8-15-2013

Management Practices of Student-Run Broadcast Radio Stations: A National Review of Contemporary College Radio

Ronald K. Raymond
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd

MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OF STUDENT-RUN BROADCAST RADIO STATIONS:

A NATIONAL REVIEW OF CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE RADIO

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Ronald K. Raymond

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2013

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Communications Media

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Ronald K. Raymond

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____   _____
                                         B. Gail Wilson, Ed.D.
                                         Professor of Communications Media,
                                         CMIT Doctoral Program Coordinator, Chair

_____   _____
                                         Mary Beth Leidman, Ed.D.
                                         Professor of Communications Media

_____   _____
                                         Zachary Stiegler, Ph.D.
                                         Assistant Professor of Communications Media

ACCEPTED

_____   _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Management Practices of Student-Run Broadcast Radio Stations: A National Review of
        Contemporary College Radio

Author: Ronald K. Raymond

Dissertation Chair: Dr. B. Gail Wilson

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Mary Beth Leidman
                                  Dr. Zachary Stiegler

Radio stations owned by colleges or universities have been in existence since the earliest days of the medium, but little research has been conducted on college radio stations. Even less has focused on campus stations that are led primarily by students. This study examined management practices of student-led FM college radio broadcast stations in the United States and provides a contemporary review of the programming, practices, and challenges associated with today's campus stations. The study used an online survey instrument to secure data from leaders of student-directed college radio stations across the country. Henri Fayol's five elements of management provided the theoretical base for the research. These included the areas of planning, organizing, commanding, co-ordinating, and controlling.

Study results indicated that student management teams are primarily responsible for day-to-day operations with Faculty-Advisor- Managers (FAMs) providing assistance with equipment and technical needs, discipline, and regulatory compliance. The study concludes with observations and comments relative to college radio provided by student managers and FAMs of campus stations from all around the United States.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many talented and caring individuals who have blessed me in varying ways throughout this project and indeed throughout the process of my ongoing education. I could not possibly remember to recognize each who has contributed in some way to whatever measure of success I attain. However, I do want to take this opportunity to specifically thank several for their belief in me and their support of my efforts to expand my knowledge base and grow as a person.

First, I would like to acknowledge my family that has allowed me to spend inordinate amounts of time and energy focusing on my work and studies and furthering my education. This has required sacrifice on everyone's account, with time, energy, and funds for family activities, vacations, and events limited to say the least. While on the subject of family, I only wish my parents were still with us to experience this milestone in my life. They remain an inspiration and are deeply missed.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee for their dedication, wisdom, and the direction they provided throughout this process. Dr. B. Gail Wilson, my dissertation chair, tirelessly and thoughtfully responded to my questions and concerns, guiding me through the process with diligence and deadlines that were appropriately challenging and achievable. Dr. Mary Beth Leidman encouraged me to pursue this project early on and provided significant recommendations that greatly improved the survey instrument and helped the project maintain focus. Dr. Zachary Stiegler offered precise reviews of the draft chapters and suggested several resources that were extremely beneficial. All share a deep knowledge of broadcasting and a passion for radio in particular, that made their presence on this committee of immense importance. I am fortunate to have had the benefit of such an outstanding leadership team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Radio stations typically operate within a particular superstructure (Leidman &

Lamberski, 1986a) and college or university stations are no different in that regard. However,

unique challenges exist for college radio stations that are managed by students and forced to

negotiate with varying influences and constituencies, all while operating within their own

institutional structure (Waits, 2007). Management representatives from college radio stations

often have to contend with groups such as school administrators, student government

associations, faculty members, other campus media organizations, music industry

representatives, students with different interests or academic backgrounds, alumni, and members

of the community at large. Leidman and Lamberski (1986a) stated "managing a college or

university station is difficult" (p. 4), adding that management training for those involved is

typically insufficient. Administrative challenges facing college radio stations are at the core of

this study, which also seeks to provide an updated profile of college stations today.

Detailed information for comparative purposes is a valuable resource for managers or

advisers presented with the challenge of maximizing their particular broadcast entities. Being

aware of what other similar stations are doing allows for comparisons and a benchmark for

assessments and adjustment. It is likely that those in positions of leadership within student-run

radio stations would welcome an opportunity to review the results of this descriptive study. In

fact, many subjects in this study requested that details be provided to them upon conclusion. The

intent at the outset was to capture a snapshot of student-run college radio in the United States

today and to focus on the challenges faced by managers charged with organizational, technical,

and leadership responsibilities in such a unique environment.

College radio is ripe for additional study. What little research has previously been done on college radio is outdated and in need of updating (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a). As in many enterprises, newer forms of technology have revolutionized approaches to radio broadcasting and continue to do so (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986b). Music downloads, digital editing, automation systems with near seamless voice-tracking capabilities, live streaming on the Internet, and advances in social media possibilities have changed the college radio landscape and require programming and management decisions that were unnecessary in prior times (Sauls & Greer, 2007; Tremblay, 2003; Willer, 2010). College radio stations remain the place where many students receive their first hands-on opportunity to be "on the air" and learn to control a broadcast facility. Determining how student-run college stations are functioning today and how they are managed is a study long overdue. The importance and need of the study is pronounced due to the dearth of previous research, lack of current subject data, and the incorporation of technological advances into daily operations. The focus is on management practices but the information disclosed has widespread application.

Statement of the Problem

Hundreds of college and university campuses around the United States are still licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to own and operate radio stations. This is in spite of a recent trend for colleges or universities to divest their traditional signals due to budgetary constraints or shifting opinions on the benefits of terrestrial broadcasting in a digital era. Some abandon radio broadcasting entirely. Others assume different methods such as Internet-only radio to maintain some form of broadcast presence (Troop, 2011; Willer, 2010). While the perceived value of campus radio stations to colleges or universities may be wavering, the hundreds still in operation under the auspices of a higher education environment represent a

substantial collection for study, and a group that has been under-researched in the past (Keith, 2007; Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a; Rubin, 2011; Waits, 2007; Wall, 2007; Wallace, 2008).

Commercial radio stations are subject to consistent evaluation, with listening habits in the top 277 markets in the United States monitored regularly by Arbitron, Inc., an international media and market research firm (Arbitron, 2012). Subscribers pay for the right to analyze and use the information tabulated by the company for promotional and sales purposes. Non-subscribers are not permitted access to complete reports or allowed to quote any figures. Ratings for noncommercial radio stations are also assessed, but are of less value to station owners due to their nonprofit status, and therefore inherently less financially competitive nature of the entities.

Radio has been a subject of research interest for academics also, but college radio much less so than its commercial counterpart. The majority of scholarly studies have focused on commercial stations, community or public radio non-commercial facilities (Leidman & Lamberski, 1968b; Wallace, 2008), and more recently Net-radio broadcasting (Baker, 2010; McClung, 2001; Waits, 2007). In comparison, what little has been completed on college radio has focused on the music industry's discovery and investment in the college radio culture in the 1980s (Baker, 2010; Desztich & McClung, 2007; Rubin, 2011; Sauls, 1995, 1998; Waits, 2007; Wall, 2007) and on issues encountered by stations rather than on particular internal work processes (Wilson, 2004).

This lack of current information is significant. Leidman (1985) evaluated non-commercial FM radio stations affiliated with colleges and universities in the early 1980s. The descriptive study provided a wealth of information relevant to that time, but much has changed in the decades since. The way in which broadcasting is accomplished today has been revolutionized by advances in technology. The cart machines, turntables, reel-to-reels, splicing blocks, and

analog systems prevalent in 1980s radio broadcasting are relics today, banished to backrooms, storage units, and personal collections. A decade and a half later, Sauls (2000) provided an update on research into college radio in *The Culture of American College Radio*, but the focus remained on previous studies and did not delve into management practices. Now, over a decade after Sauls review, this descriptive study picks up where the Leidman and Sauls projects left off by providing a current overview of the state of student-run college radio stations in America and honing in on the challenges associated with managing an organization that exists within, and is affected to varying degrees by, diverse substructures and constituencies.

The variety of influences and diversity of approaches to running a campus radio station make it particularly suitable for study. The dynamic nature of an organization that consists of members of an ever-evolving student population punctuates the need for constant updating and review (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a). Terrestrial college stations face a myriad of challenges and take many forms. Some are affiliated with National Public Radio (NPR) and/or employ full-time professional staff. Others operate with volunteer help and may recruit from local communities. Many stations blend these approaches. None of those, however, are the focus of this study. This project analyzes college or university-licensed radio stations that are led by students, some of whom may receive monetary compensation for their service, but comparatively few who have received broadcast training prior to their involvement with the campus station. A faculty adviser or manager may be paid by the university and have input on situations affecting the organization (Sauls, 1995), but day-to-day decisions and operational practices are either determined collaboratively or by a student-manager or management team.

While operating in unique circumstances, college radio stations also encounter situations typical to any broadcast entity. Management considerations include concerns such as financial

4

administration, programming and formatting decisions, FCC compliance issues, and personnel matters that demand attention. To date, little research has been conducted to indicate how student-run college radio stations deal with these types of issues. Discovering what factors influence management decisions and how the challenges of operating a college radio station are negotiated will provide valuable information to assist other student-led college or university-affiliated radio stations around the country.

Definition of Terms

- Administration – The French word *administration* used by theorist Henri Fayol in his major work *Administration Industrielle et Generale* (AIG) was translated into English as *management* (Brunsson, 2008). For the purposes of this study, the terms are used interchangeably. (See below for a definition of management.)

- Alternative – This term was originally coined to describe music outside the mainstream and is a common music format for college radio. This type of music later evolved into a genre that adopted the descriptor (Waits, 2007).

- AM – Abbreviated form of amplitude modulation, referring to the method of encoding audio on the carrier frequency. AM stations were the first to transmit radio signals to the public and continue broadcasting today (Federal Communications Commission "AM radio," n.d.).

- College Radio – Encompasses stations licensed to colleges or universities run primarily on a volunteer basis and mostly by college students (Rubin, 2011; Sauls, 1995).

- Convergence – A "coming together" of media providing multiple methods of communication under one umbrella organization (Willer, 2010).

- ERP – Effective Radiated Power (FCC "FMpower," n.d.).

- Faculty-Advisor-Manager (FAM) – An all-encompassing term developed by Leidman & Lamberski (1986a) to describe the chief executive making daily management decisions on behalf of a radio station. In the original research, the term included positions such as faculty manager, faculty advisor, manager, or student manager. For this study, the term does not include student manager, which is separated to allow for additional evaluation.

- FCC – Abbreviated form of Federal Communications Commission, an independent U.S. government agency charged with regulating U.S. interstate and international communications, including radio. Formed by the Communications Act of 1934 (Arbitron, 2012).

- FM – Abbreviated form of frequency modulation, referring to the method of encoding audio on the carrier frequency (FCC "FM radio," n.d.).

- HAAT – Antenna Height Above Average Terrain (FCC "FMpower," n.d.).

- Indie – Initially, independently produced music (typically rock or pop) free from the control of large entertainment companies. This descriptor also became an aesthetic term in the 1990s and many major label record companies have created ties, some with hidden distribution connections, to "independent" music (Waits, 2007).

- Management – The process of designing and maintaining an environment in which individuals and groups efficiently accomplish selected aims and goals (Koontz & Weihrich, 1990; Olum, 2004).

- Questionnaire – A document containing questions and other types of items designed to solicit information appropriate for analysis (Babbie, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study is to provide a contemporary review of student-led non-commercial FM college radio stations, examining management practices, and providing a benchmark by which stations can compare and evaluate themselves with similar entities. College radio stations can be organized and formatted in a variety of fashions and directed in various ways. Stations may affiliate with National Public Radio (NPR) or other entities to receive programming and re-transmit it over their local terrestrial radio frequency. They may originate their own programming entirely or choose to combine various elements into one entity. College radio stations may be led by a student manager who directs other staff members and guides all aspects of the station, often with the assistance of a faculty advisor available for consultation. Some stations hire a faculty adviser or manager to set policy and direct the efforts of a completely student staff, or in some cases, a combination of current students and community members. Others hire a completely professional staff and student involvement is minimal.

For the purposes of this study, the emphasis is on college radio broadcast stations that are primarily student-led; that is, stations that are non-affiliates of NPR or other major program providers, originate the bulk of their own programming, and predominantly consist of current students under the immediate direction of a student manager or faculty adviser / manager (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a; McClung, 2001). The presence of some community volunteers would not disqualify a station from being considered "student-led." However, authority must rest with the student manager or faculty advisor / manager and current students must form the majority of the staff.

The focus of the study is to assess student-led college radio broadcast stations through the lens of Henri Fayol's administrative / management theory, determining how such stations are

functioning today, how decisions are made, and influences that affect daily practices. Survey questions are organized around five administrative elements championed by Fayol: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling (Beach & Lindahl, 2007; Chevalier, 2008; Fayol, 1949; Galbraith, 2007; McLean, 2011; Olum, 2004; Pryor, Humphreys, Taneja, & Toombs, 2011; Wren, Bedelan, & Breeze, 2002). The study will provide a methodological approach to assessing the current college radio environment and yield a wealth of information pertinent to student-led college radio broadcast stations around the country.

Significance of the Study

Previous national studies on college radio are outdated. Technology has dramatically changed the manner in which broadcast facilities operate today. The landscape has altered and a current review will provide important information that student-managers and faculty advisers around the country can use for comparative purposes. It is important to provide "periodic re-examinations" of college radio organizations (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986b, p. 4), as circumstances change rapidly and understanding current situations and influences can help managers plan for the future. This study will provide data on student-led college radio broadcast stations around the United States that is relatively current and reflects modern management, programming, and financial considerations.

Likewise, previous college radio studies have focused on diverse elements in regard to funding, programming, the influence of various constituencies, and the effects of newer technologies (Wilson, 2004). Others have emphasized recurrent themes associated with college radio, such as alternative music programming, licensing issues, and rebellious attitudes of staff and on-air approaches (Baker, 2010). None, however, have scrutinized college radio through the lens of management theory. This area is significant in that organizations are generally complex

8

entities consisting of "an intricate mix of diverse individuals, corporate cultures, structures, systems, technologies, and processes" (McLean, 2011, p. 32). Managing any organization is difficult and student leaders of college or university-affiliated radio broadcast stations are likely inexperienced in the art of management yet are surrounded by multiple potential influences and challenges and forced to operate within the complexities of academia and government regulation (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a; Leidman, 1985). Centering the study on management elements will shed new insight into the topic of college radio and suggest many options for future research and development.

Additionally, the study has significance due to the widespread influence of college radio. Higher education institutions may utilize campus stations for clear educational purposes, some even tying classroom instruction into college radio participation. College stations may be designed to provide training for future professional careers. Some are the only media outlets focusing on local community and campus information. Others have a wider regional influence. Campus radio stations are a public relations component for the colleges or universities. There are social dynamics within the organizations that require negotiation. Some stations operate with strong business models; others function less formally. Many stream over the Internet, allowing programming to be heard by interested parties around the world. College stations reflect societal changes and cultural mores with everything from the music played to announcing styles and topics affected by changing demographics and the concerns of the times. Student-led college radio stations are particularly unique, allowing for experiential learning and negotiation of challenges. These elements are reflective of the widespread impact of college radio and its importance as a study topic.

Delimitations

A study on the subject of college radio at the national level could become all-encompassing without built-in restraints at the outset. This project necessitated the formation of clear boundaries in advance. These were carefully considered to enhance the likelihood of the project achieving desired results.

First, research was limited to terrestrial broadcast stations. Internet-only radio stations or those delivered primarily by cable or other methods were excluded. Broadcast stations that provided a simulcast via other delivery methods were considered appropriate for review since the primary transmission method involved traditional broadcast equipment and techniques (Wilson & Dudt, 2002). This study centered exclusively on student-led college or university-affiliated radio stations operating as non-commercial facilities on the FM band. This included many of the college radio stations in operation today. Non-commercial public or community radio stations were excluded from this study, as were all commercial frequencies, including those few college stations that operate as for-profit entities.

Theoretical Perspective

French industrialist and classical management theorist Henri Fayol established many of the standards for a consideration of administrative or management theory in 1916. Fayol believed all groups and organizations require management at some level and asserted that management skills could be taught and developed over time (Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003). In fact, he stated, "Management plays a very important part in the government of undertakings: of all undertakings, large or small, industrial, commercial, political, religious or any other" (p. xxi). Fayol suggested five major functions of management, all of which remain relevant today, having been incorporated into modern variations of management theory (Brunsson, 2008; Fayol, 1949).

Fayol's 14 principles of administration (Chevalier, 2008; Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Pryor et al., 2011) provided additional theoretical support for this study, delineating elements he considered to be universal in all organizations.

Fayol's administrative theory provides a practical way to review management practices of student-led college radio broadcast stations today. The five major functions of management he proposed align with duties and responsibilities faced by managers in many situations, including at college radio stations. The elements of forecasting and planning, organizing, coordination, command, and control are all pertinent to the challenges of administration and will be evaluated to better understand how student-led college radio broadcast stations are managed and what hurdles and influences require negotiation.

Research Question & Hypotheses

The grand research question is: How are student-led college radio broadcast stations managed today in regard to such issues as staffing, programming, funding, and dealing with internal and external influences?

The question lends itself to several hypotheses dealing with the management of staffing, programming, financial, and influencing elements at student-led college radio broadcast stations in the United States of America. Ideas to be evaluated include:

H1: Student-led college radio broadcast stations employ paid student managers.

H2: Programming decisions are made by student management teams.

H3: Student-led college radio broadcast stations are primarily funded by student government organizations.

H4: Alternative music is the primary format of student-led college radio broadcast stations.

H5: The main challenge facing student-led college radio broadcast stations is a lack of funding.

H6: The student manager has the greatest influence on student-led college radio broadcast stations.

These ideas will be examined as part of an overview of student-led college radio broadcast stations in the United States today. The following chapter contains a review of literature pertinent to the subject, providing a history of college radio, examining the culture of college radio, addressing changes that affect the genre, and encapsulating the theoretical basis for the study. Chapter three provides a complete breakdown of the research design and methodology. The fourth chapter includes background information, characteristics of the sample, an analysis of the data, and assessment of the hypotheses. The final chapter reviews the data as a whole, considers the implications of the study, and suggests opportunities for future research. References and appendices follow.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The ability to transmit and receive audio signals through the air moved from the realm of speculation to experimentation in the late 1900s, then from affirmation to refinement. Before the turn of the twentieth century, radio transmissions for telecommunications use were well underway, with individuals such as Thomas Edison and Nikola Tesla at the forefront (FCC "The power," 2005). Another, Reginald Fessenden, provided the first transmission of voice on December 23, 1900 speaking from an island in the Potomac River to an associate with a receiving device a mile away (FCC "The ideas," 2005). The man many consider the forefather of radio, Italian inventor Guglielmo Marconi, transmitted a wireless signal from Ireland to Canada nearly a year later, a major milestone in the history of radio (FCC "The ideas," 2005; Slotten, 2009). Yet Garratt (1994) pointed out Marconi's achievement was only possible due to the contributions of other radio pioneers over the previous eight-year span, highlighting such names as Faraday, Maxwell, Lodge, and Hertz who had contributed to several technical developments (p. 1). Weather forecasts were shared in 1914 by early pioneer stations associated with higher education at institutions such as the University of North Dakota, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and the University of Wisconsin (Rinks, 2002). While WBL in Detroit (now WWJ) began regular programming over the airwaves in 1920, it was KDKA in Pittsburgh, owned by the Westinghouse Company, which received the first official "limited commercial" broadcasting license (Leidman, 1985; Leidman & Lamberski, 1986b; Rinks, 2002; Slotten, 2009).

Radio today is quite different from what it was in the beginning. The content and methods of delivery have altered greatly, yet the basic premises of the process remain similar. To

date, the majority of academic studies on radio have focused on the commercial arena, yet colleges and universities were also among early licensees (Rinks, 2002). The history of college radio is one of extremes, with early endeavors giving way to increasing commercial pressures and governmental regulations both challenging and later supporting educational broadcasting (Leidman, 1985; Rinks, 2002; Smith, Wright II, & Ostroff, 1998; Wall, 2007; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Establishing a historical base for college radio is essential for this study.

Accordingly, this chapter provides an extensive review of the history of college radio, beginning with the early days in which many institutions of higher learning participated in this fledgling medium. Several secured operating licenses and began exploring the opportunities radio presented, often for instructional purposes but also, and eventually more extensively, for a mix of information and entertainment (Rinks, 2002; Slotten, 2009; Wall, 2007). Colleges and universities with radio licenses were instrumental in supporting government training purposes during World War I (Rinks, 2002; Slotten, 2009), yet constantly found themselves fighting an uphill battle against commercial interests (Slotten, 2009; Wall, 2007). Even as the Federal Communications Commission (Rinks, 2002; Wall 2007) and the first student-owned and operated radio station both came into existence in the 1930s, the era remained difficult for college radio stations (Bloch, 1980; Schwartzapfel, 2006, Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Eventually, the allocation of specific FM frequencies set aside for non-commercial stations provided a breakthrough that enabled college radio stations to become firmly established. Over the years, a number of organizations have formed to support the interests of college broadcasters and these groups will be identified and summarized.

Considerable research has discussed the culture of college radio and variables that have influenced and altered it dramatically over the years. The purpose of college stations depends on

the institution holding the license, the attitude taken toward the station, and the authority in charge of daily operations (Pesha, 1997; Sauls, 1995; Tremblay, 2003; Wallace, 2008). Management practices are affected by these types of internal cultural issues. College radio is also known for alternative programming. This association is further explored with particular attention given to the impact of the mainstream music business on college radio since the late 1970s (Aaron, 2005; Desztich & McClung, 2007; Rubin, 2011; Sauls, 1998). Leidman (1985) pointed out college radio stations were severely limited by inadequate budgets in a national study in the mid-1980s. Further research has indicated budgetary restraints continued to be a limiting factor in the years since (Sauls, 1998a; Tremblay, 2003; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). This issue is also addressed in this study.

Regulatory and technological changes have also affected radio, including college stations. A shrinking job market for entry-level positions and more audio choices offering instant gratification for consumers altered the landscape. The Internet and the possibility of streaming broadcasts have done the same. Many professional broadcast entities have converged media to operate more efficiently and several colleges and universities such as Kent State or Brigham Young are following this trend (Willer, 2010). This is not necessarily a bad thing, but it indicates the changing environment in which broadcast stations exist today. Some higher education institutions have sold their radio licenses in recent years, choosing to broadcast Internet-only stations or neglecting broadcasting entirely (Troop, 2011). These issues are also briefly reviewed as they dramatically affect current and future broadcast opportunities.

Henri Fayol's administrative theory forms the theoretical basis for this descriptive study and review of management practices at college radio broadcast stations in the United States today. Fayol's personal background significantly influenced his opinions on what constituted

15

administration and the possibilities and potential benefits of management training. Accordingly, this chapter includes a review of Fayol's background, and focuses on key components of his theories on management and organizations. To provide balance, criticisms of his ideas are addressed and his relevance nearly one hundred years after first proposing his theories on administration is also covered. Fayol's five principle roles of management are particularly relevant to this study, and were used to guide the development of the survey instrument and organize the collection of data. While Fayol's administrative theories were first presented nearly a century ago, colleges and universities were already involved in the fledgling medium of radio.

History of College Radio

In this era of near-constant communication and a wide array of tools readily available to access facts and opinion, it is difficult to envision a time in which information was relatively hard to acquire. Yet, that was primarily the case before the advent of radio, with media such as mail, telegraph and newspapers limited by technology. Though Terkel called it "the shortest golden age in history," (Keith, 2007, p. 530), when radio burst on the scene in the early twentieth century, it made a significant impact in the daily lives of Americans, eventually changing leisure-time activities and providing enhanced access to news and information (Keith, 2007). Evidence of the importance of radio to Americans includes its use by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt some 30 times during his presidency (1933–1945) to convey his messages of hope to the American people during challenging historical times. Likewise, the panic that ensued in some communities due to the October 30, 1938 broadcast of Orson Welles' *War of the Worlds* attests to the influence radio held in American households. So too, the rise to prominence of news commentator Edward R. Murrow due to his live reports from war-ravaged London in September, 1939 (Keith, 2007).

