

A STUDY OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND
PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS
IN THE UNITED STATES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Raymond Lee Giles
1963

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

by Raymond Lee Giles

This study was conducted to investigate the public relations programs and practices of educational television stations in the United States at the close of the first decade of educational telecasting.

For the purposes of this study, "public relations" was defined as the planned effort to motivate or influence opinion favorably toward the station.

The study was instituted as an initial step in exploring the public relations of ETV by: 1) investigating the public relations history of ETV as determined from published sources; 2) reporting a current survey of public relations practices conducted; and 3) suggesting new areas for research as indicated by the conclusions drawn from these data.

It was proposed that ETV should be aware of its important relationships with public relations, in meeting the obligations of serving the public interest. Educational television should be integrated within the community it serves, and communicate with its publics constantly to provide optimum understanding.

A review of the literature in the field of public relations and educational television indicated that public relations seeks to create a favorable image that is more an abstract quality than a concrete quantity; that public relations is personal, human relations, as much as it is the practice of calculated strategies; and that the best public relations for broadcasters, educational especially, is public service responsibly administered.

The recognized importance of public relations in contemporary society and the lack of recent, significant research data relative to public relations and educational television led to the hypotheses upon which this study was based.

These hypotheses were tested in a survey of the current public relations programs and practices of all of the educational television stations in the United States listed as broadcasting a regular schedule of programs as of January, 1963.

The mail questionnaire was used in seeking responses from a total of 72 educational television stations. The managers of these stations were questioned because of the manager's unique position of having both the authority to set policy and the knowledge to evaluate the overall service of the station.

A response of 91.7 per cent was received on the questionnaires, with inventories returned from 66 of the 72 stations.

The results of the survey indicated that in spite of important interrelationships of public relations and educational television, the majority of educational telecasters have not yet adopted the practice of public relations as an integral element of station operation. It was determined, however, that of the several divisions of stations catalogued in the survey, those stations classified as "community owned" generally have better developed public relations departments and programs than do stations in any other classification.

It was also indicated that many ETV broadcasters, particularly those in metropolitan areas and the leaders of ETV organizations, are increasingly aware of the importance of practicing public relations.

Finally, since this study was an initial investigation, it was concluded that much more research of both general and specific nature is needed to investigate fully the implications that the practice of public relations has for educational television.

Specific areas needing research included: the proper place of public relations in the station's administrative hierarchy; the impact of budgeting and fund-raising on a station's public relations program; the training and placement of public relations personnel; and the future of public relations in the field of ETV.

This study was an initial attempt to investigate

Raymond Lee Giles

the public relations programs and practices of the nation's educational telecasters, but it was proposed that once the vital interrelationships of public relations and ETV are more fully realized, significant and continuing research will be devoted to this area, as it is in many other areas of educational television.

A STUDY OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES OF
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Raymond Lee Giles

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Television-Radio

1963

Thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Michigan State University

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful appreciation is expressed to Dr. Walter B. Emery, Professor of Television-radio, for his wise counsel and patient guidance during the planning and preparation of this thesis.

The writer is also grateful for the cooperation of the station managers of educational television stations across the nation for their assistance in supplying vital data during the survey of public relations practices.

PREFACE

It has been ten years since the first licensed educational television station in the United States signed on the air with a regular broadcast schedule of programs. During this time a unique broadcast medium has grown and prospered to the point where there are educational television stations in nearly every state in the Union.

Yet educational television is still an infant medium with unique problems of growth and policy, and frequent surveys and analyses are necessary both to report its history and to project its future.

Public relations is one area of ETV policy and planning worthy of study at this point in the development of the medium, because of the need to motivate and maintain favorable support for a medium that depends upon public acceptance for its very existence.

This study was instituted as one effort to investigate the public relations programs and practices of ETV by: 1) exploring the public relations history of ETV as determined from published sources; 2) reporting a current survey of public relations practices of educational telecasters; and 3) suggesting new areas for research as indicated by the conclusions drawn from these data.

It is hoped that this study will stimulate additional

data so that there will be a new basis for further research in the area of public relations for educational television.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
PREFACE	111
LIST OF TABLES.viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
The Impact of Public Relations.	2
Public Relations Defined.	3
The Corporate Definition	4
The "Academic" Definition.	5
A PR Definition for this Study.	7
The Importance of Public Relations.	7
The Importance of Public Relations to ETV	8
II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.	11
The Hypothesis.	12
Objectives of the Study	14
Subject Areas for Investigation	15
The Public Relations Function	15
The Management Function.	16
The Staff Function	16
The Process	16
The Tools of Communication.	17
The Publics	17
Fund Raising.	18
Summary	18
III. A REVIEW OF NOTABLE SURVEYS AND REPORTS CONCERN- ING PUBLIC RELATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION	19
The Public Relations "Image" of ETV	19
The Calculated Strategies	24
Some ETV-PR Viewpoints.	25
A recapitulation	31
Survey Reports.	32
The Sulzer Study.	32
The Sanderson Study	35
A Summary	39

