francisco State University
San Jose State University
Santa Ana/Santiago Canyon College
Santa Monica Community College
Savannah State University
Scottsdale Community College
Sheridan College
Shippensburg University
Slippery Rock University
South Suburban College
Southeast Missouri State University
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Southern Utah University
St. Bonaventure University
St. Cloud State University
St. Francis College
St. John's University
St. Mary's University
Staffordshire University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Stephens College
SUNY - Brockport

SUNY - Oneonta
SUNY - Oswego
Suny Alfred WETD
Susquehanna University
Syracuse University
Temple Univ/Dept of Broadcasting, Telecom. & Mass Media
Texas Christian University
Texas State University - San Marcos
Texas Tech University
The American College of Greece / Communications
The University of Akron
Towson University
Towson University
Trinity University
Truman State University
Univeristy of Wisconsin at River Falls
University of Advancing Technology Education
University of Alabama
University of Arkansas
University of Central Florida
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Cincinnati
University of Delaware
University of Denver
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii, Manoa
University of Houston
University of Illinois, Springfield
University of Indianapolis
University of Iowa
University of Kansas / Willaim Allen White
University of Kent
University of Kentucky
University of La Verne
University of Louisiana, Lafayette
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Memphis
University of Miami
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Montana
University of Nebraska at Kearney
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nebraska atLincoln
University of Nevada at Las Vegas
University of Nevada at Reno
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
University of North Carolina at Wilmington / Communication Studies
University of North Carolina Pembroke
University of North Dakota
University of North Texas
University of Northern Iowa
University of Oklahoma
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 Chatanooga
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at El Paso
University of the Incarnate Word
University of Toledo
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 Platteville
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Utah State University
Valdosta State University
Vincennes University
Virginia Polytechnical Institute & State University
Wake Forest University
Washington State Community College
Washington State University
Wayne State University
Western Illinois University
Westminster College
Winthrop University

BROADCAST EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Educating for Tomorrow's Media

Feedback
Broadcast Education Association
World Headquarters
1771 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA
http://www.beaweb.org

2008-09 BEA OFFICERS

PRESIDENT
Mark Tolstedt, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC RELATIONS
Glenda Williams, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

VICE PRESIDENT for INDUSTRY RELATIONS
Erica Farber, Radio & Records

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Max Utsler, University of Kansas

NAB/BEA FUTURE CONFERENCE DATES

Year	NAB Show	BEA Show
2009	April 20-23	April 22-25
2010	April 12-15	April 14-17
2011	April 11-14	April 13-16
2012	April 16-19	April 18- 21
2013	April 8-11	April 10-13
2014	April 7-10	April 9-12
2015	April 13-16	April 15-18
2016	April 18-21	April 20-23
2017	April 24-27	April 26-29
2018	April 9-12	April 11-14
2019	April 15-18	April 17-20
2020	April 20-23	April 22-25

FEEDBACK INDEX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Feedback's index and bibliography is now in Microsoft Word format. It is available by clicking on the link below:

http://ilocker.bsu.edu/users/sndavis/world_shared/feedback/jan09/feedbackindex.doc
http://ilocker.bsu.edu/users/sndavis/world_shared/feedback/jan09/feedbackbiblio.doc