In the early days, educational institutions were among parties securing AM radio licenses. Faced with financial challenges and a seeming lack of governmental support, many colleges and universities were forced to make tough decisions–re-investing in and attempting to improve their facilities over time or succumbing to pressures and selling stations or allowing them to "go dark" (Rinks, 2002; Smith et al., 1998, Wall, 2007). Eventually, a government-regulated reservation of bandwidth for noncommercial educational facilities provided a level of support that college or university-affiliated radio stations had desired for years (Leidman, 1985; Smith et al., 1998; Troop, 2011; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). College radio today is difficult to define. Approaches to formatting, management, leadership, funding, and philosophy vary considerably. Support within academia for traditional terrestrial broadcasting is not universal. A descriptive snapshot will provide important information on the state of a now 100-plus year old entity, college radio.

Early days. Nontraditional educational facilities–like their commercial counterparts– began on the AM band. Higher education institutions such as Tulane University, Wittenberg College, and the University of Arkansas experimented with wireless communications prior to the turn of the twentieth century (Rinks, 2002). Many early radio stations were located on campuses of colleges or universities or begun by faculty members (Wall, 2007). Some were started in particular departments of educational institutions, often within the area of physical sciences (Smith et al., 1998). The Radio Act of 1912 led to the granting of nearly a thousand licenses for transmitters. While most went to ham radio operators, ships at sea or land-to-sea services, higher education facilities landed a number of these licenses. Among those to secure transmission rights were the universities of Arkansas, Cornell, Dartmouth, Iowa, Loyola of New Orleans, Nebraska, Ohio State, Penn State, St. Louis, Tulane, and Villanova, along with St. Joseph's and Wittenberg colleges and the Philadelphia School of Wireless Telegraphy (Rinks, 2002). As early as 1914,

weather forecasts were the staple of broadcasts on stations owned by the University of North Dakota, Iowa State Agricultural College, Kansas State (Slotten, 2009), Nebraska Wesleyan University, and the University of Wisconsin in Madison (Rinks, 2002).

The advent of World War I shut down most stations for reasons of national security, but several higher education facilities were used by the U.S. government for training purposes. Harvard University and the University of Wisconsin provided training opportunities for members of the U.S. Navy. The University of Arkansas, Cornell, Ohio State, Penn State, St. Louis University, and Tulane University supported U.S. Army and special military unit initiatives involving the training of radio operators and the monitoring of enemy communications (Rinks, 2002). After the war ended in 1919, the Secretary of Commerce assumed control back from the U.S. Navy to regulate broadcasting (Rinks, 2002; Slotten, 2009). The first two official licenses granted to educational institutions went to the state universities of Minnesota and Wisconsin in January 1922 (Rinks, 2002). There are discrepancies in the reported number of college or university-affiliated radio stations in existence in the early 1920s (Leidman, 1985; Rinks, 2002; Wall, 2007), but the challenges that soon faced them are universally agreed upon. Numerous directives imposed by the Department of Commerce caused many educational stations to surrender licenses (Smith et al., 1998). By 1923, many involved in educational broadcasting expressed concerns that college radio stations were in danger of disappearing due to commercial interests (Slotten, 2009). The assumption was that college stations provided top-down programming designed to educate and refine listeners, yet archival analysis by Slotten (2009) suggested broadcasters of the time were sensitive to the desires of the audience and tried to provide programming that served their expressed needs.

Nonetheless, challenges continued for educational broadcasters. The Third National Radio Conference in 1923 provided recommendations for classifications and expansion that affected technical requirements for educational stations. That same year, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) began requiring music performance fees from commercial and non-commercial radio stations alike (Rinks, 2002). In 1925, the Fourth National Radio Conference offered recommendations that limited the number of stations on-air instead of expanding the broadcast spectrum (Rinks, 2002). Officials enforced mandates to eliminate interference over the airwaves, but these policies had financial and programming implications as well. Reductions in power or broadcast hours along with required frequency changes forced many to abandon investments in educational broadcasting, rather than purchasing new transmitters or sharing time with commercial broadcasters (Rinks, 2002). In 1925 alone, KFAJ at the University of Colorado shut down after a mandated power reduction, KFDH at the University of Arizona went dark, KFNJ licensed to Central Missouri State Teachers College and WHAG at the University of Cincinnati surrendered broadcasting rights. Others that allowed stations to expire included Furman University, Dartmouth, and the University of Montana. Stephen's College in Missouri sold their station to a commercial operation, and Louisiana State University gave up its station the following year due to financial implications (Rinks, 2002).

Congress's approval of The Radio Act of 1927 continued the downhill spiral for educational facilities. The creation of the Federal Radio Commission (FRC) transferred authority over radio from the Department of Commerce and concurrently set in motion a process that would cause all radio station licenses to expire after a two month period, to be re-licensed with new operating parameters. This was frequently a costly measure and educational radio stations with limited resources in comparison to commercial counterparts, continued to flounder (Wall,

2007). Licensed educational stations numbered over 200 at the time of the FRC announcement, yet only 49 remained just four years later (Rinks, 2002; Wall, 2007). In 1931, that number was cut by more than half, with only 24 surviving, most of those belonging to land-grant colleges or state universities (Rinks, 2002).

  Challenges and growth. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President of the United States in 1932 and rumors began to circulate that the new administration was considering a "communication commission." Those involved in educational broadcasting endeavors sought to have 25-percent of all frequencies reserved for several categories of non-commercial stations, including educational. The Wagner-Hatfield amendment to the proposed Communications Act would also have required all licenses to be re-allocated, a position educational broadcasters favored. The amendment failed in Senate, however (Rinks, 2002), with commercial broadcasters convincing legislators in the early 1930s that enough educational programming was already being provided and special provisions were not justifiable (Smith et al., 1998).

  The passing of The Communications Act of 1934 and the concurrent formation of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) was an important milestone in broadcast history. At the behest of Congress, the FCC reviewed the idea of reserving specific frequencies for noncommercial broadcasters. Initially, the Commission reported to Congress that such allocations were not necessary and simply required commercial stations to track educational and noncommercial types of programming. The introduction of the new regulatory unit came after three straight years in which no institutions of higher learning received new radio licenses and affirmed the preferred status of commercial broadcasting ventures over non-commercial and educational (Rinks, 2002; Wall, 2007). In the period between 1921 and 1936, educational

institutions received 202 broadcast licenses. Less than 19% remained on-air by early 1937 (Smith et al., 1998).

College radio stations have proven resilient, however. During the period from the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s, university-affiliated stations contrived innovative ways to transmit programming. Many involved curious configurations in which electronic connections were routed through heating tunnels or electrical systems to various buildings on college grounds (Slotten, 2009; Waits, 2007; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Cable networks were particularly useful for covering sporting events and often were permanently connected to key buildings on campus. The creativity of these early broadcasts at college radio stations was noteworthy. The first broadcast of a sporting event at the University of Nebraska featured an engineering student at a football game using a telephone to call-in the action to other students at the station. They, in turn, "broadcast information in code over the university transmitter" (Slotten, 2009, p. 65). Studios and transmission equipment were often in poor condition with colleges unwilling or unable to invest deeply into campus radio facilities (Slotten, 2009).

While students in the 1920s and early 1930s frequently contributed to broadcast operations, the first student-owned and operated radio station in the United States did not develop until the mid-1930s (Bloch, 1980; Slotten, 2009). "The Brown Network" on the campus of Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, emerged out of the efforts of two freshmen students. On November 30, 1936, David Borst and George Abraham first transmitted songs from a private record collection to other students on campus. The two did so without formal approval from the university but later provided a service by broadcasting the inauguration of Brown's new president, Henry Merritt Wriston (Bloch, 1980; Schwartzapfel, 2006, Wilson & Dudt, 2001).

In spite of this, the late 1930s and early 1940s saw college radio continue to struggle. Notwithstanding efforts to preserve a non-commercial educational outlet by the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education (NACRE) and National Committee on Education by Radio (NCER) (Leidman, 1985), only 30 AM educational stations remained in operation in 1941 (Rinks, 2002). However, a breakthrough was on the horizon.

The FCC's determination to allocate 20 FM channels specifically for noncommercial use (channels 201 to 220 between 88.1-91.9 megahertz) in 1945 made a significant impact that continues even today (Leidman, 1985; Sauls, 1995, 1998a; Troop, 2011; Wall, 2007; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). In 1947, 38 noncommercial educational licenses were in place. Fifty years later, as colleges and universities increasingly recognized the value of ownership, that figure exceeded 1,100 (Sauls, 1998a). This was a direct result of the FCC's decision to support non-commercial and educational programming with the 1945 allocation verdict (Sauls, 1995; Wilson & Dudt, 2001).

Minimum operating power at the time was 250 watts. In an effort to increase educational ownership, the FCC reduced power requirements to a minimum of 10 watts for Class D stations in 1948 (Leidman, 1985; Smith et al., 1998). The idea was to allow colleges and universities to get on the air at a reduced cost. Equipment necessary to broadcast at a lower power was (and is) less expensive than equipment required for higher power allocations. The hope was most college stations would increase power at a future date. This did not occur as consistently as the FCC had hoped, however, and the commission reversed position, encouraging such stations to upgrade to Class A status by increasing power to a minimum of 100 watts by January 1980 in order to avoid potential issues (Leidman, 1985; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Those not elevating power or moving to

a commercial channel were required by the FCC to move to reserved band channel 200 (87.9 FM) and lost protection against interference (Furchtgott-Roth, 1998).

Today, college radio stations are in abundance, yet not all licensees choose to operate facilities, and even among those that do, many are not student-led. Some are National Public Radio (NPR) affiliates, receiving regular programming from a national network, others are considered community stations, often allowing local residents opportunities to hold air shifts and volunteer or be employed at the station. Many colleges and universities have turned to newer technologies to "broadcast" programming. College station "Radio KJHL" from the University of Kansas became the first online station to webcast all hours of the day in 1994 (Baker, 2010). Seven years later, Brooklyn college radio became the first North American Net-only college radio station, streaming an alternative format all hours of the day (Baker, 2010).

Organizations. The trend for college and university-affiliated radio stations has evolved from early experimental endeavors to AM-only stations to low-power FMs to higher power FM stations now mixed with Net-only broadcasts. Along the way, advocates have formed numerous groups and organizations for various reasons. These have included lobbying on behalf of educational radio, meeting to discuss issues of importance to college broadcasters, providing training opportunities, networking possibilities, and assorted support options for students and faculty involved in educational stations. One of the earliest conglomerations occurred in 1925, when licensees of educational facilities organized as the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations (ACUBS) to protest what they considered unfair treatment and push for a reserved section of the radio spectrum for educational broadcasters (Slotten, 2009; Smith, et al., 1998). The group was largely unsuccessful and reorganized in 1934 as the National Association

of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB), rededicating to pursue the interests of broadcasters associated with colleges and universities (Smith, et al., 1998).

In 1929, two groups with differing views on the future of educational broadcasting came into existence. The first, led by Columbia University faculty member Levering Tyson, organized as the National Council for Radio in Education (NACRE). This group centered efforts on the creation of educational and public-service programming that would work in cooperation with commercial stations. The second, primarily trumpeted by Armstrong Perry, a freelance journalist with strong views on the possibilities of educational radio, became known as the National Committee on Education by Radio (NCER) (Leidman, 1985; Rinks, 2002; Slotten, 2009). This group focused primarily on the interests of "independent noncommercial radio stations, especially those located at colleges and universities" (Slotten, 2009, p. 160). While both organizations sought to reform radio in 1930, their approaches were widely disparate and friction surfaced, with Tyson expressing deep feelings of bitterness and betrayal toward Perry and other educators who he felt were diminishing the importance of his organization (Slotten, 2009).

Both groups lobbied Congress from their particular perspectives unsuccessfully in the early 1930s. While Tyson's NACRE continued to seek ways to facilitate cooperative efforts in developing new programs between educators and commercial broadcasters, Perry's NCER promoted reserved frequencies and special provisions for noncommercial broadcasters (Slotten, 2009). Neither succeeded, and with the passing of the Communications Act of 1934 and the formation of the FCC, Congress effectively eliminated the usefulness of both organizations. Congress granted the FCC full regulatory authority and lobbying efforts directed at legislators to reform radio were made irrelevant (Slotten, 2009).

In the years since, several organizations have formed to sustain the efforts of college and university-affiliated radio broadcasters. The Intercollegiate Broadcasting System (IBS) came into existence in February 1940, designed to support those interested in various aspects of not-for-profit educational radio. Fittingly, the first meeting of the IBS took place on the campus of Brown University, where students took the initiative to begin playing music in 1936 (Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Operating as a non-profit itself, the organization serves a thousand member high school and college radio facilities along with streaming / webcasting stations around the U.S. and in Canada. Most stations are primarily staffed by students. In addition to hosting annual conferences from coast-to-coast, the organization represents the interests of member stations in legal, copyright, and regulatory matters in Congress and with the FCC (Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, 2012).

The IBS has changed with the times. Originally focused on providing technical information on AM "carrier-current campus college radio," and commercial advertising, the organization now provides information in such areas as creativity, funding, management, operations, programming, recruiting, and training (IBS, 2012). Over the years, IBS has been an active voice for college radio, lobbying for the reservation of part of the spectrum for noncommercial educational stations, petitioning the FCC to support the creation and retention of Class D (10-watt) FM stations, and to provide expanded allocations for Low Power FM (LPFM) noncommercial radio stations. IBS has also fought to reduce charges associated with performing rights and underwriting fees for noncommercial educational stations (IBS, 2012).

College Media Association (CMA) began its mission of supporting student media and advisers in 1954. With a focus on college media professionals and particularly the role of the adviser, CMA provides resources to enhance professional development and enable advisers to

improve their skills and nurture the college media environments they are a part of. The organization shares current information and research pertinent to college radio and advisement and offers a variety of learning experiences, including conferences, conventions, seminars, and workshops. CMA's stated desire is to "serve as the authoritative voice of the collegiate media and advisers" (College Media Association, 2012).

A year after the formation of CMA, Broadcast Education Association (BEA) came into existence. Originally known as the Association for Professional Broadcast Education (APBE) with an emphasis on preparing students for the radio or television job market, the organization was an outgrowth of the University Association for Professional Radio Education (UAPRE) that began in 1948 with 10 members from various higher education institutions. UAPRE sought to influence the National Commission on Accreditation on endorsement issues but met with little success. It dissolved as the new organization developed in May 1955. BEA has evolved over time and now branches in several directions, offering conventions, social networking opportunities, discussion forums, and two scholarly publications, the *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* and *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*. International in scope, BEA emphasizes electronic media information and research and attempts to "facilitate interaction between academicians and leaders in the industry" (Broadcast Education Association, 2012).

An organization specifically geared for student-staffed radio and television stations came on the scene in 1988 (Fidler, 1992). Created by students at Brown University, the National Association of College Broadcasters (NACB) formed after a large grant from the CBS Foundation and made a big splash quickly, featuring major celebrities such as news commentator Walter Cronkite, media mogul Ted Turner, and music producer Quincy Jones as keynote speakers at annual conferences and gathering over 600 member stations within four years. Incorporated as

a non-profit organization, NACB struggled fiscally as it grew and eventually succumbed to financial pressure, folding in 1998. In its brief history, however, the organization made a substantial impact and faculty advisers at two of its member stations united efforts soon thereafter to create another entity (College Broadcasters Incorporated, 2012).

That organization, College Broadcasters Incorporated (CBI), was designed to represent students involved in traditional and new media. The brainchild of Will Robedee and Warren Kozireski, CBI provides students and advisers access to numerous resources, and coordinates an annual gathering billed as the "largest student media convention" (CBI, 2012) in the United States. The organization offers station memberships for media affiliated with colleges or universities and associate memberships for individuals and businesses that support the interests of college broadcasters or engage in business practices with such organizations (CBI, 2012).

Two other entities are worthy of mention. CMJ Network, Inc. began as College Media Journal (CMJ) in 1978. Created by Robert Haber, CMJ was a bi-weekly magazine targeting programmers at college radio stations. (Harrison, 1979). The company provided the CMJ New Music Monthly magazine featuring interviews and information on unsigned, independent, and established music artists from 1993 to 2009. The CMJ New Music Report is a weekly compilation distributed nationally to subscribers and includes playlists from colleges and non-commercial stations. Many college stations consider it an important programming and music resource. CMJ also provides chart information and hosts an annual festival and conference in New York City (CMJ, 2012).

The International Radio and Television Society Foundation (IRTS) began in 1939 to provide a forum for education and discussion of communication issues. It transformed into its present incarnation supporting all forms of electronic media with the development of a charitable

element in 1964. Today IRTS exists to unite members from all levels of professionalism in the media and entertainment industries. Long-time professionals are co-members with students just embarking on media careers. Among other endeavors, the foundation sponsors career workshops to invest in future leaders, provides seminars for faculty educators to mingle with media industry professionals, and sponsors a highly competitive summer fellowship program eligible only to college juniors, seniors, or graduate students (IRTS Foundation, 2012).

The Culture of College Radio

College radio broadcast stations have changed dramatically from early incarnations. Stations today may be primarily designed for educational purposes, career training, entertainment, or a combination of elements. Over the years, however, researchers and college radio experts have frequently referred to a culture surrounding college radio; one generally described as alternative and free-form. These descriptions have merit, but as society changes and technology advances, the culture of college radio may also be changing.

Management practices of student-led college radio broadcast stations affect the internal environment, influencing everything from format choice to announcer style and target audience. Stations focusing attention on the student population are likely to differ from those primarily concerned with serving administrators, alumni, members of surrounding communities, or particular groups or departments on campus (such as athletics or student government associations). All of these could influence management decisions and practices, either purposefully or unintentionally.

So too, can authority and funding sources. Institutions maintaining ultimate authority over the station or holding the purse-strings could be expected to exert influence on occasion and perhaps, quite often. Decisions within the organization that could agitate those in authority may

be altered by this realization. Likewise, anything that could reduce budget allocations might well be avoided. The issues of purpose, niche appeal, and funding realities for college radio stations are valuable for consideration.

Diversity of purpose. Why do college radio stations exist? It would be virtually impossible to come to universal agreement on how best to answer that simple question. Various sources could respond quite differently, and all may be right (Sauls, 1995). Noncommercial FM college and university-affiliated radio broadcast stations all operate under the same FCC rules and regulations yet may do so for quite different purposes. In the early days of radio broadcasting, educational stations dealt with this same question. While some transmitted information for instructional purposes, others focused more on sports broadcasts, various forms of music, or programs determined to be of primary interest (such as an agriculture reports) to the listening audience (Slotten, 2009). This diversity of programming content is likely to be evident even today.

The underlying purpose for a college station may be dependent on the viewpoint of the licensee: the particular college or university maintaining ultimate responsibility for the entity. Some contend it should provide occupational training to prepare students interested in the field for future careers in broadcasting (McClung, 2001; Willer 2010). Under this philosophy, the campus radio station should be managed in such a way as to enable students to be taught skills, refine them, make mistakes, learn from them, discover latent abilities, and synthesize talent with acquired knowledge; all of this in preparation to launch successful careers in the broadcast industry (Pesha, 1997; Sauls, 1995). While it is likely that some of this could occur incidentally simply by being regularly involved at a station (Wilson, 2004), Smith (1990) called this approach the "traditional function of most campus radio stations" (p. 17). Leidman (1985) described

college radio stations as "on-the-job training facilities with problems" (p. 6). In some instances, academic coursework is melded with campus radio station involvement to support and further this approach (Sauls, 1995; Willer, 2010). In a study of state universities in Pennsylvania, however, Wilson & Dudt (2001) found most college radio stations were not used for instructional purposes.

Unlike those who view college stations as pre-professional preparation grounds, other licensees lower the emphasis on training and allow the campus radio station to focus on more relaxed purposes. Some view it as a student organization and creative outlet for those interested in participating; more a club than a learning environment, with little or no academic bearing (Willer, 2010; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Many students have no desire to pursue a career in radio broadcasting, yet still align as volunteers with the campus radio station (Baker, 2010; Sauls, 1995). Whether simply for the experience, the joy of the music, the thrill of being a "deejay," the social aspects associated with being part of the station, or for multiple other possible reasons, student staff come from varied backgrounds and get involved at different levels (Wilson, 2004). This approach to the station makes college radio accessible to interested parties within the student population.

While the occupational training and student group approaches seem diametrically opposite, college radio may also be "both-and" for students. It is possible for those interested in careers within the field to utilize their college radio experience to hone skills and prepare for future opportunities. At the same time, those with little to no interest in the broadcast job market can enjoy their participation at the station without negatively affecting those students with career aspirations (Tremblay, 2003; Wallace, 2008). The participatory nature of college radio allows

students to develop personal agendas within the confines of the shared environment (Baker, 2010).

While not an expressed purpose by most licensees, college radio stations are also considered test markets for new genres of music and new artists. Radio stations typically try to carve out a niche for themselves within a crowded spectrum (Desztich & McClung, 2007; Tremblay, 2003). Mainstream formats in radio generally garner the greatest number of listeners and generate the highest ratings, explaining why they are featured on commercial frequencies. In general, noncommercial FM college and university-affiliated radio stations do not have the resources of most commercial stations and the turnover in staff among student-run stations makes any long-term desire to compete even more difficult. Additionally, access to commercially successful artists is limited for stations with low ratings or those located in smaller population markets. Over the years, college radio stations have embraced newer artists and contributed to the formation of new genres of music (Sauls, 1995).

For some, this has become part of their identity; eschewing successful mainstream artists to the point of "banning" their hit songs from airplay in favor of promoting independent or unsigned artists that are more accessible and appreciative of opportunities for exposure (Baker 2010; Priestman, 2002; Sauls, 1998a; Waits, 2007). Likewise, such stations reject formalized programs such as those created by NPR, preferring programming that is more raw and unrefined (McClung, 2001). One of the purposes for these types of stations is to welcome opportunities to serve as test markets for new music, different styles, and new ways of thinking and communicating (Baker, 2010; Tremblay, 2003).

The entertainment aspect is an important factor for college radio stations. Student announcers and producers influence "stationality," the overall tone and personality of the radio

station as perceived by listeners (Sauls, 1995). Programming guidelines and management

decisions constrain or enhance perceptual boundaries, but the "student-staff is the life of a

station, representing its conscience, character, and personality" (Brant, 1981; Desztich &

McClung, 2007, p. 199). Sauls (1995) asserted college radio stations serve to connect the campus

community and mirror or reveal the cultural climate in which they exist. This connection often

extends beyond the campus itself, with the college radio station embedding itself within the

larger community served by its signal. Such stations choose to purposefully become the "voice"

of the surrounding area, expanding beyond the geographical boundaries of the campus to

integrate into the daily lives of community members (Sauls, 1998a). When a station consistently

displays concern for the community, over time the community responds and learns to care about

the station (Brant, 1981; Desztich & McClung, 2007).

While all stations (commercial and non-commercial alike) are licensed by the FCC to

serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity (Sauls, 1995, 1998a, 1998b; "The radio

act," 2003), college radio stations are unique due to the substructures within which they operate.

As such, their influence as public relations tools for the colleges and universities is very real.

Recognition of professional accomplishments and positive works by the university or college on-

air can directly or indirectly serve to enhance the institutional image (Brant, 1981; Sauls, 1998a),

as can a well-managed station that conducts itself with professionalism on-air and with decorum

in personal encounters (Sauls, 1995). However, when institutional support is lacking or

undefined, stations may struggle to understand their place within the overall organizational

superstructure (Wilson & Dudt, 2001). The typical college or university-affiliated radio station

negotiates with at least three masters: the FCC, the license-holder, and the community at large

(Leidman, 1985).

Niche programming. As is common with non-commercial broadcasters, college radio stations typically wander from mainstream constraints and formats. In fact, two terms that are mentioned consistently in regard to college radio are "alternative" and "music." The two words can be combined but also operate separately to describe areas that generally differentiate college radio stations from mainstream comparatives, with alternative carrying broad connotations and music often including artists and songs that may not chart nationally yet have appeal at the college level.

Alternative can refer to music played on the college radio station, to the programming in general or even extended to describe a culture or identity associated with the station. As mentioned earlier, FM non-commercial college radio stations are known for playing independent or unsigned artists that are unlikely to receive widespread acceptance by the general population (McClung, Mims, & Hong, 2003; Sauls, 1995; Waits, 2007; Wall, 2007; Wallace, 2008). College stations often choose to feature and promote musicians and vocalists that remain "outside" the norm, under-capitalized and obscure (Rubin, 2010; Waits, 2007). The issue of alternative music in college radio involves relationships that have become complicated over time.

Understanding begins with the fact that it would be difficult to overstate the importance of music to college radio. To begin with, music is highly valued in Western societies and is one of the most popular leisure-time activities for young people (Fitzgerald, Joseph, Hayes, & O'Regan, 1995; Zillmann & Gan, 1997). Music correlates with other activities in life and is often used for mood enhancement or regulation (Schramm, 2006; Sloboda & O'Neill, 2001). Students may turn to music to de-stress from homework, for simple enjoyment, or to support activities they engage in, from dancing and parties to video game playing and the day-to-day of campus life (Sloboda & O'Neill, 2001). Music is used to support romantic encounters, for intellectual or

emotional companionship, to create affiliations, and to fill social voids in the life of the listener (Schramm, 2006). What's more, research indicates musical tastes lock-in at an early age. Holbrook and Schindler (1989) asserted people relate for the remainder of their lives to the music they listen to before age 24. This attests to the importance of music in the lives of undergraduates, the vast majority of whom are younger and living in their age of dominant influence (Schramm, 2006). The radio is a quick choice (though one possibility among many) to supply music (Schramm, 2006), and about 90% of college stations have a music orientation (Desztich & McClung, 2007; Sauls, 2000).

The importance of the music played on college stations elevated in the period from the late 1970s through the early 1990s. During this time, so-called underground bands that became mainstays on college radio, like Jane's Addiction, Nirvana, Pearl Jam, R.E.M., Red Hot Chili Peppers, Soundgarden, U2, and Talking Heads, came to the attention of mainstream record labels that signed the artists, promoted their music, and helped them achieve crossover success (Aaron, 2005; Desztich & McClung, 2007; Knopper, 1994; Sauls, 1995, 1998). Rubin (2011) points out more than half of the top 25 albums of the 1980s according to Rolling Stone magazine received heavy airplay support from college radio stations. Likewise did over 50 percent of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame inductees in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Along the way, the mainstream music business began paying closer attention to college radio stations. Record companies recognized the influential role college radio played in the introduction of new artists and its position as a distinct radio market that could be capitalized upon for profit (Holtermann, 1992; Kruse, 2003; Riordan, 2000; Sauls, 1995; Waits, 2007; Wall, 2007). Record companies seeking to expose new artists early in their careers and assess their break-out potential utilize college radio as an early indicator (Desztich & McClung, 2007; Sauls,

1998, Waits, 2007). Not all acknowledge this as a benefit. Negus (1992) suggested this type of close relationship could weaken the reality of college radio as an independent source of music, unaffiliated and unaffected by corporate interests (Wall, 2007). Rubin (2011) described the tension that may exist between an entity that is considered in opposition to commercial radio practices, yet is influenced similarly by record companies and promoters. In contrast, Desztich & McClung (2007) describe the relationship as "mutually beneficial" (p. 198). Like it or not, college radio exists to some degree within the subculture of the music industry (Holtermann, 1992; Waits, 2007), and is likely to remain affected by the relationship. Indeed, many major record labels today produce music now termed "indie." The intrinsic link between college radio and music is evident in the term "college rock," an expression that developed to describe a form of rock music associated with campus radio in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Baker, 2010; Wall, 2007).

The term "alternative" has also been used to describe the music played on college radio stations. That the expression gained acceptance to describe a particular genre of rock music within the music industry and with the ratings companies represents a curious irony (Desztich & McClung, 2007). Since the late 1980s the term "indie" has risen in prominence at college stations. Short for "independent," the word hearkens back to the traditional, non-mainstream approach to playing music that is generally associated with college stations (Baker, 2010; Desztich & McClung, 2007; Rubin, 2010; Waits, 2007; Wallace, 2008): that of being an alternative to commercial radio (Tremblay, 2003). Yet, as mentioned earlier, many mainstream recording labels now distribute under other names and promote their own brands of "alternative" or "indie" music, causing some stations to experience conflict over music definitions (Waits, 2007).

Alternative can also be an ideology; a way of describing an attitude, behavior, or approach to doing radio, a college station's identity. Campus stations have the ability to include students from diverse backgrounds and geographical areas. Each brings unique perspectives and experience to the melting pot that is the radio station. Desztich & McClung (2007) say that for many listeners, the college radio station is more than just a source for music and entertainment. "It is something people are. It has become part of their identity. It reflects the diverse culture of each individual campus" (p. 198). The uniqueness of the students and each environment surely impacts programming choices and the overall personality of the station (Sauls, 1995; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Desztich & McClung (2007) cite previous research affirming an image and culture associated with college radio and further describe that culture as being based on "independence, difference, and exclusivity" (p. 210), words that support the idea of an "indie" or alternative approach to broadcasting.

That outlook correlates with announcing and performance standards that are typically less rigid and restrictive than those existing in commercial counterparts. With dollars, ratings, and reputations at stake, commercial outlets tend to guard the airwaves, establishing boundaries and evaluating personnel frequently to maintain quality control and maximize profits. Announcers at college stations–even those receiving pay–are not in long-term work relationships and performance standards are generally much more relaxed. "Freeform" is another term that surfaces frequently in discussions of college radio, used to describe a lack of rules or restrictions that inhibit announcers or constrain music and programming choices (Desztich & McClung, 2007). Whereas commercial stations utilize programming software or "hot clocks" to ensure various categories of songs play at particular points in the hour (Desztich & McClung, 2007), college radio stations operating freeform ("open format") may allow announcers to choose

whatever they want to play and when (Kruse, 2003; Sauls, 1995; Waits, 2007). While this programming approach can inspire creativity and be beneficial overall (Desztich & McClung, 2007), it can also be easily abused by those that do not understand or may not care how to attract and maintain an audience (McClung 2001). Wallace (2008) described one campus station in which the idea of freeform led to unprofessionalism, citing inconsistencies in announcer schedules, music selections, and hours of operation, along with on-air shows that relied on inside jokes, information of little importance to the larger public off-campus, and news delivery issues that included mispronunciations and inappropriate laughter.

While this example would suggest otherwise, a freeform approach is not uncommon and can be effective. Waits (2007) describes an environment in which the college radio station is run by a dedicated group of students who exhibit artistic control over the station while still maintaining individual freedoms and welcoming the individuality and creativity that each member brings. The difference between one station being unprofessional and churlish and another being creative, interesting, and engaging may be an element of management.

Staffing and management configurations can vary widely among stations. While the student staff could be expected to reflect the general university population, a number of factors could inhibit participation (Tremblay, 2003). Pre-determined music styles, training requirements, availability of air-shifts, and individual station policies can promote inclusion or discourage participation. Many stations employ a member of the faculty or a professional manager to oversee operations, providing continuity as student staffs change year-to-year due to graduation and attrition (Sauls, 1995, 1998b; Wilson, 2004; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). The role of management in college radio is understudied and has not been closely reviewed.

Funding variations. Part of the responsibility of a radio station manager is to monitor and control the financial elements involved with operating the broadcast facility. For commercial broadcasters, sales of on-air advertising and promotional partnership opportunities typically produce the highest revenues. This is not the case for non-commercial broadcasters who, as evidenced by the descriptor itself, are not permitted by the FCC under The Communication Act of 1934 to generate income through commercial sales (Sauls, 1995; Wilson & Dudt, 2001) and have to operate delicately to comply with regulations in regard to sponsorships. The FCC allows non-commercial radio stations to acknowledge financial gifts from donors and underwriters according to specific guidelines provided by the Commission. Rules were relaxed to some degree in 1984 to allow enhanced donor and underwriting announcements (Stiegler, 2011). Such acknowledgements are still permissible and may include:

- logograms or slogans which identify and do not promote;

- location information;

- value neutral descriptions of a product line or service; and

- brand and trade names and product or service listings (FCC, 1992).

Any such announcements that offer comparative statements, promote benefits or attributes of the donor group, or include calls to action are expressly forbidden.

Underwriting is not as well understood by businesses and organizations as is commercial advertising. Non-commercial station representatives seeking underwriting support may find it necessary to educate the benefactor on what can and cannot be said over-the-air. Most college radio stations secure little funding in the way of underwriting, a process 13 U.S. college radio advisors who participated in a study described as "problematic under the current regulatory restraints" (Tremblay, 2003, p. 182). Program sponsors may be difficult for college radio stations

to secure (Wilson & Dudt, 2001), though some are able to generate income in this manner (Sauls, 1995).

Generally, college radio stations rely on other sources, frequently from within the institution itself. Licensees (the colleges or universities holding the FCC license to operate a radio station) often provide the funding for the station budget (Brant, 1981; Sauls 1995, 1998a; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Student government associations, general academic funds, or student services fees are sometimes used to finance radio operations (Sauls, 1995, 1998a; Wilson & Dudt, 2001). Funds may also be solicited outside of the institution. Listener contributions, on-air fundraisers, and gifts from alumni who had worked at the campus station during their time as students are sometimes requested (Sauls, 1995). These methods are unlikely to provide significant income. In fact, a 2001 study of 13 non-commercial Pennsylvania campus radio stations revealed that none had secured funding in any of these ways (Wilson & Dudt, 2001)

Lack of adequate budgets has been an issue for decades. Leidman (1985) referenced previous studies in a national review of college radio that indicated budgetary restrictions were a common problem (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986b). Sauls (1998a) considered one of the limitations of college radio "the lack of adequate funding" (pp. 163-164). Wilson and Dudt (2001) indicated even those stations receiving some support "struggle to find adequate funding to maintain operations" (p. 5). This is a common theme that runs through the literature on non-commercial radio stations.

Questions arise regarding influence when funding is provided by sources outside of the organization. College radio stations receiving the bulk of their funding from the administration or from student government organizations may encounter expectations in return (Tremblay, 2003), a situation that could easily progress to conflict (Sauls, 1995). This could occur internally

(debating ideals versus economic realities) or externally (in direct confrontation with the administration or agency controlling the purse-strings) (Knopper, 1994; Sauls, 1995). Research has indicated differing responses. The Wilson and Dudt (2001) study found stations receiving support from student government associations to be largely satisfied with the arrangement (with the ability to request additional emergency funds when necessary). However, Lucoff (1979) felt having administrators with little or no broadcast experience controlling the funding of the campus radio station was short-sighted (Sauls, 1998a). Operating budgets, like the tenor of the stations themselves, are likely to vary as greatly as the campuses and communities in which they function.

Changing Times

Technological advances continue to impact listening habits around the world and college students are often early adopters. This generation is more connected to technology than any prior, with the ubiquitous cell phone of today providing multiple methods of mobile communication and nearly endless entertainment opportunities. It has assembled and incorporated capabilities that no other device available to the general public ever has. This affects traditional media as declines in time spent listening for radio, viewership for television, and subscribers to newspapers clearly indicate. While technology unmistakably has benefits for traditional media as well, some higher education institutions are responding by combining or abandoning campus media. While not the focus of this study, these ideas are relevant to any discussion of college broadcasting today and necessitate a brief review.

Technology and regulation. As a whole, the broadcast industry continues to respond to changes in technology that have altered listening patterns and dependence on traditional media. Younger generations have grown up along with social media technologies, and interaction

between media and listeners can no longer be singularly directed (Willer, 2010). Personal entertainment technologies (such as the iPod and cell phones) allow individuals more control, variety, and choice in deciding what to watch or listen to, as well as when and where consumption takes place (Cohen & Jacobs, 2007). Consumers have greater access to music than ever before and new releases, breaking songs, and artist information and product are no longer features exclusive to radio stations (Tremblay, 2003).

Automation systems and FCC changes in regard to consolidation of ownership allow professional broadcast operations the ability to share announcers across several stations and formats, even within the same market (Tremblay, 2003). This has eliminated "thousands of entry level positions" (Tremblay, 2003, p. 170), many of which may have been available to college graduates in times past. Sauls and Greer (2007) addressed a mid-year hearing on broadcast localism that occurred in 2004 in which one speaker described the voice-tracking of air shifts as "one of the most insidious byproducts of media consolidation" (p. 42). Yet, even with that scathing evaluation, the practice continues at stations across the country today.

The Internet and streaming. Like its commercial counterpart, non-commercial college radio is adapting and responding to new challenges. By mid-2000, over 350 college and university-affiliated radio stations had individual websites (McClung, 2001) and many have been streaming their locally-produced content on the Web for years (McClung et al., 2003). College radio stations typically treat the web as a launching point for providing information about the station, recruiting other students to get involved, and providing direct access to the live stream (Willer, 2010). McClung (2001) determined audio streaming to be the most important interactive function for overall visitors on college radio web sites with over 80% preferring this feature. Other advantages were the ability to sample music or featured artist audio files. Younger listeners

to station streams focused on entertainment elements. Older listeners tended to use college radio for purposes of social integration and to create tighter bonds with the institution (McClung, 2001).

Maintaining a website requires diligence and is often a problem for college stations. A study of college and university affiliated radio stations in Pennsylvania found many websites abandoned, under construction, or lacking current information, though audio streams were generally functional (Wilson, 2011). Willer (2010) suggested most college radio stations tend to emphasize the traditional medium over the online version, viewing it as supplemental to the main signal, and describing many college radio (and television) web sites as "woefully outdated" (p. 49).

Maintenance, convergence, or abandonment. New technologies change the landscape for businesses and consumers every day. One response to change can be to try to ignore it, focusing efforts on maintaining the status quo. However, those in touch with emerging technologies often feel the need to adapt to remain relevant (Willer, 2010).

The term "convergence" is familiar to most involved in the media. As technologies intertwine, budgets tighten, and audiences fragment, media conglomerates often "converge" entities together; in essence, responding organizationally to outside factors to maintain interest and profitability. Convergence under this definition results in the uniting of stations under one umbrella. In the broadcast world, consolidation is an example of this, with media previously at odds with each other (such as newspapers, radio, and television) now working hand-in-hand, often from within the same physical facility (Willer, 2010). Many colleges and universities are also converging media, enabling students to work in multi-faceted media roles on campus and preparing those interested in media careers for an environment that is continually undergoing

modifications (Willer, 2010). In some cases, physical relocations occur with structural changes consolidating campus media into shared facilities. Kent State University School of Journalism and Mass Communication is one example of this, uniting campus media under one roof while maintaining individual organizational structures (Willer, 2010). "I-Comm" at Brigham Young University is another, having united media groups under one umbrella term while concurrently supporting autonomy and cooperation (Willer, 2010). Challenges of converged situations involving college radio include maintaining individual media identities while fostering cooperation among former competitors and establishing frameworks for common ground and shared goals (Willer, 2010).

While some license holders attempt to maintain their college radio station as is and others adopt a convergence model for campus media, many colleges and universities choose a different route. In what may be the biggest challenge to the future of college radio, many institutions of higher learning are choosing to abandon traditional radio, either selling licenses and eliminating opportunities for students to engage in radio broadcasting, or turning to Net-only radio as an alternative means to continue programming without the higher expense associated with terrestrial radio. While start-up costs have been estimated at over a quarter-million for traditional radio stations, Net-only stations can begin programming for less than 10-thousand dollars (Baker, 2010). Colleges or universities seeking financial relief or under-valuing traditional radio broadcasting may see the sale of the terrestrial license as a way to alleviate responsibility while still allowing an outlet for students via a newer form of technology (Troop, 2011).

Some may believe the Internet will eliminate and supplant the need for terrestrial radio. Willer (2010) suggested this viewpoint was erroneous, pointing out that Internet radio is nowhere near as portable as traditional broadcasting, that a comparable online audience would increase

streaming costs significantly (cutting into savings), and that audio fidelity for music streamed over the Internet is inferior to traditional broadcasts (pp. 50-51). While those assessments may all have been accurate at the time, the issues of portability and fidelity have certainly improved as technology continues to advance.

Nonetheless, colleges and universities continue to sell licenses at an increasing rate. Three recent sales of college radio stations which were programmed by students drew particular attention. These included Rice University's KTRU-FM 91.7, the University of San Francisco's KUSF-FM 90.3, and Vanderbilt University's WRVU FM 91.1. Protests from student staff members and concerned community members did not dissuade the university administrations from moving forward with the license sales (Troop, 2011). This trend is a growing concern for many associated with traditional college radio stations.

College Radio Day (CRD)–a day designed to celebrate high school and college radio stations around the world–debuted on October 11, 2011. Rob Quicke, the General Manager of WPSC-FM at William Paterson University conceived the idea for the event and developed the concept in conjunction with Peter Kreferi, the General Manager of WXAV-FM at Saint Xavier University (College Radio Day, "About Us"). Participating stations broadcast as usual throughout the day but supplement programming with specially produced elements and giveaways designed to introduce new listeners and remind existing ones of the benefits college radio broadcasters provide and increase the profile of the group as a whole (CRD, "F.A.Q."). Sales of a limited edition (1,500 copies) *College Radio Day: The Album 2012* double-CD tied in to the second CRD celebration were promoted to generate dollars in support of a new non-profit College Radio Defense Fund (CRDF). The stated goal of this fund is to "help stations survive in a difficult economic time when some stations are being sold off or shut down but will primarily

help promote stations by helping to fund events and helping buy new on-air equipment" (CRD, "College radio"). Stations are recruited to participate in CRD at no cost simply to promote the mission of college radio (CRD, "F.A.Q.").

At this stage, several elements particular to college radio stations have been reviewed. A historical background was established, the culture particular to college radio was presented, and the issue of change acknowledged. At this point, the critique of critical literature shifts to theoretical considerations. Organizations of many varieties can apply administrative theory for evaluative purposes. The next section provides a review of the principles critical to Fayol's administrative theory.

Administrative Theory

Organizations are complex entities. Even within the same or similar industries, individual organizations maintain a uniqueness that separates them from others. The human factor cannot be overstated. Just as fingerprints are unique to the individual, the diverse mix of personalities, characteristics, idiosyncrasies, and skill sets within varying groups makes organizations as a whole distinctly different from each other. Though rules, regulations, and other constraints are in place to guide activity, human beings are affected by many factors–emotional, physical, and psychological among them–that influence decisions and behavior (Archer, 2000; Downward, Finch & Ramsay, 2002; Miller & Tsang, 2010; Searle, 2001). Motives–explicit or implicit–also affect conduct and performance (Miller & Tsang, 2010). Human and organizational differences emphasize the importance of skillful management (McLean, 2011; Olum, 2004). Henri Fayol was a management expert, a pioneer of early administrative theory (McLean, 2011; Parker & Ritson, 2005) whose concepts, largely inductively derived, have influenced and permeated numerous organizations and schools of thought for decades. Taking a closer look at Fayol's

theories has value for evaluating the practices and challenges of leaders at student-led college radio stations today.

      Background. The terms *management* and *administration* are similar and often used synonymously. French industrialist and management thinker Henri Fayol, whose work provides the nucleus for this study, considered them interchangeable (Galbraith, 2007; Parker & Ritson, 2005). In conjunction with other writings and speech opportunities, Fayol's *General and Industrial Management* book presented many of his innovative ideas on organizations and management. These have served as building blocks over time for many other management concepts, yet the original ideas are still relevant today (Berdayes, 2002; Brunsson, 2008; Crainer, 2003; P. J. Gordon, 2003; V. H. Gordon, 2009; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Wren, et al., 2002).

      Fayol's background would hardly have led anyone to suspect he would eventually be considered the founding father of the classical management school of thought (Beach & Lindahl, 2007; Ochoa & Mujtaba, 2009; Parker & Ritson, 2005), Born into a middle-class French family in 1841 (McLean, 2011; Parker & Ritson, 2005), Jules Henri Fayol became a mining engineer at age 20 and rose through the ranks of the Commentary-Fourehambault Company. Fayol became a manager at age 25, received a higher level management role at 31, and became the company's chief executive officer at age 47 (Parker & Ritson, 2005), growing the mining company from the verge of bankruptcy to a place of financial health and providing employment for 10,000 workers before retiring at age 58 (Crainer, 2003; Wren et al., 2002). At about that time, Fayol established the Centre for Administrative Studies (CAS) to further develop and promote his management theories. He also later worked as a consultant and investigator for the French government (Parker & Ritson, 2005). This account of his work history is significant in that Fayol's theories on

management derived from his personal experiences and cognitive reasoning capacity (McLean, 2011; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Pryor, et al., 2011).

Key components. At the core of Fayol's administrative theory were his beliefs that all organizations were in need of management, that principles were sufficiently universal to be useful for all types of groups, and that managerial skills could be learned and refined (Crainer, 2003; Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003). Management guru Peter Drucker echoed these beliefs in his 1954 book *The Practice of Management.* Like Fayol earlier, Drucker (1954) considered management a skill rather than an innate ability and believed it could be taught and developed over time. This educational aspect was of great importance to Fayol, and it stemmed clearly from his beliefs in management universality (Crainer, 2003). Based on these concepts, management then became a discipline in and of itself, and could be studied, refined, and taught (Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003). The abundance of management training opportunities and the acceptance and respect awarded Masters of Business Administration (MBA) degrees today suggests the theorist recognized the significance of the issue well in advance of most others (Brunsson, 2008; Crainer, 2003; P. J. Gordon, 2003). While the particulars of the theory have advocates and detractors, the enduring impact of Fayol on management theory is almost universally acknowledged (Crainer, 2003; V. H. Gordon, 2009; Olum, 2004; Pryor et al., 2011). Brunsson (2008) described Fayol's ideas as proven to be "immensely successful" (p. 39). Olum (2004) stated Fayol's five principle roles of management "are still actively practiced today" (p. 15). McLean (2011) said, "Without doubt, Fayol has left an indelible mark on management history" (p. 33).

Fayol's theories on management derived from his large scale view of organizations as a whole. Regardless of the type or size or environment in which an organization operated, Fayol

47

felt there were six key activities prevalent in most group settings. These included technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, and managerial concerns (Fayol, 1949; McLean, 2011; Pugh & Hickson, 2007). Each carried particular associations and could vary in importance based on the type of organization and business, but all were represented at some level (McLean, 2011; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Pryor & Taneja, 2010).

Management activities were of particular importance to Fayol. Under this heading, Fayol postulated there were five major functions of management. These included forecasting and planning, organizing, coordination, command, and control (Beach & Lindahl, 2007; Chevalier, 2008; Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003; V. H. Gordon, 2009; McLean, 2011; Olum, 2004; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Pryor et al., 2011). Fayol defined management as the following:

> To manage is to forecast and plan, to organize, to command, to co-ordinate and to control. To foresee and provide means examining the future and drawing up the plan of action. To organize means building up the dual structure, material and human, of the undertaking. To command means maintaining activity among the personnel. To co-ordinate means binding together, unifying and harmonizing all activity and effort. To control means seeing that everything occurs in conformity with established rule and expressed command (1949, pp. 5-6).

Brunsson (2008) cited a reference in the 1993 tenth edition of the *Principles of Management* textbook to emphasize the robustness of Fayol's five elements, which are described therein as "absolute truths, to which there can be no objection" (p. 33).

Fayol felt managers were responsible for controlling performance and these five areas delineated best practices for doing so (Fayol, 1949; McLean, 2011; Ochoa & Mujtaba, 2009). Under these guidelines, managers could define goals, establish a chain of command, implement

action steps, sequence endeavors for productivity, and maintain checks and balances to assess

and alter efforts as needed (Brunsson, 2008; Chevalier, 2008; Fayol, 1949; Olum, 2004; Wren, et

al., 2002). Even today, these ideas are widely practiced (Olum, 2004), with derivatives such as

the acronym POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and

budgeting) still taught in many management education programs (Brunsson, 2008). Further, even

the creator of that concept, Luther Gulick, acknowledged Fayol as the inspiration behind it

(Wren et al., 2002). Fayol's original five managerial elements formed the crux of this evaluation

of student-led non-commercial college radio stations. They were used to guide the structuring of

the survey instrument and the formulation of individual questions.

Fayol was also well-known for proposing 14 principles of management he believed were

common to all types of effective organizations. While the roles of management provided the core

basis for this study, recognition of these standards needs to also be provided. Fayol's 14 common

principles of management included:

1. Specialization – Division of labor.

2. Authority with responsibility – Establishing lines along which orders flow.

3. Discipline – Accountability for actions.

4. Unity of command – Clear and distinct leadership.

5. Unity of direction – Consistent supervision and flow of information.

6. Subordination of individual interests – The goals of the enterprise take precedence.

7. Remuneration – A fair days pay for a fair days work.

8. Centralization – All planning and decision making occurs at the top level.

9. Chain of command – Orders flow from the top and get transmitted down throughout the

   organization along lines of authority.

10. Order –Everything and everyone has an appropriate place within the organization.

11. Equity – Everyone should be treated fairly, but not necessarily equally.

12. Personnel tenure – Extended employment is preferred.

13. Initiative – Ability to begin a plan or task and follow through energetically

14. Esprit de corps – Shared feelings of pride, fellowship, and common loyalty among group members (Crainer, 2003; Gailbraith, 2007; Fayol, 1949; Olum, 2004; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Pryor, et al., 2011).

Fayol believed these principles of management were largely universal and represented a methodology conducive to efficiency, worker satisfaction, and company optimization (Fayol, 1949; Galbraith, 2007). Individual effort and team dynamics were critical within his view of model organizations (Fayol, 1949; Olum, 2004). Most of the 14 principles remain relevant over time, though the ideas of unity of command and direction are not always applicable in some approaches to organizational management today (Olum, 2004). Nonetheless, the principles when taken as a whole, suggest Fayol's "situational, contextualized, and flexible approach to management" (Parker & Ritson, 2005, p. 189), a view in contrast to the common notion of Fayol as an "inflexible and authoritarian generalist" with rigid management rules that were applicable in all organizations and situations (Parker & Ritson, 2005, p. 178).

Criticisms and modern application. Though Fayol's theories are often lumped together with those of Frederick Taylor, comparisons reveal significant differences. The 14 general principles of management have led some to consider Fayol's viewpoint top-down and rigid, similar in perspective to Taylor's scientific management (Berdayes, 2002; Brunsson, 2008; Taylor, 1914). However, scrutiny of Fayol's writings, speeches, and language supports a clear separation. Parker & Ritson (2005) defined several ways in which this comparison falls short.

50

First, Fayol's major work, *General and Industrial Management*, in no way prescribes a rigid methodology for controlling workers and managing organizational functions. Instead, Fayol promoted a "holistic and flexible" (p. 182) approach to administration that recognized organizational similarities but remained open to situational decision-making. Further, Fayol's intention was never to create a hard and fast set of rules applicable in all situations. Rather, the clear intent from the beginning was to begin the discussion which would eventually lead to a generally accepted theory of management at some point in the future (Fayol, 1949). Once this theory developed, management education could be made available to everyone in varying degrees. Since Fayol believed all units required some form of management (Berdayes, 2002; Fayol, 1949), this educational opportunity would provide universal benefit.

Likewise, Fayol disagreed with Taylor in regard to financial incentives. While recognizing the importance of proper remuneration for services, Fayol contended there were numerous factors that affected performance and attitude (Fayol, 1949). While money provided some incentive, it was by no means the only (or even necessarily the most important) influence on job satisfaction (Fayol, 1949; Parker & Ritson, 2005). Fayol's emphasis on non-financial incentives and principle 14 (esprit de corps) evidenced his recognition of the employee as a whole person whose life outside the walls of the organization was extremely important and affected performance within (Fayol, 1949). This acknowledgement indicated Fayol understood early many of the concepts that became integral later to the human relations movement in the workplace (Parker & Ritson, 2005).

The language Fayol employed in his seminal work also conveyed a view of the organization much different than Taylor's. Again, the rigidity of the scientific management approach was rejected by Fayol, who recognized the complexity of organizations and the need

for administrators to exercise abilities to assess situations and respond with flexibility. Fayol allowed leaders the freedom to adjust managerial approaches and functions based on their particular contexts (Fayol, 1949; McLean, 2011; Taylor, 1914). This is in contrast to the commonly held view of Fayol as one espousing an ideal list of tasks or skills that would "define the role of administrators in all situations (V. H. Gordon, 2009, p. 68). He never proposed that, and in fact, these concepts clearly relate to later systems approaches to administration, contingency theory, and knowledge management practices (Parker & Ritson, 2005).

A broad review of Fayol's management theory encompasses a number of themes. Fayol clearly believed in the importance of a defined organizational structure, with one clear leader, and a chain of command that was immutable. He considered all employees to have a management function at some level and advocated education for all to ensure the acquisition of basic abilities and competencies (Berdayes, 2002; Fayol, 1949; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Wren et al., 2002). Fayol emphasized that as an organization grew in size, communication would necessarily have to be negotiated through larger channels, with the top administrator unable to directly speak to all employees at all levels. He advocated for order and responsibility, with unspoken and written rules to constrain and regulate behavior. Fayol felt planning and forecasting were critical for business success as was unity in purpose and action (Beach & Lindahl, 2007; Fayol, 1949; Olum, 2004; Parker & Ritson, 2005; Wren et al., 2002).

Fayol's theories have not been free from criticism and yet have endured over time. To those linking him with Taylor and the rigidity of scientific management (Taylor, 1914), Fayol was considered inflexible and irrelevant for management practices today (Parker & Ritson, 2005). Yet even among those who decry the likelihood of an ideal set of management skills, Fayol's theories remain remarkably germane and have served as the basis for several variations

that are practiced in contemporary organizations. His definition of the principles and roles of administration correlates with many of the issues contemporary managers negotiate (Beach & Lindahl, 2007; McLean, 2011; Olum, 2004). As Parker and Ritson (2005) put it, "His approach to organizational research, change management and strategy place him as a situational strategic manager with a deep appreciation of corporate, business and functional level strategy in dynamic and complex environments" (p. 192). That description allows Fayol's proposals to co-exist with modern companies like Pixar that de-emphasize centralized decision-making and foster more chaotic, creative work environments (Galbraith, 2007). Even in those types of situations, some form of management is necessary and desirable.

In contemporary organizational settings, influences come from many varied directions, and require skillful handling of the five principle roles of management defined by Fayol nearly a century ago. These universal functions allow for interpretation, evaluation, application, and critique by managers within the context of their own organizations (Fayol, 1949; V. H. Gordon, 2009; McLean, 2001). Such entities may differ significantly, yet leaders can apply the concepts suggested by Fayol toward individual circumstances and develop management techniques that meet particular needs (Parker & Ritson, 2005). The management theories of Henri Fayol have made significant impact on administrative approaches and thinking over the years (Fells, 2000; McLean, 2011), and many ideas remain "relevant and valuable" (Pryor & Taneja, 2010) to leaders of contemporary organizations. Hales (as cited in McLean, 2011) paid tribute to Fayol's contribution to management thinking in 1993 with the statement, "If all philosophy is a set of footnotes to Plato, management theory is, in large measure, a reply to Fayol's original memo" (p. 33).

So too, is the growth of management training practices around the U.S. and throughout the world today. Many business schools, colleges, and universities consider management a distinct subject worthy of study (Brunsson, 2008). Achieving a master's degree in business administration (MBA) was something not even possible at the time Fayol began promoting the value of management training (Fayol, 1949). Yet today, it is highly valued and respected for business leaders in various organizations (Navarro, 2005), and provides training to allow managers to develop skills that are applicable to almost any business or organizational setting (Gilbert, 2004). This would likely please Fayol, who intended for the theories to be stepping stones on which discussion and debate could center leading toward a generally accepted theory of management at some future point in time (Brunsson, 2008; Fayol, 1949; Parker & Ritson, 2005). While no consensus on one particular theory exists, Fayol's concepts are integral parts of many and sparked an interest in the idea of management as an important function worthy of study and valuable for application in various areas and fields. Though the original ideas were conceived nearly a century ago, Fayol's influence remains; so much so that Parker and Ritson (2005) suggest he should be considered "among the leading management theory and practice advocates today" (p. 192).

Closing Remarks

Review of the literature confirms college radio has changed with technological advances and cultural shifts. What began as an experimental form of communication became a traditional standard and now continues to adapt in a digital world where individual choice and convenience have grown in relevance. Some challenges, such as securing an audience, deciding on programming, managing a staff, and dealing with funding deficiencies, appear at the outset of this study to be the same. Others, such as licensees deciding to sell stations or end broadcasting

54

entirely are similar to previous times, yet different in that other options for campus stations (such as Internet-only or cablecasting) are now available. It will be important to determine how FAMs respond to new technologies, how they make decisions, and what sources (and to what extent) influence their choices. Management of any organization is difficult, and college radio stations operate within several substructures that can complicate matters further. Students are likely inexperienced in the area of administration, yet charged with running an organization that is owned by another entity, regulated by the federal government, and often funded by sources other than themselves. This makes evaluating management practice and providing descriptive information on college radio stations today even more important.

Fayol's five elements of management are incorporated into many modern management theories and remain practical for consideration on their own. These areas form a background from which to evaluate management practices at college radio stations in the modern era. Planning is a significant part of administration, and for college stations, includes making determinations on format, hours of operation, music styles, program content, and operating goals in general. Organizing involves staffing assignments, employment decisions, training issues, and equipment purchases and integration. Commanding entails leadership issues, including such items as communication methods, frequency, and problem-solving. Coordinating deals with managing assets, including human resources, Internet options and maintenance, and fiduciary responsibilities. Controlling principles center on conflict prevention and resolution, balancing influence from various constituents, providing guidelines for organizational behavior, and ensuring FCC compliance. The survey instrument builds upon each of these issues to provide a snapshot of college broadcast radio today and insight into management practices at student-led stations.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

This section addresses the process used to secure and analyze data pertaining to the

descriptive study of student-led college radio broadcast stations in the United States. It addresses

the type of research design, the population, sample and participants, the instrument and tools

used to acquire information for analysis, the procedures utilized for evaluation, and any

limitations and ethical concerns associated with the study. Detailed explanations clarify the

process and challenges that were encountered are addressed. Numerous tables supplement the

analysis and allow for further examination of precise data collection samples. Six hypotheses

associated with the study are evaluated with detailed information provided to allow for an

overview of the current state of American student-led college radio stations.

Type of Research Design

A study of this scope can best be accomplished through use of a survey instrument.

Surveys have been used for thousands of years to acquire information and are still prevalent in

research today. Babbie (2004) cited biblical references to censuses (a form of survey) dating

back to the time of Moses and related an effort in 1880 by German philosopher and socialist Karl

Marx who distributed 25,000 questionnaires in an attempt to secure information on employer-

employee relationships (p. 243). Today, researchers frequently use questionnaires for many

purposes, including academic studies, and to provide a snapshot capturing a point in time

(Buddenbaum & Novak, 2001). The terms *survey* and *questionnaire* are frequently used

synonymously and are considered interchangeable in this study (Berger, 2000).

Questionnaires have inherent qualities that are pertinent for descriptive studies. Survey

research is particularly well-suited to discover "the distribution of certain traits or attributes"

(Babbie, 1973 as cited in Dudt, 1985), and is the "best method available to the social researcher who is interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly" (Babbie, 2004, p. 243). Descriptive surveys "collect data systematically to describe a situation or area of interest factually and accurately" (Michael, 1979, as cited in Dudt, 1985). It is a benefit for precision to have large sample sizes with descriptive and explanatory analyses and survey studies are conducive to this (Babbie, 2004). Surveys enable large quantities of information to be obtained in a cost-efficient manner and do so with fewer ethical concerns than other forms of research involving human subjects (Buddenbaum & Novak, 2001).

The approach to secure data is primarily quantitative. However, an open-ended question at the end of the survey allows for a degree of qualitative response (Trochim, 2001). An online survey instrument utilizing Qualtrics ™ software was designed to secure self-administered, unsupervised responses (Berger, 2000) to questions dealing with staffing, programming, and financial considerations at student-run non-commercial FM college radio stations in the United States. Questions aligned under the five principle elements of management identified by theorist Henri Fayol.

Survey research, the primary method for securing data in this project, has advantages that make it appropriate for use. Berger (2000) highlights five particular advantages of survey use. Specifically, surveys:

- are inexpensive;

- can obtain current information;

- enable the acquisition of a great deal of information at one time;

- provide quantitative or numeric data; and

- are very common (p. 191).

With this project on a national scope involving hundreds of college radio stations, controlling costs was important. Costs of securing data through the use of a questionnaire delivered and responded to in an online environment were negligible. Due to the immediacy of the Internet and the time parameters for responding to the instrument, information could be expected to be current. The survey utilized a variety of close-ended questions (and one open-ended) under the headings prescribed by Henri Fayol's five principle roles of management and enabled a large amount of content to be obtained. By the nature of the instrument, the data received was primarily quantitative. With surveys being common to most people, the request for participation in this study should not have raised any concerns, and subjects expressed none.

It should be noted there are weaknesses to survey research as well. Concepts are inherently indefinite with differing individuals perceiving terms and ideas relative to their own experiences and understanding (Babbie, 2004). While attempts were made to avoid ambiguous expressions and ideas, concepts such as descriptions of music formats, personal or corporate influence, and assessments of challenges are undoubtedly influenced by personal perception. Likewise, survey research is inflexible in the sense that questionnaires must remain identical throughout the study and areas that surface early in the process cannot be added to the investigation. Additionally, surveys rarely capture the totality of social life with an inability to acquire insights that personal observation might reveal (Babbie, 2004). In a setting such as a college radio station environment, this weakness requires acknowledgement, though the nature of the descriptive study dictated the appropriateness of employing a survey for data acquisition.

Population, Sample, and Participants

The first step in the process was to acquire a current list of college radio stations across the United States. As there was no known existing current list available, this information was

secured from the official website of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the governmental agency regulating all traditional radio stations operating in the United States. A query of licensed stations on the www.fcc.gov website yielded a complete list of FM radio stations currently in operation. The query is an online search mechanism provided by the FCC which enables interested parties to secure basic information (determined by user-selected options) about U.S., Canadian, and Mexican radio stations. This list is updated regularly on the FCC website and was considered both reliable and relatively current. Limiting the search options excluded commercially-operated, AM radio, and foreign stations that were not a part of this study. This generated list of FM stations in the U.S. was then pared down to include only those operating in the noncommercial frequency band. A variety of information, including ownership detail, was provided for each record. The revised list was then further refined based on ownership information. Noncommercial stations clearly not owned by colleges or universities were removed from the list.

The process of establishing a reputable list continued with online visits to individual websites to make a firm determination of which stations were not just owned but also operated by colleges or universities. NPR affiliates and community stations that maintained college or university ownership but were clearly not operated by a FAM or student manager were also excluded from the refined list. The original search provided listings for 4,051 non-commercial educational licensed FM radio stations. After refinement, the population base for this survey was determined to be 424 college radio stations, representing only 10.5% of the original figure. The FCC organizes stations based on maximum power limitations, using nine letter or letter and number combinations (FCC "FM broadcast"; FCC "Low power"). Table 1 illustrates FCC designations and the number of college radio stations qualifying for study in each classification.

Table 1

Number of College Radio Stations Categorized by Class

FM Station Class	Maximum ERP (in kW)	Maximum HAAT (in meters)	No. of Stations in Survey	%
A	6.0	100	331	78.1%
B1	25.0	100	20	4.7%
B	50.0	150	10	2.4%
C3	25.0	100	24	5.7%
C2	50.0	150	11	2.6%
C1	100.0	299	4	1.0%
C0	100.0	450	0	0.0%
C	100.0	600	3	0.7%
D	0.1	30	21	5.0%
Total			424	100.0%

The issue of student management of the stations was difficult to discern from many websites and was resolved via a qualifying question at the beginning of the survey instrument. Any station representatives attempting to take the survey at non-student-led stations were disqualified based on their preliminary response and taken to the end of the instrument where they were thanked for their consideration without any data being collected. This amounted to only 2.9% of the respondents who began the survey. Contact information for each station was secured by cross-referencing FCC data with website records and station details secured from the latest edition (2010 version) of Broadcasting & Cable Yearbook, an industry-standard reference publication (Covington, Jr., 1997; Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a, 1986b). Email addresses were required for distributing the survey and in situations where these were outdated or unavailable, phone calls were made to the stations or colleges/universities to secure them. Rather than selecting a random sample, the survey instrument was directed to the highest level manager at each of the 424 identified college radio stations, with recognition that it was unknown prior to

surveying how many were led by students. This complete approach to sampling limited the likelihood of sampling errors and increased the probability of responses and confidence in the information received (Leidman & Lamberski, 1986a).

Data Collection Instruments, Variables, and Materials

A Qualtrics ™ survey instrument solicited data for evaluation. The initial questionnaire and subsequent revisions was assessed before implementation by three full-time educators at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, all of whom have professional experience and expert knowledge of the broadcast industry and the uniqueness of college radio stations. Upon completion of the preliminary revision of the survey instrument, a pilot study evaluated the quality of the instrument before widespread distribution. It was distributed to three college radio stations in western Pennsylvania. Follow-up interviews assessed the length and likelihood of completion and determined if all questions were understandable, useful for acquiring the information desired, crafted appropriately to avoid concern, and sufficiently thorough (Berger, 2000). The feedback acquired allowed the instrument to be further polished before re-submission to the same expert panel for a secondary review. Final refinements were made before implementation.

Once the questionnaire was finalized, an online link to the Qualtrics ™ survey instrument was emailed to the 424 identified college radio stations. Surveys were addressed to FAMs whenever they were able to be determined and to student managers in instances where FAM contact information was unavailable. In all situations, responses were requested from the individual most responsible for day-to-day station management and decision-making. A follow-up email was sent nine days after the initial request, encouraging those who had not yet

61

participated to respond to the survey. The researcher sent a final contact via email 10 days after the second correspondence.

Recruitment elements contained within the informed consent form included affirmations of the protection of privacy, the anonymity of online responses through Qualtrics ™, the request for voluntary participation, and the assurance that all respondents were 18 years of age or older at the time of completion. The actual text of the emails may be seen in Appendices A and B. All information secured was viewed in the aggregate to ensure anonymity.

Limitations of this process included the fact that radio stations in general are often in flux. Some are just signing on as others go dark, alter call letters, or change ownership. College radio stations are apt to change personnel rapidly due to graduation and attrition. Likewise, leadership (both student-managers and faculty advisers) may change frequently. In addition, it is impossible to determine in advance if email addresses are accurate as these are also frequently in flux and may not reflect current contact information (Wilson, 2004).

The survey instrument was designed to provide descriptive information on student-led college radio stations in general and particular data pertaining to the five areas identified by Fayol as typical components of management. Sections of inquiry were included to identify issues of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. The instrument consisted mainly of multiple-choice questions designed to be mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Berger, 2000). Some required subjects to provide responses in rank order. An "Other" option was available on many questions which allowed for "keyed-in" responses when the answers provided were determined to be less suitable. The survey concluded with an open-ended opportunity for respondents to elaborate on specific areas pertinent to student-led college radio. This provided a qualitative element, albeit of a fairly minor nature. Nonetheless, the information was considered

valuable to allow subjects to explain areas of concern in additional detail or clarify inconsistencies in responses. Many used it to share personal observations and experiences.

As noted previously, it is impossible to clearly determine ahead of time how many stations are led by students. This made determining an acceptable response rate nearly impossible. A 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of four indicates a sample size needed of 249 (58% of surveys sent) to reasonably reflect results congruent with the target population (Creative Research Systems, n.d.). While acknowledging that survey response rates are largely rough guides, Babbie (2004) suggested a rule of thumb of 50 percent as being "adequate for analysis and reporting" (p. 261). However, the unknown of the percentage of stations led by students makes it necessary to rely on univariate statistics based on the responses received and the early qualifier question that separated stations by management practice.

Data Analysis Procedures

This descriptive study relies heavily on the identification of trends and patterns in subject responses. To increase reliability and reduce the potential for inconsistency, all data was coded by the same individual (intra-coder). To ensure validity, the survey instrument was evaluated by communications professionals (jury validation) in advance of implementation, with areas of ambiguity or possible confusing or leading questions re-assessed and altered before distribution. A small pilot study was also conducted to further adjust the questionnaire before distribution. Upon receipt of responses, data was coded, comparisons drawn, and information interpreted.

Due to the nature of the descriptive study, variables were almost all nominal, making frequency the best indicator for analysis. Measures of central tendency: means, medians, modes, and ranges, were also useful in some situations. These evaluation measures are supplemented by discussion of the various questions within each section and accompanying tables that present raw

data for further review. This approach supports interpretation of information by the researcher and permits additional opportunity for reader scrutiny and assessment.

Qualtrics ™ software reports data received in the aggregate, protecting individual privacy and confidentiality at all times. The program provides built-in statistical assessment tools that assist in measuring frequency and central tendencies. The open-ended questions were individually coded and evaluated with results also included in the text and provided in table form to allow for additional review.

Limitations

There are many recognized limitations to this study. As addressed earlier, the broadcast landscape is constantly evolving with stations changing ownership, altering formats, or shutting down. The trend for colleges and universities to sell terrestrial radio properties is increasing. This study could be particularly affected by this movement. While the information secured from the official FCC website was current at the time of the last update, the process of a research project of this scope takes a considerable amount of time and some of the stations included in the survey may have been affected by significant changes before the study achieved completion.

Likewise, the study is limited to licensed non-commercial educational (NCE) FM radio stations in the United States only. A small number of colleges and universities operate for-profit commercial entities that could involve student managers. These are completely excluded from the study. Likewise, AM stations of any kind are not included in this study. While this number again represents a very limited number of stations, the approach to managing AM radio stations today is often much different than that of FM stations. Similarly, this study does not address Internet-only radio stations that are student-led and owned by colleges or universities. Time

constraints in both completing the study efficiently and doing so while limiting degradation of data due to station changes made narrowing the focus of the study a necessity.

The emphasis on student-led college radio broadcast stations made the process of securing information more difficult. While the FM query on the FCC website and the accompanying follow-up procedures allowed a reasonable amount of clarification on ownership issues, programming elements and leadership were impossible to discern from software and website evaluations. This effort required self-reporting at the time of questionnaire completion. This in itself presented the opportunity for error, either from a deliberate false response or from a mistake during survey completion. The ambiguity surrounding the leadership aspect made it impossible within the time restrictions of this project to acquire an accurate list of student-led college stations and therefore predict a reasonable response rate in advance. This is a limitation that could only be resolved over an extended period of time, which was not possible in this situation.

As noted earlier, questionnaires also have limitations. They are inflexible in regard to the need to retain identical questions throughout and are not able to adapt to new issues that may surface early on in the study. Likewise, they are inherently unable to fully capture the totality of social life in the way that personal observation can.

The inclusion of an open-ended question at the end of the survey was considered valuable yet also presented a challenge. Such questions are more difficult to code than quantitative data and require a degree of evaluation on the part of the researcher. While a difficulty, the question yielded verbal nuggets that revealed additional detail that would have been lost with a purely quantitative study.

Additionally, a study on a subject as broad as student-led non-commercial FM college radio broadcast stations in the U.S. cannot possibly capture enough in a brief survey to present exhaustive findings. At best, the study presents a snapshot in time, approximating management practices at such stations but not fully covering the subject. A questionnaire that would provide more complete data would increase in magnitude significantly and require copious amounts of time to complete and review. It is likely that response rates for such an instrument would be very low without significant compensation for completion.

Finally, this study focused on a narrow aspect of the NCE band. NPR affiliates, community radio stations, Internet-only stations, AM NCE stations, and FM stations operated commercially by colleges and universities were excluded. These are all areas available for future research but could not be addressed within the confines of this study.

Ethical Concerns

Ethical concerns in this study were minimal. No compensation was offered or provided. Participation was voluntary and did not include vulnerable subjects. All respondents were required to be age 18 or older. The topics were not of a particularly sensitive nature, though many comments to an open-ended question expressed concerns and frustrations with particular situations and institutions. The study did not involve mental or physical duress in any conceivable manner. Manipulation, deception, or withholding of information was not in any way a part of this research project.

In chapter four, the data from the survey is provided and analyzed, using descriptive statistics. Characteristics of the sample are presented to establish a basic background on the respondents and stations represented. Questions are aligned under the five principle roles of management proposed by Henri Fayol. Descriptions of results are provided to emphasize areas of particular significance.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Sample

This chapter is an analysis of the results from the survey instrument that was distributed to college radio stations nationwide. Subjects submitted responses online via Qualtrics ™. The primary focus was to assess management practices of student-led college radio stations in the United States while also providing a synopsis of such stations at this time. To secure information, a combination of quantitative descriptive analysis was united with qualitative feedback received from an open-ended question at the end of the survey.

Instrument. The survey instrument utilized in this study was designed with eight response layers (see Appendix C for the complete survey). The first served as a qualifier ensuring eligibility to participate. The second secured basic information pertaining to the station and the individual responding. The next five layers were relative to Henri Fayol's principle roles of management. The eighth (final) layer allowed for qualitative feedback with responses of any kind regarding college radio accepted. In total, the first seven layers provided quantitative data for analysis and the final added qualitative information.

The eight response layers provided unified data while remaining separate according to category. The first question eliminated any subjects who were willing to participate in the study but were not eligible due to their stations not being primarily led by students. Questions 2-4 were designed to secure information about the position of the respondent, the approximate year of establishment of the radio station, the holder of the license, and the station's primary format. The following set of questions (5-13) related to issues of planning, the first of Fayol's five principle management responsibilities. Layer 4 (questions 14-20) dealt with tasks associated with

organization (Fayol's second). The following question set (21-25) related to issues of command (the third principle role). The next two sets (questions 26-30 and 31-37, respectively) were devoted to the challenges of coordination and control (the fourth and fifth elements of management, according to Fayol). A final open-ended question allowed subjects to respond at the end of the survey, providing a qualitative research component for additional analysis.

Participation. The response rate for participation in this study is difficult to determine. As addressed in the "Limitations" section of the methodology, time and financial constraints, coupled with outdated and irrelevant college radio website information, made it virtually impossible to determine whether some stations included in the initial survey request were actually primarily led by students. In cases where ownership data indicated a college or university connection yet station leadership was uncertain, emails were sent regardless, with the expectation that respondents who did not qualify would not take the survey or would be excluded based on their response to question one. In fact, four who started the survey were disqualified due to their response to the initial question pertaining to leadership, one other emailed the researcher to indicate they were not student-led, and another emailed that the administration at their institution had just made the decision to sell the broadcast license and move to an Internet-only endeavor. Overall, there were 300 stations that self-identified via their websites as student-led. Another 124 had a higher education connection and suggested the possibility of student leadership from a website review. A total of 424 emails were distributed to separate college radio stations around the United States. There were 133 participating respondents who began the instrument, equating to a minimum base response rate of 31.4%. A total of 121 respondents (28.5% minimum) completed the entire survey. While the precise number of student-led college radio stations was unable to be determined, the response rate was undoubtedly substantially less

68

than anticipated and did not approach the 50% minimum suggested by Babbie (2004, p. 261) or the 58% previous calculation for a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of four. With the amount of surveys received, maintaining the same confidence level would increase the confidence interval to seven (Creative Research Systems, n.d.), a result that must be kept in mind when evaluating the data.

Leadership roles. The majority of responses were gathered from those that self-identified under the Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM) category. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects fell into this grouping with slightly less than a third of the remainder self-identifying as Student Managers. Those that fell under the "Other" category did not specify roles at their individual stations. Table 2 illustrates the breakdown of responses.

Table 2

Respondent Roles by Category

Role	No.	%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	89	66.9%
Student Manager	42	31.6%
Other	2	1.5%
Total	133	100%

Station foundation. To gain a measure of historical perspective, respondents were asked to identify the approximate year in which the college broadcast station they were affiliated with was first licensed. As expected, responses varied considerably with the earliest dating back to 1920 and the most recent 2008. It is possible, as the first two official licenses granted to education institutions occurred in 1922, that the oldest station referenced may have been an early AM educational station that later migrated to the FM band or simply that the oldest approximation was just that, a reasonable guess on behalf of the respondent. Regardless, the

response is an outlier, with the breakdown of answers in Table 3 indicating the preponderance of stations were initiated in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s (72.2%). Over a third found their genesis in the decade of the 1970s alone. Table 4 reviews central tendencies with 1972 the primary year for initial college broadcast station licensing.

Table 3

Approximate Grant Date of Original Station License by Decade

Decade	No.	%
1920s	1	0.8%
1930s	0	0.0%
1940s	8	6.3%
1950s	12	9.5%
1960s	29	23.0%
1970s	43	34.1%
1980s	19	15.1%
1990s	10	7.9%
2000s	4	3.2%
Total	126	100.0%

Table 4

Distribution of Central Tendencies by Year

Measure	No.	Year
Mean	1971.6	1972
Median	1972	1972
Mode	8	1970, 1972, 1974

Regardless of who actually performs management functions, licensees of radio stations have ultimate legal culpability with the FCC for operating within regulations. For this reason, it was determined to investigate the entities that hold the licenses. As expected for student-led stations and illustrated in Table 5, colleges or universities maintained the vast majority of

ownership (87.3%). Various boards associated with higher education also held broadcast

licenses. These were specified in the "Other" category, with four Boards of Regents and three

Boards of Trustees presented as license-holders, along with the mention of an independent board

and the Board of Governors in one state.

Table 5

Distribution of FCC Licenses by Ownership

Licensee	No.	%
College / University	110	87.3%
University Foundation	2	1.6%
Student Cooperative	2	1.6%
Other	12	9.5%
Total	126	100.0%

These preliminary questions provided a suitable background for the data analysis to follow.

Analysis of Data

With this understanding of the outline of the questioning, the respondents participating,

subject roles, and the foundations of the station, the focus shifted to administrative practices as

defined by Fayol's Five Elements of Management. The first of these foundations examined was

planning, a principle integral for success in most organizations.

Planning. It was appropriate that planning was the first element of management

addressed by Fayol, in that foresight is essential and covers a wide range of activities. At a

college radio station, planning involves formatting, establishing operating goals, preparing for

breaks in the academic year when student staff may be unavailable, and staying abreast of

challenges and opportunities that may affect the operation and effectiveness of the station. These

elements were assessed through questions 5-13 on the survey instrument.

The issue of format was addressed first, with questions 5 and 6 inquiring about the primary and secondary formats represented at the individual stations. Music was identified as the primary format of exactly 92% of the stations represented in the survey. A mix of elements that could include music, talk and sports accounted for nearly all of the remaining responses. Secondary formats were more evenly distributed with news/talk (41.7%) narrowly edging sports (37.5%) as the second most chosen format. Music was identified as the primary format by all but 10 respondents yet also recognized as the secondary format by 19 subjects. One explanation for this apparent anomaly could be that several respondents at stations that played music exclusively reported the same selection in both categories, using the options to emphasize the music focus of the station. Responses regarding primary and secondary formats are specified in Table 6.

Table 6

Identification of Primary and Secondary Formats

Format	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%
Music	115	92.0%	19	15.8%
News / Talk	1	0.8%	50	41.7%
Sports	0	0.0%	45	37.5%
Other	9	7.2%	6	5.0%
Total	125	100.0%	120	100.0%

Determining the style of music permitted for airplay on stations is also a planning element and generated a variety of responses. Subjects were asked to list up to the top three styles of music featured on their station. Alternative (including indie) was the primary selection for 55.6% of the stations and also scored highest overall with 32.4% of the total mentions. Freeform (anything goes) received the second most selections as the primary format (19.4%), followed by Rock (including classic and modern) at 10.5%

Secondary selections resulted in a tie between Alternative and Rock (24.3%) with Freeform (20.0%) not far behind and Urban (including hip-hop & R&B) increasing dramatically from 3 to 15 mentions. Rock led the way for the third style of music played on stations garnering 27.0% of the responses. Urban secured second place in this category with 23.0% of the tallies.

Alternative received the most responses with 110, nearly a third of the overall mentions (32.4%). This was significantly ahead of Rock (20.1%) and Freeform (17.7%), the two selections that followed Alternative as the primary style of music. Among the 19 additional formats mentioned by respondents in the "Other" style section, only Jazz received more than three mentions overall, with three listings as the primary format, three as secondary, and five as tertiary. This amounted to 3.2% of overall mentions, placing Jazz just ahead of Country as a music style choice for student-led college radio. Table 7 breaks down the style choices by preference with Table 8 reviewing the overall totals.

Additional assessment indicates Alternative received strong support as both a primary and secondary music style. Freeform received nearly identical responses for primary and secondary while Rock was more frequently cited as a secondary or tertiary music format. While the primary music style for only 2.4% of stations represented, Urban was often a secondary or tertiary format and registered an overall airplay status of 12.1%. Pop and Country appeared to remain largely in the world of mainstream, for-profit radio.

Table 7

Styles of Music Played Most Often

Type	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%	Tertiary No.	%
Alternative	69	55.6%	28	24.4%	13	13.0%
Freeform	24	19.4%	23	20.0%	13	13.0%
Rock	13	10.5%	28	24.4%	27	27.0%
Pop	5	4.0%	6	5.2%	6	6.0%
Urban	3	2.4%	15	13.0%	23	23.0%
Country	1	0.8%	2	1.7%	4	4.0%
Other	9	7.3%	13	11.3%	14	14.0%
Total	124	100.0%	115	100.0%	100	100.0%

Table 8

Descriptive Data Comparing Styles of Music Played Most Often Overall

Style	No.	%	Mean	Variance	SD
Alternative	110	32.4%	1.49	0.49	0.70
Rock	68	20.1%	2.21	0.55	0.74
Freeform	60	17.7%	1.82	0.59	0.77
Urban	41	12.1%	2.49	0.41	0.64
Pop	17	5.0%	2.06	0.68	0.83
Country	7	2.1%	2.43	0.62	0.79
Other (combined)	36	10.6%	2.14	0.64	0.80
Total	339	100.0%			

The next areas for review under the planning umbrella dealt with responsibility issues. Assessing who was primarily responsible for determining operating goals for the station would suggest a level of influence that may or may not coincide with title. Likewise, who determines what is actually approved for airplay on the station is also an indication of influence and management practice. Music was already determined to be the primary format for over 90% of the student-led radio broadcast stations in the study. Restraints on the music and other forms of

programming align under the planning component of management practice. The element of planning extends to responding to calendar events throughout the year as well. Nowhere is this more critical than with student-led college radio stations that have to contend with academic calendars that include break times from classes when many students (staff members) vacation or return to their hometowns to spend time with family.

Responses to these questions generated results that provided clues to management practice and levels of influence. As it pertained to the establishment of operating goals, the Student Management Team led the way, garnering nearly half of the responses (44.8%) with the FAM (34.4%) receiving over a third. The Student Manager was a distant third with less than 15.0% (13.6%) of the tallies. Control of airplay elements also fell under the authority of the Student Management Team first, with over half of the responses (54.8%). The Student Manager ranked a distant second in this category, receiving 13.7% of the responses. The FAM was third with 12 votes and nearly 10% (9.7%), just ahead of staff deejays that were acknowledged 11 times (8.9%) in the "Other" category. Also mentioned more than once were individual Student Management Team members such as the Music Director (MD) or Program Director (PD).

In spite of scheduling issues pertaining to student responsibilities and academic calendar breaks, the vast majority of the stations surveyed indicated that they operate beyond the confines of the academic year. Of the 124 responses received, 109 (87.9%) indicated stations find ways to remain on-air year-round. Methods and responsibility for maintaining operations during times when school is not in session were varied with responsibility virtually even between the Student Management Team (35.8%) and the FAM (34.9%). The Student Manager maintained that responsibility for 12.8% of the stations surveyed, while others turned to community members,

available staff, and automation software to continue to broadcast. Table 9 illustrates primary

responsibility issues under the planning heading.

Table 9

Identification of Primary Responsibility for Determining Operating Goals, Deciding What is Played On-Air, and Operating the Station During Breaks

Group or Individual	Goals		Airplay		Breaks	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Student Management Team	56	44.8%	68	54.8%	39	35.8%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	43	34.4%	12	9.7%	38	34.9%
Student Manager	17	13.6%	17	13.7%	14	12.8%
Department Chairperson	3	2.4%	1	0.8%	1	0.9%
Other	6	4.8%	26	21.0%	17	15.6%
Total	125	100.0%	124	100.0%	109	100.0%

Along with planning for breaks in the schedule, the issue of forecasting includes

assessing areas of challenge to determine how to position a station. Question 12 in the survey

asked respondents to evaluate and rank the top three issues affecting their organization. Far

outpacing other responses as the primary problems facing the campus stations were lack of

funding (28.5%) and lack of student support / interest (23.6%). These two factors were

mentioned more frequently than any other in overall responses as well, albeit in reverse order.

Lack of administrative support received the third highest ranking as the primary issue facing the

campus stations (9.8%) and was third overall (14.5%). These three issues exceeded all others as

the primary and secondary challenges with poor/failing equipment frequently mentioned in the

second and third categories. Table 10 illustrates the first, second, and third issue choices for

stations, and Table 11 breaks down the cumulative totals for additional review. There were 25

total responses in the "Other" category, six of which indicated stations were not currently facing

any significant issues. No other response in that category garnered more than three tallies.

Table 10

Issues Facing Stations, by Significance

Type	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%	Tertiary No.	%
Lack of funding	35	28.5%	15	15.6%	7	8.3%
Lack of student support / interest	29	23.6%	16	16.7%	13	15.5%
Lack of administrative support	12	9.8%	20	20.8%	12	14.3%
Lack of community support	9	7.3%	7	7.3%	13	15.5%
Weak on-air signal	9	7.3%	10	10.4%	8	9.5%
Lack of enforceable policies	6	4.9%	9	9.4%	7	8.3%
Possibility the station will be sold	4	3.3%	2	2.1%	4	4.8%
Poor / failing equipment	3	2.4%	13	13.5%	15	17.9%
Other	16	13.0%	4	4.2%	5	6.0%
Total	123	100.0%	96	100.0%	84	100.0%

Table 11

Descriptive Data Comparing Issues Facing Stations Overall

Issue	No.	%	Mean	Variance	SD
Lack of student support / interest	58	19.1%	1.72	0.66	0.81
Lack of funding	57	18.8%	1.51	0.50	0.71
Lack of administrative support	44	14.5%	2.00	0.56	0.75
Poor / failing equipment	31	10.2%	2.39	0.45	0.67
Lack of community support	29	9.6%	2.14	0.77	0.88
Weak on-air signal	27	8.9%	1.96	0.65	0.81
Lack of enforceable policies	22	7.3%	2.05	0.62	0.79
Possibility the station will be sold	10	3.3%	2.00	0.89	0.94
Other	25	8.3%	1.56	0.67	0.82
Total	303	100.0%			

Organizing. The second of Henri Fayol's five principle roles of management is

organizing. Accordingly, the second section of the survey included several questions derived to

77

secure information on the organizational efforts of student-led college broadcast stations. Elements reviewed in this section included titled and paid positions, training efforts for student staff, and an evaluation of the broadcast equipment in use. These issues are all contained within the management function of organizing personnel and equipment to maximize achievement of organizational goals.

Determining who made decisions as to which staff members received titled positions was the first aspect scrutinized. Data revealed a wide variety of methods with 123 station representatives providing 154 responses, indicating a complexity to the process that was not unanticipated. With a recognition that various parties could work collectively in such determinations, respondents were permitted to select more than one response or suggest one or more not provided. In fact, "Other" was selected by nearly 30% (29.3%) of the 123 respondents with additional detail provided by a write-in opportunity. The Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM) had the most influence on hiring with 65 acknowledgements, representing 42.2% of the total responses and 52.9% of the stations. With roughly one-third (33.1%) of total response and 41.5% of the individual stations, Student Managers also had significant influence. In the Other category, some representatives indicated a multi-tier process in which the Student Manager was hired and then given the responsibility of assembling the titled staff. Others revealed that some positions were appointed after an extensive interview process. Various boards and committees were mentioned, along with a generic "elections" that did not specifically identify with any particular group charged with making the final selections. Thirteen of the 36 "Other" selections indicated there were staff elections that took place. Another five specified election boards. Table 12 indicates the multiplicity of responses derived from the 123 station representatives.

Table 12

Identification of Who Determines Which Staff Members Receive Titled Positions

Group or Individual	No.	% of Responses	% of Stations
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	65	42.2%	52.9%
Student Manager	51	33.1%	41.5%
Department Chairperson	2	1.3%	1.6%
Other	36	23.4%	29.3%
Total	154	100.0%	125.3%

Organizing a staff is a challenge for any manager and the variety of possibilities for

positions at radio stations is diverse. As these are student-led stations under examination, it could

be expected that most positions would be held by students, although many campus-affiliated

stations welcome alumni and community volunteers to add expertise and fill-in scheduling gaps.

The most frequent position held by students was Program Director, the only position that was

student-filled at over 90% of the stations surveyed (90.2%). Following closely behind was the

only other position exceeding 80%, that of Music Director at 89.4%. With the exception of

Underwriting Director, all listed positions in the survey were occupied at least half of the time by

students. In the "Other" category selected by 20 respondents, student-filled positions included

Chief Engineer (4 responses), Business Manager (3 mentions), and Operations Director, Training

Director, Traffic, and Social Media Director (all with 2 recognitions). Other individual positions

were also disclosed with one mention apiece.

While students occupied the majority of most common staff positions (excluding

Underwriting Director), compensation for titled positions dropped off dramatically. Only the

Station Manager position was compensated financially at more than half of the stations surveyed

(58.5%). However, there were 34 responses to question 15 in the "Other" category which is a

substantial number, representing paid positions other than those provided at over one-fourth of the stations (27.7%). Among the diverse responses, only Engineer received more than five recognitions (7 overall) with announcers paid only during non-academic breaks receiving four. As evidenced in Table 13, many students holding titled positions remain unpaid for their efforts. The fact that the Program Director position is most often filled by a student and is the second most frequently compensated is worth noting. The Station Manager position commonly holds more authority within an organizational business structure, yet when compared to the Program Director, that position is occupied by a student nearly 20% less frequently though compensated financially by over 10% more. This suggests many stations self-identified as student-led may be employing professional paid managers or graduate assistants to support the students and provide leadership.

Table 13

Positions Held by Students and Positions That are Paid

	Students		Paid	
Position	No.	%	No.	%
Program Director	111	90.2%	58	47.2%
Music Director	110	89.4%	52	42.2%
Announcer	97	78.9%	3	2.4%
Promotions Director	96	78.0%	39	31.7%
Production Director	93	75.6%	39	31.7%
News Director	89	72.3%	40	32.5%
Station Manager	87	70.7%	72	58.5%
Sports Director	79	64.2%	31	25.2%
Webmaster	79	64.2%	26	21.1%
Public Relations Director	69	56.1%	17	13.8%
Staff Member (without air shift)	64	52.0%	7	5.7%
Underwriting Director	54	43.9%	33	26.8%
Other	20	16.3%	34	27.7%

Compensation may take several different forms. Table 14 illustrates the breakdown of survey results, indicating monetary incentives are provided much more often than college credit or other methods. Two of the "Other" responses indicated payment was achieved via monthly salary.

Table 14

Distribution of Compensation for Students in Paid Positions

Type of Compensation	No.	%
Hourly Wage	46	37.7%
Semester Stipend	43	35.2%
College Credit	15	12.3%
No Paid Positions	29	23.8%
Other	6	4.9%

Organization of the staff includes training opportunities for announcers desiring air shifts. As shown in Table 15, requirements at individual stations varied dramatically. Interestingly, the highest percentage (30.6%) required a minimal amount of training; between 1 and 3 hours. The second highest required significantly more; greater than 7 hours. Only about one station in ten (10.7%) mandated less than an hour of training.

Table 15

Hours of Required Training Before Being Granted Air Shifts

Length of Time	No.	%
Less than one hour	13	10.7%
1 – 3 hours	37	30.6%
3 – 5 hours	22	18.2%
5 – 7 hours	16	13.2%
Greater than 7 hours	33	27.3%
Total	121	100.0%

Further, the responsibility for guiding new announcers falls primarily with the Student Management Team (76.9%), though this question (#18) also generated a multiplicity of responses. In addition to the suggested answers, respondents specified 20 "Other" selections, with seven indicating training comes from current DJs and four revealing in-class instruction is required ahead of time. As displayed in Table 16, the 121 subjects provided 194 responses, indicating responsibility is often not limited to one group or individual. Nonetheless, it is clear the Student Management Team is most often responsible for training, with the FAM (32.2%) and Student Manager (28.9%) accountable at nearly the same level.

Table 16

Responsibility for Training Students Desiring Air Shifts

Group or Individual	No.	% of Responses	% of Stations
Student Management Team	93	47.9%	76.9%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	39	20.1%	32.2%
Student Manager	35	18.1%	28.9%
Department Chairperson	3	1.6%	2.5%
Other	24	12.4%	19.8%
Total	194	100.0%	160.3%

The final area under evaluation in the organizing level of management was the broadcast equipment itself. Respondents were asked in question 19 to evaluate the equipment currently in use for broadcasting purposes. What was readily evident was that most considered their station equipment to be in Good condition or better with just over 12% sharing Fair (9.1%) or Poor (3.3%) evaluations. Good or Very Good represented about two-thirds of responses with Excellent selected by 22.3%. Table 17 illustrates what has to be encouraging results for the nearly 88% of stations that provided positive assessments.

Table 17

Evaluation of Broadcast Equipment Currently In Use

Standard	No.	%	Measure	Value
Excellent	27	22.3%	Mean	3.61
Very Good	39	32.2%	Variance	1.07
Good	40	33.1%	SD	1.04
Fair	11	9.1%		
Poor	4	3.3%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Commanding. The third principle role of management advocated by Fayol is that of command. As it related to student-led college radio broadcast stations, this area was designed to include information on how material was disseminated to the staff members as a whole (and other related parties), who was responsible for handling internal issues, and who had the authority to handle any technical or equipment problems that surfaced. Questions 20 – 24 in the survey instrument secured data in these areas.

Communication is an important aspect of command and all but 15 responding stations indicated they had staff meetings on a regular basis, amounting to 87.6% of responses. "Regular" was defined further by asking respondents to clarify how often meetings were held. Weekly meetings were the predominant choice, achieving nearly 70% (68.9%) of the responses. Monthly (13.2%) and Bi-weekly (11.3%) represented over 10% each, as evidenced in Table 18. This suggests communication is occurring with the staff on a frequent basis, though the scope and detail of the information provided in such meetings was not included in this study.

Table 18

Frequency of Staff Meetings

Frequency	No.	%
Weekly	73	68.9%
Monthly	14	13.2%
Bi-weekly	12	11.3%
More than once per week	3	2.8%
Other	4	3.8%
Total	106	100.0%

Nor were meetings the primary method of communication. Subjects ranked their top three forms of communication with the staff and results indicated email (59.5%) was the method most frequently used. The rate was almost three to one as the primary method and nearly 5% higher overall. Staff meetings were ranked second as the primary communication choice and were mentioned more frequently than any other technique as the secondary and tertiary choices. Individual meetings gathered higher totals in the secondary category and ranked second highest as the third communication choice. Social Media was fairly steady as a first, second, or third choice, with 15, 21, and 21 responses, ranking third overall behind Email and Staff meetings at 16.2%. There were only nine responses out of 351 that listed "Other", but of these, five mentioned Texting, with one choosing it as the primary method of communication and two each in the other levels. Table 19 illustrates the ranking of communication techniques in order with Table 20 encapsulating the overall results.

Table 19

Methods of Communication with Staff

Type	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%	Tertiary No.	%
Email	72	59.5%	29	24.4%	12	10.8%
Staff meetings	25	20.7%	41	34.5%	32	28.8%
Social Media	15	12.4%	21	17.6%	21	18.9%
Individual meetings	4	3.3%	13	10.9%	31	27.9%
Instant Messaging	2	1.7%	8	6.7%	5	4.5%
Memos	0	0.0%	4	3.4%	7	6.3%
Other	3	2.5%	3	2.5%	3	2.7%
Total	121	100.0%	119	100.0%	111	100.0%

Table 20

Descriptive Data Comparing Overall Methods of Communication with Staff

Type	No.	%	Mean	Variance	SD
Email	113	32.2%	1.47	0.47	0.68
Staff meetings	98	27.9%	2.07	0.58	0.76
Social Media	57	16.2%	2.11	0.63	0.79
Individual meetings	48	13.7%	2.56	0.42	0.65
Instant Messaging	15	4.3%	2.20	0.46	0.68
Memos	11	3.1%	2.64	0.25	0.50
Other	9	2.6%	2.00	0.75	0.87
Total	351	100.0%			

Commanding the organization includes dealing with problems among staff and with failing or malfunctioning equipment. Unlike many of the areas evaluated previously, Student Management Teams took a back seat to the FAM and the station Engineer in these areas. The FAM was the primary choice for dealing with staff issues at 41.3% of the stations, with the Student Manager and Student Management Team each getting involved at the 27.3% level (Table 21). While collectively this indicated students assume responsibility over half of the time, results

altered significantly when it came to technical and equipment issues. Table 22 reveals a heavy dependency on the Engineer and FAM in handling these types of situations. Engineers were the primary selection 60.3% of the time with FAMs called to action at 24.0% of the stations. Students were largely absent in this area which came as no great surprise. Technical issues in radio broadcasting can be quite complex and often require a level of expertise most students would not yet have acquired. In fact, specialized training in electronics may be necessary for certain types of equipment repair situations. Among the "Other" responses were three stations indicating the Technical Director would be responsible for dealing with such issues.

Table 21

Primary Responsibility for Dealing with Staff Problems or Issues

Group or Individual	No.	%	Measure	Value
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	50	41.3%	Mean	2.91
Student Management Team	33	27.3%	Variance	0.85
Student Manager	33	27.3%	SD	0.92
Department Chairperson	1	0.8%		
Other	4	3.3%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Table 22

Primary Responsibility for Dealing with Technical or Equipment Problems

Group or Individual	No.	%	Measure	Value
Engineer	73	60.3%	Mean	1.77
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	29	24.0%	Variance	1.55
Student Management Team	4	3.3%	SD	1.24
Student Manager	4	3.3%		
Other	11	9.1%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Coordinating. Principle role of management number four from Henri Fayol is coordinating, the next area examined in this study. In relation to student-led college radio, coordinating involves (among other things) managing human and financial resources. Staff make-up and consistency may be an area under near-constant evolution at college radio stations. Students graduate, transfer, accept employment opportunities, get involved in other activities, have social conflicts, tests to study for, and other interruptions that affect their involvement. Coordinating staff to cover air shifts, attend events, and complete regular tasks is a function of management. Questions 26 and 27 on the survey asked subjects to reveal the approximate size of their staff and the percentage of those actively involved.

The results suggested that nearly half of the reporting stations had student involvement at a substantial level. Whereas most professional stations today use consolidation, automation, and other technologies to reduce staff size, college stations involve higher numbers. As Table 23 indicates, the total number of students on staff was reported at 41 or greater by 49.6% of the respondents. The range from 26–40 ranked second highest (24.0%), closely followed by 10–25 (23.1%).

Table 23

Approximate Radio Station Staff Size

Staff total	No.	%	Measure	Value
Less than 10	4	3.3%	Mean	3.20
11 – 25	28	23.1%	Variance	0.83
26 – 40	29	24.0%	SD	0.91
41 or greater	60	49.6%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Further examination reveals most stations have active student memberships. Table 24 illustrates a direct proportion between involvement and higher response rates. The highest percentage of active students (81 – 100%) also generated the highest number of responses (39 or 32.2%), with fewer mentions at subsequent lower involvement rates.

Table 24

Approximate Percentage of Active Staff Members

% Active	No.	%	Measure	Value
1 – 20%	14	11.6%	Mean	3.49
21 – 40%	18	14.9%	Variance	1.90
41 – 60%	23	19.0%	SD	1.38
61 – 80%	27	22.3%		
81 – 100%	39	32.2%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Further analysis of the data secured from these two questions supports the assumptions. Table 25 reveals the results from a cross-tabulation of the two questions. For these analyses, data was recoded with "less than 10" and "11–25" combined due to the small number of responses in each. Chi-Square generally requires a minimum of 5 in each cell. Table 26 indicates there is no significant difference between the two variables and the effect size is medium.

Table 25

Cross-tabulation of Staff Size and Active Members

		Which of the following most closely approximates the percentage of the overall staff you would consider to be ACTIVE members?					
		1-20 percent	21-40 percent	41-60 percent	61-80 percent	81-100 percent	Total
Which of the following most closely approximates the TOTAL number of students who are involved in the college or university radio station?	11-25	7	2	8	5	10	32
	26-40	4	7	4	8	6	29
	41 or greater	3	9	11	14	23	60
Total		14	18	23	27	39	121

Table 26

Chi-Square Test

	Value	Df	P Value	Effect Size
Pearson Chi-Square	12.539	8	.129	Medium

Note. 4 cells (26.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36

Additionally, most stations were found to have associated websites and nearly three-quarters of those (74.4%) were maintained by staff members. This also indicated a level of involvement, although a review of the websites connected with each station surveyed revealed differing results. Some were well-maintained and exhibited professionalism and attention to detail. Many, however, were severely outdated or had limited functionality. As shown in Table 27, only 3.3% of campus radio stations surveyed did not have a current website.

89

Table 27

Party Maintaining the Station Website

Group or Individual	No.	%	Measure	Value
Staff member(s) of the radio station	90	74.4%	Mean	2.70
College / University	21	17.4%	Variance	0.79
Do not have current website	4	3.3%	SD	0.89
Party not otherwise associated with College / University or radio station	4	3.3%		
Student not otherwise associated with radio station	2	1.7%		
Total	121	100.0%		

The issue of budgeting is certainly one of coordination and planning. Financial matters can be difficult for even the most seasoned manager to handle effectively, and college radio stations in this study already revealed that lack of funding was a primary concern. Total annual budgets varied widely among the stations surveyed, with nearly as many operating on less than $10,000 as those functioning with more than $50,000. As displayed in Table 28, budget amounts in-between those figures were the most common.

Table 28

Annual Operating Budget

Dollar Amount	No.	%	Measure	Value
Greater than $50,000	26	21.5%	Mean	2.53
Between $25,001 and $50,000	36	29.8%	Variance	1.08
Between $10,001 and $25,000	35	28.9%	SD	1.04
Less than $10,000	24	19.8%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Note: Excludes salaries of faculty and/or professional staff but includes student wages

Sources of funding for the college radio stations were also explored and results were revealing. While over 70% secured primary funding from the College / University or Student Funds, Underwriting and Donations were integral secondary and tertiary supports. Only 4.1% of the subjects listed these as primary sources of funding, yet they led in the other two categories and received the second and fourth-most mentions respectively overall. Endowments, grants, and dues/memberships were virtually inconsequential in terms of response rates, though it should be noted the first two could provide large dollar amounts unlikely to be secured from the third. As the licensees of the majority of the stations, it could be assumed the higher education institutions would provide resources for the stations, and that appears to be the case. Table 29 provides funding sources by rank order, and Table 30 reveals the overall totals.

Table 29

Sources of Funding, by Importance

Type	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%	Tertiary No.	%
College or University	48	39.7%	14	12.7%	13	15.5%
Student Funds	39	32.2%	17	15.5%	0	0.0%
Student Government Assoc.	15	12.4%	9	8.2%	7	8.3%
Department	7	5.8%	15	13.6%	5	6.0%
Underwriting / Sponsorships	5	4.1%	29	26.4%	26	31.0%
Donations	5	4.1%	18	16.4%	18	21.4%
Endowment	1	0.8%	2	1.8%	1	1.2%
Grants	1	0.8%	2	1.8%	5	6.0%
Dues / memberships	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	4	4.8%
Other	0	0.0%	3	2.7%	5	6.0%
Total	121	100.0%	110	100.0%	84	100.0%

Table 30

Descriptive Data Comparing Sources of Funding by Importance

Type	No.	%	Mean	Variance	SD
College or University	75	23.8%	1.53	0.60	0.78
Underwriting / Sponsorships	60	19.1%	2.35	0.40	0.63
Student Funds	56	17.8%	1.30	0.22	0.46
Donations	41	13.0%	2.32	0.47	0.69
Student Government Assoc.	31	9.9%	1.74	0.66	0.82
Department	27	8.6%	1.93	0.46	0.68
Grants	8	2.5%	2.50	0.57	0.76
Dues / memberships	5	1.6%	2.80	0.20	0.45
Endowment	4	1.3%	2.00	0.67	0.82
Other	8	2.5%	2.63	0.27	0.52
Total	315	100.0%			

Controlling. The final principle of management as outlined by Fayol is controlling.

Relationships with fund providers, influencers, policies, and regulations were all relevant in this

category for college radio stations. Seven questions dealt in particular with these areas.

Survey subjects were asked to describe their relationship with the primary source of

funding identified with the previous questions and outlined in Tables 29 and 30. Much like the

assessments of the broadcast equipment earlier, most responses were favorable with Good, Very

Good, and Excellent accounting for 87.7% of the answers (Table 31). The two highest evaluation

standards (Very Good and Excellent) received 57.1% of the totals, affirming the idea that

relationships were relatively unstrained with primary fund providers on the whole.

Table 31

Relationship with the Primary Fund Provider

Evaluation	No.	%	Measure	Value
Excellent	32	26.5%	Mean	3.67
Very Good	37	30.6%	Variance	1.17
Good	37	30.6%	SD	1.08
Fair	10	8.3%		
Poor	5	4.1%		
Total	121	100.0%		

Influence is a measure of power and may be secured in many fashions. Those with titled

positions may inherently acquire levels of power and control beyond that of regular staff

members. Fayol distinguished between a "manager's official authority deriving from office and

personal authority, compounded of intelligence, experience, moral worth, ability to lead, past

service, etc." (p. 21). Additionally, groups or individuals in charge of financial matters and

budgets often have power based on position. In the case of college radio, audiences, alumni, and

the college or university administration may all overtly or covertly have influence on the affairs

of the radio station. So too, could business owners providing underwriting or the community as a

whole. Simply by virtue of their position as FCC license holders, higher education institutions

could exert influence if desired. This area was explored with survey question number 31, asking

subjects to rank the three strongest sources of influence. As exhibited in Tables 32 and 33, 121

subjects responded with 348 options selected.

Results indicated that control largely remained within the confines of the radio stations.

Student Management Teams again scored high among subjects, gaining the most responses in the

primary and secondary categories and narrowly missing on leading in all three. FAMs garnered

significant recognition as well, placing second in the primary and secondary categories and tying

for first as a tertiary influence. Student Managers placed second in categories one and two.

Overall, Student Management Teams outpaced all other sources of influence, followed by FAMs

and Student Managers.

By placement alone, the three pacesetters secured 88.5% of the primary votes, 69.3% of

the secondary mentions, and 39.2% of the tertiary. Overall totals were 66.4%. These were

remarkable numbers and emphasized the degree of influence maintained by the students and

FAM. College/University Administration, the Student Population, and Community Members all

averaged less than 10% of the responses.

Table 32

Sources of Influence, by Strength

Type	Primary No.	%	Secondary No.	%	Tertiary No.	%
Student Management Team	47	38.9%	38	32.5%	17	15.5%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	43	35.5%	22	18.8%	18	16.4%
Student Manager	17	14.1%	21	18.0%	8	7.3%
College / University Administration	5	4.1%	11	9.4%	16	14.6%
Department Chairperson	3	2.5%	1	0.9%	5	4.6%
Student Population	3	2.5%	11	9.4%	18	16.4%
Community Members	2	1.7%	3	2.6%	17	15.5%
Student Government Assoc.	1	0.8%	5	4.3%	3	2.7%
Alumni	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	5	4.6%
Other	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	3	2.7%
Total	121	100.0%	117	100.0%	110	100.0%

Table 33

Descriptive Data Comparing Sources of Influence, by Strength

Type	No.	%	Mean	Variance	SD
Student Management Team	102	29.3%	1.71	0.55	0.74
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	83	23.9%	1.70	0.65	0.81
Student Manager	46	13.2%	1.80	0.52	0.72
College / University Administration	32	9.2%	2.34	0.56	0.75
Student Population	32	9.2%	2.47	0.45	0.67
Community Members	22	6.3%	2.68	0.42	0.65
Department Chairperson	9	2.6%	2.22	0.94	0.97
Student Government Association	9	2.6%	2.22	0.44	0.67
Alumni	7	2.0%	2.71	0.24	0.49
Other	6	1.7%	2.50	0.30	0.55
Total	348	100.0%			

Influence and control were also evaluated in relationship to internal station policies. Student manuals outlining policies and expectations for staff were recognized at 91.7% of the stations surveyed. Of these, 81.1% required students to sign an agreement stating they would adhere to the policies prescribed in the station manual. Controlling behavior is an important part of management and this led to the area of determining who was responsible for disciplining staff that violated station policies.

Data regarding this matter could be interpreted two ways. In evaluating data at face value, primary responsibility fell to the FAM first, with the Student Management Team following in the second position, and the Student Manager in third, credited about half as often as the FAM. While this indicates the FAM is the primary choice overall, Table 34 shows students as a whole (team and manager) maintained responsibility for discipline over half of the time (54.6%) with the FAM at the lower rate of 40.5%.

Table 34

Primary Responsibility for Disciplining Staff for Policy Violations

Group or Individual	No.	%	Measure	Value
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	49	40.5%	Mean	2.87
Student Management Team	41	33.9%	Variance	0.80
Student Manager	25	20.7%	SD	0.89
Department Chairperson	1	0.8%		
Other	5	4.1%		
Total	121	100.0%		

With the Federal Communications Commission overseeing broadcasting and providing a vast array of regulations by which all stations, including NCE's, are subject, control areas of compliance and license renewal were also pursued. In these situations, the data provided clear-cut results. FAMs were responsible for ensuring compliance with FCC rules and regulations (Table 35) at two-thirds of the surveyed stations (67.8%) and were charged with renewing station licenses 70.3% of the time. While it could be argued that all on-air announcers have some degree of culpability with the FCC, Student Managers held primary responsibility for ensuring compliance at 21.5% of the campus stations. Aside from FAM, others responsible for license renewals varied considerably, with no groups or individuals gathering even 10% of the mentions. In addition to those specifically listed in Table 35, legal staff were also specified four times in the "Other" category. Table 36 illustrates the associated descriptive data.

Table 35

Primary Responsibility for Ensuring FCC Compliance and Renewing the Station License

	Compliance		Renewal	
Group or Individual	No.	%	No.	%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	82	67.8%	85	70.3%
Student Manager	26	21.5%	11	9.1%
Engineer	6	5.0%	7	5.8%
Department Chairperson	2	1.7%	3	2.5%
Other	5	4.1%	15	12.4%
Total	121	100.0%	121	100.0%

Table 36

Descriptive Data for Ensuring FCC Compliance and Renewing License

Issue	Mean	Variance	SD
Compliance	3.21	0.45	0.67
Renewal	3.23	0.70	0.83

Assessment of Hypotheses

RQ: How are student-led college radio broadcast stations managed today in regard to such issues as staffing, programming, funding, and dealing with internal and external influences?

This question served as the foundation for the study, materializing from a recognition that technological changes and cultural shifts affect all forms of media. The uniqueness of a non-commercial educational radio station environment led primarily by students who likely have had little practical management training or experience made the subject particularly suitable for

study. Likewise, the relative lack of data pertaining to this area and the potential usefulness of the information for those involved in advisory or management capacities could not be overlooked.

First Hypothesis. *H1: Student-led college radio broadcast stations employ paid Student Managers.*

The first hypothesis was based on the researcher's personal experiences as an undergraduate at a student-led college radio station and later a faculty advisor at the same, as well as a suspicion that cultural changes such as escalating costs of tuition and lowering of grant monies may have resulted in campus radio stations being forced to pay student leaders to ensure participation and consistent leadership. However, data indicated that less than half of the positions held by students were compensated with the lone exception of the Station Manager position. Even then, however, only a little more than half (58.5%) received some form of compensation, with hourly wages (37.7%) and semester stipends (35.2%) the most common methods of payment. This suggests that H1 was only partially supported with over 40% of the Student Managers operating as volunteer leaders.

Extrapolating further, the Student Management Teams–which could consist of any combination of Director level positions–were also lacking compensation at over half of the radio stations surveyed. Program Director (47.2%) and Music Director (42.2%) trailed the Station Manager with no other positions compensated at even one-third of the student-led stations. This indicates that Student Managers and directors are most often volunteers who participate without the benefit of payment or college credit. Reasons for participating at a student-led college radio station are likely diverse with some hoping to acquire and hone skills necessary to launch broadcast careers and others just as likely to do so for reasons quite disparate, whether for simply the joy of music, to be a part of a fun organization, to experience something new, or any other

98

reason. On the whole, compensation would not appear to be a primary factor for securing a managers or directors position, though it must be acknowledged it could be a factor at certain institutions that do provide methods of reward.

Second Hypothesis. *H2: Programming decisions are made by Student Management Teams.*

Programming decisions at campus radio stations involve such issues as formatting, musical style, and air-shift designations, all constrained by the overriding goals of the organization. With music the primary format of over 90% of the radio stations, followed by news/talk and sports, determining what styles of music are permissible falls under the guidelines of the programming element. This hypothesis was largely supported by the data, with Student Management Teams directing the choice of programming elements at over half of the stations surveyed (54.8%), and with a better than 4 to 1 ratio in comparison to Student Managers and more than 5 to 1 when contrasted with FAMs.

Likewise, Student Management Teams (44.8%) surpassed FAMs (34.4%) by more than 10% in determining operating goals for the station, far outdistancing Student Managers, who spearheaded such efforts individually only 13.6% of the time. In addition Student Management Teams were involved in the training process for announcers desiring air-shifts at nearly half of the stations surveyed (47.9%), more than doubling FAMs and Student Managers alone. This combination of data indicates again that the team concept of management is evident in the early planning stages of the process and proceeds during actual implementation.

While important to differentiate the teams from the individual, it is also relevant to consider that Student Managers are likely members of the Student Management Teams and therefore have some degree of influence in each of these areas beyond just the separate totals.

Whereas the influence of the FAM would not be included, the Student Manager data could be combined with the Student Management teams to get an even greater understanding of overall influence and the separation in powers and responsibilities between students and FAMs. In doing so, impact on station programming would tip more heavily in favor of students with a cumulative figure of more than two-thirds (68.6%). Operating goals would increase to over half (58.4%) and training responsibilities would elevate to nearly two-thirds (66.0%). As illustrated in Table 37, this cumulative data provides further support for the second hypothesis.

Table 37

Information Combining Student Manager and Student Management Teams Data Relating to Operating Goals, Airplay Determinations, and Announcer Training

	Goals		Airplay		Training	
Group of Individual	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Student Management Team and Student Manager	73	58.4%	85	68.6%	128	66.0%
Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)	43	34.4%	12	9.7%	39	20.1%
Department Chairperson	3	2.4%	1	0.8%	3	1.6%
Other	6	4.8%	26	21.0%	24	12.4%
Total	125	100.0%	124	100.1%	194	100.1%

Third Hypothesis. *H3: Student-led college radio broadcast stations are primarily funded by student government organizations.*

Nearly 60% of the operating budgets for student-led campus broadcast stations were split almost evenly between those existing with $10,000 to $25,000 in funding and those between $25,001 and $50,000. The additional 40% was nearly evenly divided between those existing on less than $10,000 and those with budgets exceeding $50,000. This revealed how significantly budgets varied between organizations lumped under the same NCE heading by the FCC. While budgets varied dramatically, sources of funding were primarily derived from two areas. As the

license holders for 87.3% of the campus radio stations, colleges or universities provided primary funding for nearly 40%. Student Funds were the primary source of funding for nearly one-third of the stations (32.2%) and Student Government Associations for only 12.4%. When considering evaluations of first, second, and third sources of income, Student Government Associations dropped to fifth overall at just under 10%. College or universities were cited most frequently, nearly securing one-fourth of the total mentions. Underwriting and Sponsorships increased in importance as secondary and tertiary sources of funding, securing the second most mentions overall.

The issue of primary funding is key in this area, however. The depth of funding was not further explored in this study, leaving it uncertain as to whether primary funding meant 100%, 50%, 34%, or even less in situations where stations received multiple levels of income. This makes it most important to consider the number one ranking position, held definitively by the colleges or universities themselves. As the FCC license holders, this would seem a reasonable conclusion, though with these being student-led stations the possibility of student funding or Student Government Associations providing operating funds also seemed likely. This hypothesis was not clearly supported, however.

Fourth Hypothesis. *H4: Alternative music is the primary format of student-led college radio broadcast stations.*

College radio has long been considered a bastion for Alternative and independent (Indie) music. While Arbitron lists over sixty formats in its current station format guides, it was suspected that college stations even today were most likely to adhere to traditions of Alternative or Freeform musical styles. Not surprisingly, Alternative music paved the way as the primary

musical style choice on over half of the stations (55.6%) and secured nearly a third of the total mentions as a first, second, or third selection.

Freeform and Rock music also fared well on many college stations. Freeform–an anything goes type of style–secured nearly one-fifth of the responses as the primary musical style and almost the same level of total responses. Rock music was the third choice for primary format, but edged Freeform for the second most frequently mentioned musical style when first, second, and third choices were combined. Since Rock music mixes well with Alternative and Freeform, this should come as no surprise either.

Of interest is the fact that Urban music, which is often included to some degree in the mixes of Pop/CHR and Rock stations, also did well overall at college stations. While the primary format on only 2.4% of the stations, Urban increased substantially as a second or third music choice, suggesting that it is included in the mix at college stations much as it is at commercial counterparts. It could be, however, that the Urban artists and songs played on college stations again differ from those that have achieved commercial success on mainstream stations. This would coincide with college radio's tendency toward including independent or smaller-label artists in their playlists.

Fifth Hypothesis. *H5: The main challenge facing student-led college radio broadcast stations is a lack of funding.*

There is little doubt that NCE stations face plentiful challenges in today's economy and culture. Numerous individuals have expressed concerns over decisions from high profile colleges and universities to exchange terrestrial signals for Internet-only broadcast facilities. Campus stations have received significant fines from the FCC for a variety of regulatory failures. Free-speech issues have made the news in various forms of campus media as students fight back

102

against what they consider censorship from authority figures and administrators. The list of possible issues and relevant topics could become quite extensive.

It is likely, however, that most managers desire greater budgets with which to work. Larger dollar amounts offer opportunities for promotion, technical improvements, facility upgrades and similar issues that support the operating goals of the organization. Human nature may also be a factor (at least in western cultures) where being satisfied with what one has and not striving for more can be seen as a detriment. This issue of insufficient funding was the basis for hypothesis five, the likely leading candidate for a main challenge facing the student-led stations.

Yet, while this issue was supported to some degree, it was not a clear-cut selection as the primary challenge. While lack of funding edged out lack of student support/interest by nearly 5% as the primary challenge, it was less frequently mentioned as a secondary or tertiary issue and was edged out slightly overall (18.8%) by lack of student support/interest (19.1%). Likewise, lack of administrative support took third place in the rankings as both a primary issue and in the overall totals. Lack of student support, administrative support, and community support were the second, third, and fourth most frequent primary challenges mentioned and when combined, amounted to over 40% of the total responses (43.2%). This indicates a substantial frustration level for student-led campus broadcast stations. These three areas should constitute large portions of a campus station's audience and yet these replies suggested that stations may feel underappreciated and disconnected.

Sixth Hypothesis. *H6: The Student Manager has the greatest influence on student-led college radio broadcast stations.*

103

Of all of the hypotheses, the sixth could be considered the most relevant to this study. Management practices formed the core of the survey instrument and review and determining who has the most influence on a student-led college or university radio station reveals a great deal about the principle roles assigned by Fayol in his prescient writings on the topic. This hypothesis could only be considered when taken as a whole, with elements from each role factoring into consideration. Primary responsibilities for day to day operations rested with Student Management Teams. Such responsibilities as operating goals, determining what is played on the station, maintaining operations during down times, and training announcers for air-shifts were team management functions first, with FAMs also outranking Student Managers in these areas. Issues of discipline and regulatory compliance along with problem-solving in regard to matters involving equipment or between staff members remained primarily with FAMs. Student Managers generally ranked behind both Student Management Teams and FAMs in most categories indicating influence.

Additionally, in response to a direct question about levels of influence, Student Management Teams ranked highest with 38.9% of the responses, followed closely by FAMs with 35.5% and Student Managers lagging at 14.1%. Overall assessments including primary, secondary, and tertiary rankings also favored the same rank order. Taken as a whole, the data suggests a close managerial relationship between Student Management Teams and FAMs, with Student Managers exerting less individual leadership while remaining an integral part of the team concept. The division of responsibilities is interesting in that planning and operational functions remained largely the focus of the Student Management Teams with the disciplinary roles typically associated with more mature authority figures and issues requiring more expertise (such as equipment and FCC regulations) remained with FAMs. These roles appear

complementary and synergistic, allowing students to lead appropriately where most capable and tapping into the strengths of more seasoned FAMs who can step in where needed and ensure the license is protected as student populations change with each passing semester.

The hypothesis was, therefore, not supported. The data downplayed the individual importance of the Student Manager while indicating a greater dependence on the team concept of management with the cooperation of willing and capable FAMs.

Summary

From these results, it is evident that support for the six hypotheses was mixed. Fayol's five elements of management provided a solid framework from which to evaluate various areas associated with student-run college radio broadcast stations. College radio is complex and while the responses to the questionnaire provided substantial quantitative data for review, the comments to the open-ended question also provided supplemental information that revealed opinions, experiences, and passion. This qualitative element fit most appropriately in the discussion section in the following chapter. Much like freeform music radio where announcers are given free rein to play whatever they want on their shows, survey respondents were permitted to add any additional comments they wanted about any aspect of college radio. On the whole, the statements remained relevant to the topic of the study and provided additional flavor to better understand the state of college radio at this stage in its storied history.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Review

College radio has a long-standing history in the United States. Colleges and universities, and individuals associated with the same, were involved in the early stages of radio broadcast development. Students have played significant roles in the development of the medium. College radio and NCE stations in general have experienced difficult periods in which their very existence was threatened. New challenges are evident today as technological advances and escalating costs associated with terrestrial broadcasting cause some license-holders to question the validity of retaining a traditional broadcast license. Cultural shifts and societal changes affect every medium. While commercial radio is the subject of constant review, college radio is much less frequently put under a microscope. Research on particular areas such as management practices is virtually non-existent. This study determined to hone in on this particular area.

The study was national in scope, seeking responses from leadership at student-led college radio stations around the United States. Respondents were able to share information pertinent to five levels of management as originally presented by French theorist Henri Fayol, basic building blocks from which modern management theory has developed. Research subjects were able to pontificate about any aspect of college radio via an open-ended question, and many passionately shared points of view and opinion that will be presented in detail in the pages to follow. The study secured a wealth of information about student-led stations in the U.S. today and serves as a launching point for further research.

Findings

The following is a brief summary of the findings of this research project, derived from the overriding research question and associated hypotheses.

RQ: How are student-led college radio broadcast stations managed today in regard to such issues as staffing, programming, funding, and dealing with internal and external influences?

H1: Student-led college radio broadcast stations employ paid student managers.

The first hypothesis was only partially supported. The Station Manager position was the only role compensated more than half of the time (58.5%), but students were in that capacity 70.7% of the time. This was less frequent than six other titled positions held by students, suggesting that nearly 30% of the time colleges or universities hired a professional manager or utilized a volunteer (less likely) in that role.

H2: Programming decisions are made by student management teams.

The second hypothesis was largely supported by the data. Student Management Teams directed programming elements at over half of the stations surveyed (54.8%) and outpaced Student Managers by a 4 to 1 ratio and FAMs by 5 to 1. Teams outpaced FAMs by over 10% in determining station operating goals and surpassed Student Managers by more than 3 to 1. Student Management Teams also provided over three-fourths of the training for new announcers. Taken cumulatively, this data suggests that Student Management Teams are heavily involved in these areas, essentials falling under the Planning and Organizing elements proposed by Fayol.

H3: Student-led college radio broadcast stations are primarily funded by student government organizations.

107

The third hypothesis was not supported by the data. Student Government Associations accounted for only 12.4% of the primary funding for student-led college radio stations and was the fifth source cited overall (when ranking the top three) with less than 10% of the total responses. The license holders for the majority of the stations (87.3%), the colleges or universities, also provided the most funding, recognized as the primary source by nearly 40% of the respondents and ranking first overall as well with nearly one-fourth (23.8%) of the total mentions. Student funds achieved the second most tallies as the primary source with 32.2% of the responses, but dropped to third overall (behind Underwriting / Sponsorships) in total mentions. The data (under Fayol's Coordinating principle of management) clearly did not support this hypothesis. However, the information secured was in agreement with previous studies addressed in the literature review which recognized the funding often provided by the license-holders (Brant, 1981; Sauls 1995, 1998a; Wilson & Dudt, 2001).

H4: Alternative music is the primary format of student-led college radio broadcast stations.

The fourth hypothesis was clearly supported by the data. Alternative music received over half of the responses (55.6%) as the primary format for the stations surveyed with Freeform a distant second at 19.4%. In addition, Alternative totaled nearly a third of the overall selections, outpacing Rock music by over 12%. This suggested that the common view of college radio programming in regard to music remains accurate, even as definitions for what constitutes Alternative and Independent (Indie) music in an era where major labels promote both forms (sometimes under the radar through subsidiaries) are subject to interpretation. Nonetheless, it is clear that Alternative music remains the primary selection of the majority of student-led college radio stations in the U.S. today, conforming with previous studies addressed in the literature

review (Baker, 2010; Desztich & McClung, 2007; McClung et al., 2003; Rubin, 2011; Sauls, 1995; Waits, 2007; Wall, 2007; Wallace, 2008).

H5: The main challenge facing student-led college radio broadcast stations is a lack of funding.

The fifth hypothesis was only partially supported. Lack of funding exceeded lack of student support/interest by almost 5% (28.5% to 23.6%) as the primary challenge acknowledged by respondents, but in overall mentions was edged out 19.1% to 18.8%. Furthermore, lack of administrative backing secured the third most frequent mentions as a primary issue, followed closely by lack of student support. When combined, the lack of support issues amounted to 43.2% of the total responses, far exceeding the lack of funding, which was the only financial issue mentioned. This, therefore, suggested that lack of funds was certainly a primary concern for many stations, but the lack of support from various constituencies may overall have been a bigger issue. Nonetheless, the funding concern was significant and affirmed previous references pertaining to college radio addressed in the literature review (Leidman, 1985; Leidman & Lamberski, 1986b; Sauls, 1998a, Wilson & Dudt, 2001).

H6: The student manager has the greatest influence on student-led college radio broadcast stations.

The final hypothesis, which could be considered the most significant in terms of management practice, was not supported by the data. Instead, what became evident is that Student Management Teams–of which the Student Manager is almost certainly a member–have substantial influence on the operation of student-led college radio stations. Daily operations time and again were proven to be led primarily by Student Management Teams, with FAMs ranked ahead of Student Managers. As might have been expected, FAMs scored highest in regard to

109

issues of discipline, regulatory compliance and problem-solving as related to equipment and technical issues. The Student Manager consistently ranked lower than Student Management Teams and FAMs in the categories indicating overall influence. One question specifically asked for a ranking of influence and this also supported the cumulative data, with Student Management Teams outpacing FAMS 38.9% to 35.5% and Student Managers trailing markedly at only 14.1%. This indicated a symbiotic relationship between Student Management Teams and FAMs with both taking the lead in particular areas.

It is important to note that this division of influence contrasts to some degree with Fayol's general principles of management. Fayol asserted that unity of command dictated that employees "receive orders from one superior only" (p. 24), and that unity of direction necessitated "one head and one plan for a group of activities having the same objective" (p. 25). Fayol believed that having more than one superior caused uneasiness within an organization and would eventually lead to dual command ending on its own or the organization atrophying. What is not clear under the Student Management Team approach is whether decisions are made collectively and then presented by the Station Manager or shared as a unified group. Further, the relationship between the FAM and the staff was not fully explored either, leaving this area open to additional review.

Discussion

This study did more than just address management practices, although that was the primary focus. It also attempted to capture the essence of the culture of student-led college broadcast radio in this particular era. Additional summative information is therefore required to secure a more complete understanding of the data accumulated during the process of investigation.

Most of the stations included in the survey results have been in existence for some time, with nearly 90% established from 1950 to 1999, and over a third in the 1970s alone. Nearly the same percentage is owned by colleges / universities, holders of the NCE licenses awarded by the FCC. Again, about 90% play primarily music, with secondary formats of news / talk and sports in that order. Alternative music (including Indie) is most prominently featured on the stations, followed by Freeform (anything goes) and Rock, with Urban music included in many of the mixes. Most stations operate even during academic breaks gathering assistance from various sources, including students, community members, and automation systems. Station broadcast equipment is generally considered Good to Excellent. Communication with staff members occurs regularly (most often weekly) through various sources (primarily email), and about three-fourths of the stations maintain their own website. Scrutiny of the websites, however, reveals that many are woefully outdated and difficult to navigate, though some are clearly attended to consistently. Over three-fourths of the FM college radio stations included in this study are limited in geographic service area, designated as Class A stations by the FCC with a maximum effective radiated power (ERP) of 6.0kW.

Student staff hold most of the positions at student-led college radio broadcast stations, but less than half of the stations offer compensation, with the exception of the Station Manager role which is held by a student 70.7% of the time and paid 58.5%. Pay is most often split nearly equally between hourly wages and semester stipends. Staff size is generally larger (exceeding 41) with most considered active members of the organization. Budgets vary widely with most funding provided by the colleges/universities, followed by Student Funds. Relationships with the primary fund providers are generally ranked Good to Excellent.

Nonetheless, challenges are plentiful. Twenty matters were identified by at least one respondent when asked to rank the three most significant issues facing their stations. Lack of sufficient funding and lack of support/interest ranked at the top overall. To secure additional thoughts, research subjects were provided an opportunity to expound upon any area they desired in regard to college radio via an open-ended question that concluded the survey. The comments that follow are all taken from their responses to that final question. In regard to funding, one respondent expressed an immediate crisis situation in which their campus station was "currently being de-funded by certain members of the student government. We are fighting against this at present, but it is too early to tell how it will shake out in the end. There are one or two persons who for philosophical reasons are seeking to kill employing the 'death by 1000 cuts' strategy" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). The issue of lack of support was acknowledged at the student level first, followed by administration and also the community. This was elaborated on by several of the respondents, including one who stated, "It appears the station is as good as the student management team. When enthusiasm and interest is lacking among the student management team...the station operation suffers. As faculty advisor, my biggest issues center around student interest" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). Another stated, "There is a struggle to manage if the students are not fully dedicated and the university student body does not show great effort to listen or get involved with the radio station" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). Another sounded almost forlorn, stating, "We are noticing a trend, students have less interest in DJing on air and more interest in DJing at dances. It has been difficult to get students to participate and fill up our air time, but we assume times are just changing" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013).

Others noted specifically that the lack of support is displayed in several ways. One respondent indicated, "Our station was better supported until a decision to drop the major associated with it. Without that curricular support, the administration has no interest in keeping the station as a club or community operation" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). Another proposed that institutions fail to acknowledge the benefits a good college station can offer, stating, "These stations serve important educational functions and important roles for the campus culture. Over the years, most of our administrators have demonstrated little understanding of the role of student media" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). Another suggested the station is virtually forgotten about until problems arise:

> I wish that universities would realize the potential community-wide impact a radio station can have. Many times it feels as if administration has completely forgot [*sic*] about the radio station. Administration doesn't want to deal with the radio station, so they pretty much ignore it until there is a problem. Administration takes a hands-off approach to making decisions, unless the student management team makes a decision they don't like, and then they don't support the students. It makes for a terrible management model. Overall, the student management team makes good decisions, but would like more support and guidance from administration. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

One respondent mentioned the difficulty of balancing expectations and reality at a student-led station:

> The balance between the station being an educational tool and the expectation that it is a professional station is difficult to maintain. University administration, rightfully, does not want the image of the University to be damaged due to the on-air personalities at the

station. However, in order to use the station as a learning tool for students, mistakes will

be made. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

The possibility of the station being sold was mentioned by only 3.3% of respondents, a

surprising figure considering the number of institutions that have divested terrestrial properties

for Internet-only stations in recent years. However, one suggested it is, "sometimes hard to

justify to the administration and student government the value of a terrestrial signal, especially as

relicensing approaches" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013).

From a management standpoint, a complementary approach was recognized, with Student

Management Teams taking primary responsibility for day to day goal-setting and operational

functions. These teams often included a Student Manager, a position that by itself was less likely

to wield significant influence. FAMs were primarily responsible for technical, disciplinary, and

regulatory issues, areas seemingly more conducive to experienced and knowledgeable authority

figures. It should be acknowledged, however, that methods of organization and management

varied drastically among many of the stations and that this study does not suggest in any way a

one-size-fits-all approach to successful student-led media. Instead, what became evident is that

stations are widely disparate, with everything from staff size, budgets, equipment, and

approaches to management as unique as the stations themselves. Although generalities can be

made, they must be approached with caution and interpreted carefully.

Comments from one subject reveal just how different student-led college broadcast

stations can be:

WERS is the highest-rated student-run radio station in the U.S. (according to Arbitron) as

well as #1 in the Princeton Review. Because Emerson College is the preeminent

communications college in the country, our mission is to train future leaders of the

114

industry as well as to provide a viable, competitive on-air product in the #10 radio market in America. At present, the college subsidizes half of our $1 million dollar annual budget with the remainder coming from a combination of corporate underwriting and membership. Our 7 person professional staff has a combined 150 years in the radio industry and we pay 12 student managers a combined $90k per year. The point here is that this is not a typical college station and student run radio can be competitive. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

Several respondents had comments that shed additional light on the student-led model. One stated, "It should be noted, that the Faculty Advisor oversees the day to day operations, but the manager and staff run the radio station" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013). Another voiced support for student-led stations, suggesting, "True student led stations are rare but a true gem. They must be protected and not become NPR-ized" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013).

Others shared concerns about student-led media and about what the future may hold at the institutional level:

> I've overseen radio at four colleges and the student-led model, where the department faculty let the students run the show, doesn't work as well as the faculty-led model. The key is the faculty member has to truly know radio and have a radio background. Too many colleges are letting faculty with no background in radio oversee stations! Often radio is thought of as a game anyone can play instead of a viable professional outreach tool of the university. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

Such concerns reveal the depth of passion about college radio held by the respondents, another of whom suggested that college stations provide many professional benefits:

Student-run media are an extremely important and rewarding experience that is rapidly

disappearing. They provide more "real-world" experience than most other extracurricular

opportunities and can be used to benefit a wide range of interests and backgrounds. The

gradual demise of student media across the country and the lack of recognition of its

importance will be something that hurts universities across the nation, and most

importantly will take away important opportunities from students to learn how to operate

as part of an organization with real consequences, build workplace skills, and gain the

leadership skills needed to excel in the future. (Anonymous, personal communication,

April 3, 2013)

General comments from the respondents in regard to student-led college radio stations

also provide an important synopsis of the concerns, discrepancies, and beliefs in and about

college radio. These were coded and divided into 13 categories that are illustrated in Table 38.

The comments taken as a whole support the information provided earlier, exemplifying the

importance some place on the educational and training aspects available, the challenges

associated with lack of interest and support, and different viewpoints on best methods of

managing college radio stations.

Table 38

Tabulation of Respondent Statements about College Radio Stations

Comments	No.	%
College Radio is imperative for providing hands-on experience.	10	15.4%
Radio is underappreciated by colleges / universities.	8	12.3%
College Radio is the best.	7	10.8%
It is difficult if students are not fully dedicated.	4	6.2%
Student-led is the best way to go.	4	6.2%
College Radio is a crucial part of education.	4	6.2%
College Radio is an important cultural institution.	3	4.6%
College stations are an invaluable PR tool for universities.	3	4.6%
There are suggestions to switch to Internet-only.	3	4.6%
Free format is the best.	2	3.1%
Student-led does not work as well as faculty-led.	2	3.1%
I have witnessed students lose their stations.	2	3.1%
Other	13	20.0%
Total	65	100.0%

Additionally, several respondents emphasized that college radio offers educational and professional benefits for students that make it worth continued investment. One leader pointed to the success their campus station has had in preparing individuals for successful broadcast careers:

Our station is seen as a training lab for broadcasters NOT a playground or sandbox in which students entertain themselves. We have high standards in music, training, on air performance, reporting, and sports coverage. Our alumni are or have been employed at MTV, NBC New York, Discovery Channel, National Geographic Channel, ESPN, and countless radio, broadcast TV, and cable outlets across the country. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

Likewise, another respondent has witnessed students using their campus radio experience to launch fruitful careers, while also noting decisions that have directly affected student-led stations:

> In general, I have found student-led college radio station to be the best source of education and experience for those going into media. We have had numerous alumni obtain positions straight out of college as a result. I've also witnessed the worst that can happen, that is to say the students being stripped of their station, as in the case of WFUV-FM of Fordham University. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

Representing the views of others, one subject succinctly described the educational and professional aspects that college stations can provide:

> When run and operated with a modicum of professionalism, college radio is a valuable resource of alternative programming within the community for which the station is licensed to operate. An atmosphere of proficiency allows students to hone essential skills in communication, collaboration, and critical thinking, and also provides a creative outlet for talented people. Vital expertise in public speaking, management, and writing is also nurtured. Whether pursuing a career in broadcasting or not, these are essential skills necessary for success in any 21st century workplace. (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013)

Another noted college radio stations provide benefits that also assist those not interested in pursuing broadcast careers:

> We realize that the vast majority of our students will not go into Radio Broadcasting. However, the skills that they learn in the daily operation of this enterprise is coordinate to taking classes in management, group theory and dynamics, public speaking, marketing

and many others. We consider the station to be a working laboratory to put into practice

the many skills needed to run an organization 24/7/365. (Anonymous, personal

communication, April 3, 2013)

One respondent succinctly described the potential benefits college radio continues to offer,

stating, "Student-run stations can be quite awesome and wonderful learning grounds for students.

Radio remains relevant to young people and college radio is a great place for students to connect

with their peers" (Anonymous, personal communication, April 3, 2013).

Implications

This project affords a starting point from which other studies could easily follow. While

focusing on management practices, it also provides a benchmark or snapshot of a moment in

time as it pertains to student-led college radio broadcast stations. This portion of the media

landscape represents just a fraction of the NCE stations associated with colleges or universities.

Many campus radio stations have taken different approaches to management, affiliating with

NPR or other national organizations that provide programming, operating with entirely

professional staffs, limiting student involvement, or using new technologies to move away from

broadcast radio into netcasting or cable systems.

As it pertains to student-led campus stations, the study suggests management

relationships with specific roles attended to by students and FAMs and associated personnel. It

suggests management practices that are pertinent for evaluation and review. The data indicates

there are vast discrepancies in size and scope among stations. Some of the disparity is due to the

operational conditions imposed by the FCC that impact signal strength. However, other

substantial differences exist between stations in terms of audience or staff size, operating

budgets, institutional support, management principles, and organizational goals and priorities.

The data from this study is useful for comparative purposes, allowing stations to evaluate what they are doing and what they hope to accomplish in comparison with other stations operating under a student management model in communities around the nation.

College radio stations still have value. They still have purpose, though some have more clearly defined goals and motivations than others. Campus stations vary widely in approach yet can be important for career development, community involvement, public relations efforts, breaking and establishing new artists, reaching out to alumni, exercising free speech and impacting culture. College radio stations all operate under the same FCC regulations but in many respects chart their own courses based on the interest, enthusiasm, and effort of the members and leadership. It is hopeful that this information will be useful for stations seeking to evaluate and assess their positions in comparison to similar entities.

Anyone involved in or studying radio broadcasting at this point in the medium's evolution is aware of the multiple challenges the genre faces. Corporate entities in the commercial arena have downsized considerably across the country in recent years, with many veteran professional broadcasters forced to seek new employment opportunities elsewhere, often outside of the broadcast industry. Newer technologies continue to alter consumer media and entertainment preferences, challenging broadcasters at any level to find ways of establishing and maintaining relevancy with potential audiences.

These issues are multiplied at the college radio level. With fewer professional jobs available in the industry and more experienced broadcasters seeking positions after having been released due to downsizing, graduates hoping for radio careers often find it difficult securing opportunities. Automation equipment has become standard across the United States and also impacts opportunities, negating the need for broadcast entities to fill all shifts with live

announcers. Less desirable time slots such as late evenings or overnights were once the staple of inexperienced announcers with stations using the less audience-critical times on-air to develop young talent. This was a win-win situation that has become rare in today's radio broadcast environment.

The issues affecting college radio are far beyond those that impact after-graduation opportunities. There are many concerns that are particular to college stations. Mainstream counterparts do not have to replace large numbers of staff every year, but college stations lose personnel due to graduation annually and need to consistently develop and promote replacements. This is particularly important for student-led college stations where skill levels, personal characteristics and leadership potential may vary considerably from year to year.

College stations also face the challenge of an audience base in near-constant flux. Whereas mainstream stations largely seek to attract and maintain an audience over time, the nature of a college or university campus is such that new students enter every year and others leave to graduation. While a portion of a college station's audience should remain relatively constant (such as the community at large), the student population continually ebbs and flows. Even as the student-staff changes and likely affects the output of the station to some degree, campus stations are faced with the challenge of becoming known (and relevant) to new students who may become audience members or even staff at some point during the process of their education.

With colleges and universities holding the FCC licenses at over 87% of the student-led stations in this study, maintaining institutional support is critically important. Many colleges and universities have sold-off terrestrial signals in recent years, moving to Internet-only situations or eliminating broadcast opportunities on campus altogether. This remains an ongoing issue for

those involved in college radio at various levels. Student-led stations may be at particular risk. Institutions are concerned with protecting their image and brand and might exhibit less tolerance for mistakes or unprofessionalism when dealing with student leaders as opposed to professional managers who could be subject to more severe disciplinary actions (including termination).

Budget issues affect stations at any level and college stations are particularly vulnerable. Outside of the manager position, less than half of the management team at student-led college stations in this study received compensation of any kind. This may cause some members to seek paid employment positions elsewhere, limiting their availability for campus station events and activities. Additionally, most stations were dependent on other entities for the bulk of their budget. Any significant reductions in annual allocations would be difficult for most college stations to overcome. With a few exceptions, college radio stations generally cannot command underwriting dollars at a level anywhere near the potential commercial advertising sales for mainstream stations who have the benefit of consistency, professional employees (including sales staff), and in the case of music stations, more popular artists and songs. This leaves college radio stations more susceptible to negative consequences from budget variances.

What all of this also suggests is the importance of management. Fayol theorized that all organizations require management (Crainer, 2003; Fayol, 1949; P. J. Gordon, 2003). In a practical situation, he himself was able to take a company on the verge of bankruptcy and use his administrative principles to turn it into a prosperous entity employing thousands of workers (Crainer, 2003; Wren et al., 2002). As the issues facing radio broadcasters in general and college radio stations in particular continue to mount, so too, does the importance of quality management. Fayol's five major functions of management are not the only method by which college radio stations can be led or evaluated, yet they provide a template that could be useful for

any leader seeking to navigate through a changing time and environment. Forecasting and planning shows due diligence in addressing the climate an organization exists in and the methods in which goals can be achieved. Organizing addresses the structure as a whole, combining with the element of coordination to order activities and groups appropriately toward station goals. Fayol's remaining principles of command and control speak to leadership components that can take many forms but are critical for success.

Ultimately, leadership at student-led college radio stations must determine for themselves how best to move forward during challenging times. Some will likely adhere explicitly to established management principles such as those prescribed by Fayol. Others will choose to respond differently. Regardless of the choice or method, college stations will be forced to adapt with the times, responding to cultural, societal, and institutional changes as best they see fit. It will be interesting to evaluate how effectively student-led college radio broadcast stations navigate these changes in the years ahead, whether they can continue to exist, and if so, in what form.

Future Research

The opportunities for future research on student-led college broadcast stations or NCE stations in general are multiple. Any one of the particular areas addressed by the survey instrument in this study or the research in general could be further isolated and closely scrutinized. Challenges affecting college radio stations today would be of particular interest. Studies honing in on this particular area might address funding issues alone or focus on the difficulties many respondents expressed in securing interest and support from various communities. Case studies of some of the larger and more successful stations would likely yield a wealth of information for comparative purposes. Since researchers could define success in

various ways, each could point to different stations ripe for individual study. Those with large budgets could be of interest. Stations with strong operating parameters (signal strength and wide coverage areas) could present valuable information. Likewise, those with longevity or high levels of community involvement could yield relevant information. Smaller stations that break new artists or specialize in a unique format or approach could produce data helpful for stations in similar situations.

Likewise, institutional viewpoints pertaining to stations could be assessed. Are they training grounds for tomorrow's professionals, public relations entities for the colleges/universities, playgrounds (or jukeboxes) for the students, or something else altogether.? How are college stations viewed today by the institutions that hold the FCC licenses? Are they valued for educational reasons? Considered community or cultural assets? Viewed with disdain by administrations that look down on their programming? These types of issues are ripe for exploration and would provide invaluable information affecting this particular genre of the broadcast spectrum.

Continuing in the vein of management critique, the complexities of the relationships between student management teams, student managers and FAMs could be further explored. Examining the negotiation of decisions, the methods of disclosing information to the entire staff, and the power dynamics at play between individuals serving on the same "team" could generate valuable information. Likewise, the interpersonal relationships between FAMs and student leadership could be closely examined. The results might suggest methods of best practice that would result in open communication, mutual respect, and effective working relationships while also uncovering areas of disconnect that cause conflict or limit the ability of the organization to achieve goals.

College radio stations were instrumental in the early days of radio. They survived during difficult eras when many lacked support and were attacked on several fronts. They blossomed during other times when the FCC moved favorably to provide spectrum space exclusively for educational stations. They have had significant successes, with the breaking of new artists that went on to sell millions of records and achieve fame. They have launched many a career in broadcasting, and while the field has changed and continues to evolve, there is still room for talented and dedicated individuals to make their mark and establish successful careers. The opportunities for future research are bountiful and remain relevant.

References

Aaron, C. (2005). Notes from the underground. *Spin Magazine*, *21*(10), 119-128.

Arbitron. (2012, Spring). *Market survey schedule and population rankings*. Retrieved from

http://www.arbitron.com/downloads/bluebook_sp12.pdf

Archer, M. S. (2000). *Being human: The problem of agency.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge

University Press.

Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA:

Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Baker, A. (2010). Reviewing net-only college radio: A case study of Brooklyn college radio.

Journal of Radio & Audio Media, *17*(1), 109-125. doi:10.1080/19376521003719409

Beach, R. H., & Lindahl, R. A. (2007). The role of planning in the school improvement process.

Educational Planning, *16*(2), 19-43.

Berdayes, V. (2002). Traditional management theory as panoptic discourse: Language and the

constitution of somatic flows. *Culture and Organization*, *8*(1), 35-49.

doi:10.1080/14759550290021172

Berger, A. A. (2000). *Media and communication research methods: An introduction to

qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bloch, L. M. (1980). *The gas pipe networks: A history of college radio 1936-1946*. Cleveland,

OH: Bloch.

Brant, B. (1981). *The college radio handbook*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Tab Books.

Broadcast Education Association. (2012). *BEA - About us*. Retrieved from

http://www.beaweb.org/about_us.htm

Brunsson, K. H. (2008). Some effects of Fayolism. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, *38*(1), 30-47. doi:10.2753/IMO0020-8825380102

Buddenbaum, J. M., & Novak, K. B. (2001). *Applied communication research* (1st ed.). Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Chevalier, R. D. (2008). A brief history of performance improvement. *Performance Improvement*, *47*(6), 5-11. doi:10.1002/pfi.20002

CMJ. (2012). *About CMJ*. Retrieved from http://www.cmj.com/about-us/

Cohen, E., & Jacobs, F. (2007, October). *The bedroom project: How young Americans use, consume, and interact with technology and media*. Retrieved from http://www.thebedroomstudy.com/

College Broadcasters Incorporated. (2012). *About CBI - College Broadcasters, Inc.*. Retrieved from http://askcbi.org/?page_id-20

College Media Association. (2012). *College Media Association - About CMA*. Retrieved from http://www.cma.cloverpad.org/Default.aspx?pageId=1111721

College Radio Day. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.collegeradioday.com/#!about-us

College Radio Day. (n.d.). *College radio day - The album*. Retrieved from http://www.collegeradioday.com/#!__album

College Radio Day. (n.d.). *F.A.Q.* Retrieved from http://www.collegeradioday.com/#!faq

Covington, Jr., W. G. (1997). *Systems theory applied to television station management in the competitive marketplace*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Crainer, S. (2003). One hundred years of management. *Business Strategy Review*, *14*(2), 41-49.

Creative Research Systems. (n.d.). *Sample size calculator*. Retrieved from http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm

Desztich, R., & McClung, S. (2007). Indie to an extent? Why music gets added to college radio playlists. *Journal of Radio Studies*, *14*(2), 196-211.

Downward, P., Finch, J. H., & Ramsay, J. (2002). Critical realism, empirical methods and inference: A critical discussion. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 26*, 481-500.

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Dudt, K. P. (1985). *The identification of operational problems of higher education affiliated cable television stations and recommendations for improvement*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London, England: Pittman.

Federal Communications Commission. (1992). *In the matter of commission policy concerning the noncommercial nature of educational broadcasting*. Retrieved from http://transition.fcc.gov/mb/audio/nature.html

Federal Communications Commission. (2005, November 21). *The ideas that made radio possible*. Retrieved from http://transition.fcc.gov/omd/history/radio/ideas.html

Federal Communications Commission. (2005, November 21). *The power that made radio realistic*. Retrieved from http://transition.fcc.gov/omd/history/radio/power.html

Federal Communications Commission. (2005, November 21). *The quality that made radio popular*. Retrieved from http://transition.fcc.gov/omd/history/radio/quality.html

Federal Communications Commission. (n.d.). *AM radio*. Retrieved from http://www.fcc.gov/topic/am-radio

Federal Communications Commission. (n.d.). *FM broadcast station classes and service contours*. Retrieved from http://www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/fm-broadcast-station-classes-and-service-contours

Federal Communications Commission. (n.d.). *FM radio*. Retrieved from

    http://www.fcc.gov/search/results/FM%20radio

Federal Communications Commission. (n.d.). *FMpower ERP and FM station class calculations*.

    Retrieved from http://transition.fcc.gov/mb/audio/bickel/fmpower.html

Federal Communications Commission. (n.d.). *Low power FM broadcast radio stations (LPFM).*

    Retrieved from http://www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/low-power-fm-broadcast-radio-stations-

    lpfm

Federal Communications Commission (n.d.). *What we do*. Retrieved from

    http://www.fcc.gov/what-we-do

Fells, M. J. (2000). Fayol stands the test of time. *Journal of Management History, 6*(8), 345-360.

Fidler, D. (1992, May). Pump up the NACB. *SPIN*, 31. Retrieved from

    http://books.google.com/books?id=ov3_OLmQ4PMC&pg=PT32&lpg=PT32&dq="natio

    nal association of college

    broadcasters"&source=bl&ots=MD6Fy2qPGh&sig=daPb8sPocO9a3XCOxQtuNkxwfw4

    &hl=en&ei=PhPSS9nuJ8H38AbxwpG2Dw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=

    21&ved=0CFgQ6AEwFA

Fitzgerald, M., Joseph, A. P., Hayes, M., & O'Regan, M. (1995). Leisure activities of adolescent

    children. *Journal of Adolescence, 18,* 349-358.

Furchtgott-Roth , H. (1998, June 15). *Notice of proposed rule making and order*. Retrieved from

    http://transition.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Mass_Media/Notices/1998/fcc98117.txt

Galbraith, S. (2007). *Anatomy of a business: What it is, what it does, and how it works*. Westport,

    CT: Greenwood Press.

Garratt, G. R. M. (1994). *The early history of radio: From Faraday to Marconi*. London, United

      Kingdom: The Institution of Electrical Engineers.

Gilbert, N. (2004). *The best 143 business schools.* New York, NY: Random House.

Gordon, P. J. (2003). One hundred years of management. *Business Strategy Review*, *14*(2), 41-

      49.

Gordon, V. H. (2009). Early twentieth century management theories and models that shaped

      twenty-first century school leadership. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*,

      59, 67-70.

Harrison, E. (1979, January 20). Magazine slants to programmers. *Billboard*, 68.

Holbrook, M. B., & Schindler, R. M. (1989). Some exploratory findings on the development of

      musical tastes. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16,* 119-124.

Holtermann, S. (1992). *The role of college radio in the music industry: A descriptive study*

      (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Intercollegiate Broadcasting System. (2012). *1,000 IBS members from college radio or high*

      school radio have membership in IBS. Retrieved from

      http://www.frontiernet.net/~ibs/aboutibs.html

IRTS Foundation. (2012). *About us*. Retrieved from http://irtsfoundation.org/aboutus.html

Keith, M. C. (2007). The long road to radio studies. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic*

      Media, *51*(3), 530-536.

Knopper, S. (1994). College radio suffers growing pains. *Billboard*, *106*(28), 84.

Koontz, H., & Weihrich, H. (1990). *Essentials of management: An international perspective*

      (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kruse, H. (1995). *Marginal formations and the production of culture: The case of college music* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana.

Leidman, M. B. (1985) *At the crossroads: A descriptive study of noncommercial FM radio stations affiliated with colleges and universities of the early 1980s* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Leidman, M. B., & Lamberski, R. J. (1986, January). *A methodology in studying noncommercial FM radio stations - A case study*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Las Vegas, NV.

Leidman, M. B., & Lamberski, R. J. (1986, January). *Descriptive study of noncommercial FM radio stations affiliated with colleges and universities.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Las Vegas, NV.

McClung, S. (2001). College radio station web sites: Perceptions of value and use. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *56*(1), 62-73.

McLean, J. (2011). Fayol - Standing the test of time. *Manager: British Journal of Administrative Management*, *Spring*, 32-33.

Miller, K. D., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2010). Testing management theories: Critical realist philosophy and research methods. *Strategic Management Journal*, *32*, 139-158. doi:10.1002/smj.868

Navarro, P. (Ed.). (2005). *What the best MBA's know: How to apply the greatest ideas taught in the best business schools.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Negus, K. (1992). *Producing pop: Culture and conflict in the popular music industry*. London, England: E. Arnold.

Ochoa, R. M., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2009). The application of historical and modern management theories in the financial industry: An analysis of how management practices affect employee turnover! *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, *7*(8), 19-31.

Olum, Y. (2004, July). *Modern management theories and practices*. Paper presented at Kenya School of Monetary Studies 15th East African central banking course, Nairobi, Kenya.

Parker, L. D., & Ritson, P. A. (2005). Revisiting Fayol: Anticipating contemporary management. *British Journal of Management*, *16*, 175-194. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00453.x

Pesha, R. (1997). Simulating broadcast in the real world. *Feedback*, *38*(1), 1-3.

Priestman, C. (2002). *Web radio: Radio production for internet streaming*. Oxford, England: Focal Press.

Pryor, M. G., Humphreys, J. H., Taneja, S., & Toombs, L. A. (2011). Where are the new organization theories? Evolution, development and theoretical debate. *International Journal of Management*, *28*(3), 959-978.

Pryor, M. G., & Taneja, S. (2010). Henri Fayol, practitioner and theoretician - Revered and reviled. *Journal of Management History*, *16*(4), 489-503.

Pugh, D. S., & Hickson, D. J. (2007). *Writers on organizations* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Penguin Books

Rinks, J. W. (2002). Higher education in radio 1922-1934. *Journal of Radio Studies*, *9*(2), 303-316.

Riordan, E. (2000). *Negotiating commodified culture: Feminist responses to college radio*
(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Rubin, N. (2011). Us college radio, the 'new British invasion' and media alterity. *Radio
Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, *9*(2), 127-143.
doi:10.1386/rajo.9.2.127_1

Sauls, S. J. (1995, April). *College radio*. Paper presented at the Annual Joint Meetings of the
Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Sauls, S. J. (1998). Factors that influence the funding of college and university media outlets:
Radio as a blueprint. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*,
27(1998), 163-171.

Sauls, S.J. (1998, October). The role of alternative programming in college radio. *Studies in
Popular Culture 21*(1), 73-81.

Sauls, S. J. (2000). The culture of American college radio. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Sauls, S. J., & Greer, D. (2007). Radio and localism: Has the FCC dropped the ball? *Journal of
Radio Studies, 14*(1), 37-48.

Schramm, H. (2006). Consumption and effects of music in the media. *Communication Research
Trends*, *25*(4), 3-29. Retrieved from http://cscc.scu.edu/trends/v25/v25_4.pdf

Schwartzapfel, B. (2006, January/February). Radio heads. *Brown Alumni Magazine*, Retrieved
from http://www.brownalumnimagazine.com/content/view/353/40/

Searle, J. R. (2001). *Rationality in action*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sloboda, J. A., & O'Neill, S. A. (2001). Emotions in everyday listening to music. In P. Juslin &
J. Sloboda (Eds.), *Music and emotion: Theory and research* (pp. 415-429). New York,
NY: Oxford University Press.

Slotten, H. R. (2009). *Radio's hidden voice*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Smith, F. L., Wright II, J. W., & Ostroff, D. H. (1998). *Perspectives on radio and television: Telecommunications in the United States* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stiegler, Z. (2011). Talk of the nation: The state of U.S. public radio. *Journal of Communications Media Studies*, *3*(1), 26-39.

Taylor, F. W. (1914). *The principles of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

The radio act of 1927. (2003, April 8). Retrieved from http://www.americanradiohistory.com/Archive-Stevenson-Burgess-Others/Federal Radio Act 1927.pdf

Tremblay, R. W. (2003). A delphi study on the future of college radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, *10*(2), 170-185.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.

Troop, D. (2011, June 19). *What's eating college radio?* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Whats-Eating-College-Radio-/127945/

Waits, J. C. (2007). Does 'indie' mean independence? Freedom and restraint in a late 1990s US college radio community. *The Radio Journal - International Studies in Broadcast and Audio Media*, *5*(2&3), 83-96. doi:10.1386/rajo.5.2&3.83/1

Wall, T. (2007). Finding an alternative: Music programming in US college radio. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast and Audio Media*, *5*(1), 35-54. doi:10.1386/rajo.5.1.35/1

Wallace, D. (2008). Reinventing the wheel vs. grinding the same old axe: An ethnographic view of the students and community members at a Massachusetts college radio station. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, *5*(1), 44-66.

Willer, J. R. (2010). Using campus media to mentally position students for the emerging media delivery systems. In J. Al-Obaidi & W. Covington, Jr. (Eds.), *Broadcast, internet, and TV media in the Arab world and small nations: Studies in recent developments* (pp. 43-53). Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Wilson, B. G. (2004). Does college radio experience matter? A study of Pennsylvania radio station managers. *College Media Review*, *42*(3-4), 16-21.

Wilson, B. G. (2011). The usefulness of college radio websites: An examination of sites maintained by Pennsylvania. *Journal of Communications Media Studies*, *3*(1), 53-66.

Wilson, B. G., & Dudt, K. P. (2001). College radio at Pennsylvania state universities: A status report. *College Media Review*, *39*(1), 4-9.

Wilson, B. G., & Dudt, K. P. (2002). College radio and religious programming: A report on religious programming on state-owned college and university radio stations. *College Media Review*, *40*(2), 4-9.

Wren, D. A., Bedeian, A. G., & Breeze, J. D. (2002). The foundations of Henri Fayol's administrative theory. *Management Decision*, *40*(9), 906-918. doi:10.1108/0025174021044110 8

Yuki, G., & Lespringer, R. (2005). Why integrating the leading and managing roles is essential for organizational effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*, *34*(4), 361-375.

Zillman, D., & Gan, S.-L. (1997). Musical taste in adolescence. In D.J. Hargreaves & A.C. North

(Eds.), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 161-187). Oxford, England: Oxford

University Press.

Appendix A

Management Practices of Student-Run Radio Stations: A National Review of
Contemporary College Radio

Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study on student-led college radio stations in the United States. This form is provided to give you the information necessary to decide upon participation. Should you agree to contribute to this study, you will respond to a secure online survey which will require approximately 10 minutes of your time. You are eligible to participate if you are age 18 or older, an active member of a college or university-affiliated radio station, and in a Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM) or Student Manager role.

Your participation is <u>voluntary</u>. There is no compensation offered. If you choose to participate, all information will be held in strict confidence and in compliance with federal regulations. To ensure the highest level of privacy, the survey will be completed anonymously online through Qualtrics ™. Your response will be considered <u>only in combination</u> with those from other participants. The summary information obtained in the study may be published in scholarly journals or presented at conferences but your identity will be kept strictly confidential. You may withdraw from this study at any time without any consequences by simply ending the online survey before completion.

Your contribution will help provide a contemporary review of student-led college radio stations and create a benchmark by which similar stations can compare and evaluate themselves. "Student-led" means the station consists primarily of current students under the direction of a Student Manager or Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM). The station should generate most of its own programming, rather than simply simulcasting another station or programs provided by another entity such as National Public Radio (NPR). The presence of some non-students or national programs on the station does not disqualify it from examination. Please click on the following link to indicate your understanding of this information and your willingness to participate in the study.

(Web link inserted here)

This is a student project with contact information for the Primary Researcher and Faculty Sponsor following. Please contact the instructor (Faculty Sponsor) for more information.

Primary Researcher	Faculty Sponsor
Mr. Ronald K. Raymond	Dr. B. Gail Wilson
Doctoral Candidate	Professor
Communications Media	Communications Media
Stouffer Hall	Stouffer Hall
Indiana, PA 15705	Indiana, PA 15705
814-460-2235	724-357-3210

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form (Used for Final Reminder via Email)

From: R.K.Raymond@iup.edu

Subject line: Final reminder – Your participation is needed and greatly appreciated

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in a research study on student-led college radio stations in the United States. By clicking on the link below, you will respond to a secure online survey which will require approximately 10 minutes of your time. To ensure your privacy, the survey will be completed anonymously online with your responses considered only in combination with those from other participants. This study is designed to be completed by a primary decision-maker at a student-led college radio station, generally a Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM) or Student Manager. If this does not pertain to you, please forward to the proper respondent.

Your contribution to this study is very important. It will help provide a contemporary review of student-led college radio stations and create a benchmark by which similar stations can compare and evaluate themselves. Thank you for your assistance!

(Web link inserted here)

This is a student project with contact information following for the Primary Researcher and Faculty Sponsor:

Primary Researcher – Mr. Ronald K. Raymond
Doctoral Candidate
R.K.Raymond@iup.edu
814-460-2235

Faculty Sponsor – Dr. B. Gail Wilson
Professor – Indiana University of Pennsylvania
724-357-3210

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

Appendix C

Survey Instrument

Student - Led College Radio

This study is designed to secure information about student-led college radio broadcast stations (traditional on-air radio stations that are primarily directed by current college students and a Student Manager or Faculty Advisor / Manager). Unless otherwise directed, please choose the single best response to each question. Thank you for participating!

Q1 Is the College / University radio station you represent primarily student-led (directed by current college students and a Student Manager or Faculty Advisor / Manager)?

○ Yes
○ No

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Q2 Which of the following best describes your role...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q2 Which of the following best describes your role at the radio station?

○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Manager
○ Other (Please specify) _____

Q3 In what approximate year was the radio station first licensed?

Q4 Who currently owns the radio station license?

○ College / University
○ University Foundation
○ Student Cooperative
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q5 Which of the following best represents the primary format of the radio station?

- ⭘ Music
- ⭘ News
- ⭘ Programs
- ⭘ Sports
- ⭘ Other (please specify) _____

Q6 Which, if any, of the following best represents the station's secondary format?

- ⭘ Music
- ⭘ News
- ⭘ Programs
- ⭘ Sports
- ⭘ Other (please specify) _____
- ⭘ None

Q7 Who is primarily responsible for determining the operating goals for the radio station?

- ⭘ Department Chairperson
- ⭘ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
- ⭘ Student Management Team
- ⭘ Student Manager
- ⭘ Other (please specify) _____

Q8 Who is primarily responsible for determining what is played on the station?

- ⭘ Department Chairperson
- ⭘ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
- ⭘ Student Management Team
- ⭘ Student Manager
- ⭘ Other (please specify) _____

Q9 Does the radio station operate only during the academic year?

○ Yes
○ No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Q10 Who is responsible for operating the ...If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Q11 What are the three styles of music most often…

Q10 Who is responsible for operating the station during times when the College / University is not in session?

○ Department Chairperson
○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Management Team
○ Student Manager
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q11 What are the three styles of music most often played on your student-operated college radio station? Rank the top three styles of music in order of airplay with 1 being the most often played style of music, 2 being the second most often played style of music, and 3 being the third most often played style of music. You may rank only one style of music but please do not rank more than three styles of music.

_____ Alternative (including indie)
_____ Country
_____ Freeform (anything goes)
_____ Pop (light rock)
_____ Rock (including classic & modern)
_____ Urban (including hip-hop & R&B)
_____ Do not play music at all
_____ Other (please specify)

Q12 What are the three most significant issues facing your student-operated college radio station? Rank the top three issues in order of significance with 1 being the most significant issue, 2 being the second most significant issue, and 3 being the third most significant issue. You may rank only one issue but please do not rank more than three issues.

_____ Lack of administrative support
_____ Lack of community support
_____ Lack of enforceable policies
_____ Lack of funding
_____ Lack of student support / interest
_____ Poor / failing equipment
_____ Possibility that the station will be sold to another entity
_____ Weak on-air signal
_____ Other (please specify)

Q13 Who determines what staff members receive titled positions (ex: Program Director, Music Director, etc.)? (Check all that apply)

❑ Department Chairperson
❑ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
❑ Student Manager
❑ Other (please specify) _____

Q14 Which of the following positions are held by students? (Check all that apply)

❑ Announcer
❑ Music Director
❑ News Director
❑ Production Director
❑ Program Director
❑ Promotions Director
❑ Public Relations Director
❑ Sports Director
❑ Staff Member (without air shift)
❑ Station Manager
❑ Webmaster
❑ Other (please specify) _____

Q15 Which of the following positions are paid? (Check all that apply)

- ❑ Announcer
- ❑ Music Director
- ❑ News Director
- ❑ Production Director
- ❑ Program Director
- ❑ Promotions Director
- ❑ Public Relations Director
- ❑ Sports Director
- ❑ Staff Member (without air shift)
- ❑ Station Manager
- ❑ Webmaster
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

Q16 How are students in paid positions compensated? (Check all that apply)

- ❑ College Credit
- ❑ Hourly Wage
- ❑ Semester Stipend
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

Q17 On average, how many hours of training are required before students are granted air-shifts?

- ○ Less than one hour
- ○ 1 - 3 hours
- ○ 3 - 5 hours
- ○ 5 - 7 hours
- ○ Greater than 7 hours

Q18 Who provides the training for students desiring air shifts? (Check all that apply)

- ❑ Department Chairperson
- ❑ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
- ❑ Student Management Team
- ❑ Student Manager
- ❑ Other (please specify) _____

Q19 On the whole, how would you describe the broadcast equipment currently in use at the radio station?

❍ Poor
❍ Fair
❍ Good
❍ Very Good
❍ Excellent

Q20 Do you have regular staff meetings?

❍ Yes
❍ No

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Q21 How frequently are meetings held? If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Q22 What are the forms of communication...

Q21 How frequently are meetings held?

❍ More than once per week
❍ Weekly
❍ Bi-weekly
❍ Monthly
❍ Other _____

Q22 What are the forms of communication most often used to provide information to the staff? Rank the top three forms of communication in order of frequency with 1 being the most often used form of communication, 2 being the second most often used form of communication, and 3 being the third most often used form of communication. You may rank as few as one form of communication but please do not rank more than three.

_____ Email
_____ Individual meetings
_____ Instant Messaging
_____ Memos
_____ Staff meetings
_____ Social Media
_____ Other (please specify)

Q23 Who is primarily responsible for dealing with problems or issues among the staff?

○ Department Chairperson
○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Management Team
○ Student Manager
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q24 Who is primarily responsible for dealing with technical or equipment problems?

○ Engineer
○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Management Team
○ Student Manager
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q25 Which of the following most closely approximates the TOTAL number of students who are involved in the college or university radio station?

○ Less than 10
○ 11 - 25
○ 26 - 40
○ 41 or greater

Q26 Which of the following most closely approximates the percentage of the overall staff you would consider to be ACTIVE members?

○ 1 - 20 percent
○ 21 - 40 percent
○ 41 - 60 percent
○ 61 - 80 percent
○ 81 - 100 percent

Q27 Who maintains the radio station's website?

○ College / University
○ Party not otherwise associated with the College / University or radio station
○ Staff member(s) of the radio station
○ Student not otherwise associated with the radio station
○ Do not have a current website

Q28 Including faculty and staff salaries and student wages, how much is the radio station's annual operating budget (in U.S. dollars)?

○ Less than $10,000
○ Between $10,001 and $25,000
○ Between $25,001 and $50,000
○ Greater than $50,000

Q29 What are the three most important sources of funding for your student-operated college radio station? Rank the top three sources of funding in order of importance with 1 being the most important source of funding, 2 being the second most important source of funding, and 3 being the third most important source of funding. You may rank only one source of funding but please do not rank more than three sources of funding.

_____ Business Underwriting / Sponsorships
_____ College or University
_____ Department
_____ Donations (telethons, raffles, private contributions, etc.)
_____ Dues / Memberships
_____ Endowment
_____ Grants (monies received from specific grant applications)
_____ Student Funds (activity fees, etc.)
_____ Student Government Associations
_____ Other (please specify)

Q30 Which of the following most accurately describes the relationship between your station and the primary fund provider (the most important source of funding)?

❍ Poor
❍ Fair
❍ Good
❍ Very Good
❍ Excellent

Q31 What are the three strongest sources of influence on the operation of your student-led college radio station? Rank the top three sources of influences in order of strength with 1 exerting the most influence, 2 exerting the second most influence, and 3 exerting the third most influence. You may rank only one source of influence but please do not rank more than three sources of influence.

_____ Alumni
_____ College / University Administration
_____ Community Members
_____ Department Chairperson
_____ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
_____ Student Government Association
_____ Student Management Team
_____ Student Manager
_____ Student Population
_____ Other (Please specify)

Q32 Is there a current student manual outlining station policies and expectations?

❍ Yes
❍ No

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Q33 Are students required to sign an agree...If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Q34 Who is primarily responsible for disc...

Q33 Are students required to sign an agreement that they will adhere to station policies?

❍ Yes
❍ No

Q34 Who is primarily responsible for disciplining staff members that violate station policies?

❍ Department Chairperson
❍ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
❍ Student Management Team
❍ Student Manager
❍ Other (please specify) _____

Q35 Who is primarily responsible for ensuring compliance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules and regulations?

○ Department Chairperson
○ Engineer
○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Manager
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q36 Who is responsible for renewing the station's license with the FCC?

○ Department Chairperson
○ Engineer
○ Faculty Advisor / Manager (FAM)
○ Student Manager
○ Other (please specify) _____

Q37 Do you have any additional comments about student-led college radio stations in general?