IV. A SURVEY OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN 1963	39
The Subject for Investigation	39
The Method of Investigation	41
The Questionnaire	42
The Questionnaire Analyzed.	43
The Sample.	44
V. REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	47
Section I. Response to the Inventory	47
Section II. Methods of Analysis	48
Section III. The Data--General Background Information.	49
Section IV. General Category I.	51
Full-Time PR Personnel.	52
Control Over PR Personnel	53
Part-Time PR Personnel.	55
The PR Budget	55
PR Policy	59
Specific PR Goals	61
Frequency of Setting or Evalu- ating PR Policy.	64
Keeping Staff PR Conscious.	64
Methods of Keeping Staff PR Conscious.	65
Frequency of Staff Meetings	68
Most Valuable PR Effort	70
Section V. General Category II	73
Use of Communication Devices.	74
Writers of Promotional Mate- rials.	74
Program Guides.	76
Size of Guides.	79
Printing Methods and Costs.	79
Mailing Lists	82
Press Relations	83
Section VI. General Category III.	85
Fan Letters	86
Studio Space Offered.	87
Talent Available.	89
Contributions to Charities.	89
Programs Related to Community Problems	91

CHAPTER	PAGE
Section VII. General Category IV.	91
Section VIII. Some Additional Comment. . .	95
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY.	99
Summary	99
Summary of Survey Responses	101
Conclusions of the Study.	108
Additional Areas for Research	109
A Final Word.	110
APPENDIX I	112
Part A.	113
Part B.	114
APPENDIX II	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	124

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Range of Percentages of "In-School" Programming .	51
2. Numbers and Percentages of Full-Time Public Relations Personnel.	53
3. Public Relations Matters Requiring the Managers' Decisions.	54
4. Station Personnel Handling PR Duties When Station Has No Full-Time Public Relations Personnel. . .	56
5. The Public Relations Budget	57
6. Stations Reporting an Organized Public Relations Policy or Program.	60
7. Frequency of Setting or Evaluating Public Relations Policy	64
8. Efforts Made to Keep Staff Members Public Relations Conscious.	65
9. Frequency of Staff Meetings	68
10. Stations Entering Competitions for Industry Awards	69
11. The Use of Promotional and Publicity Devices. . .	75
12. Writers of Promotional Materials.	77
13. Frequency of Program Guide Publication.	78
14. Printing Methods and Costs of Publishing Program Guides	80
15. The Formulation of Mailing Lists by STV Stations.	82
16. Frequency of Contact with the Press by Stations .	84
17. Use of Station Publicity and News Items by the Press.	84
18. Stations Inviting Viewers to Attend Studio Broadcasts.	86

TABLE	PAGE
19. Report of Fan Mail Received Each week by Stations.	88
20. Stations Offering Studio Space for Local Group Meetings	88
21. Availability of Talent or Personnel for Local Functions.	89
22. Stations with Programs Related to Community Needs	91
23. Analysis of Financial Support of Community Stations.	93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the little more than ten years that have passed since the Federal Communications Commission's historic Sixth Report and Order¹ reserved television channels for education, there have been many significant strides in the service. From a single station in the United States in 1953, to nearly 80 stations on the air as of January, 1963,² the overall growth of educational television has been extraordinary.

Since the University of Houston put KUHT on the air more than a decade ago, numerous other educational institutions, school systems, foundations, and community organizations have established ETV stations in 32 states and the District of Columbia.³

From the standpoint of pure physical growth, then, it seems apparent that the past decade has meant much in the establishment and development of educational television stations.

¹Federal Communications Commission, Sixth Report and Order, 17 Federal Regulations, 3909-4100 (May 2, 1952).

²National Educational Television and Radio Center, Educational Television Directory (New York, Jan., 1963).

³Ibid.

Yet in spite of this rapid station growth, educational television, as a concept and a reality, is still an emerging service. And while the physical, technical, production and programming developments of early ETV may have set a growth pattern, it may not be the best one to follow in the future.

That is why educational television is being studied in this and other countries. Hopefully, every phase of the medium will be subjected to exhaustive study to determine how best to fulfill its potential for information and entertainment. Educational television, although still too young to be precisely characterized, should be carefully surveyed and analyzed to determine its role in the future.

Much research has been done on the instructional and educational values of television, as well as the technical aspects. However, the administrative phases of the industry have not yet come under such close scrutiny. Public relations is one such area. Yet, public relations may prove to be one of ETV's best tools for achieving acceptance and growth.

THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Increasing emphasis is being placed upon public relations programs by institutions and organizations of many types and kinds. Even as private citizens, we are aware of public relations programs of our businesses and industries, our universities and colleges, and even our

churches and religious organizations. Public relations has become a major industry in our country during this century, as more and more businesses and organizations discover a need to create better rapport with the publics they serve.

Public relations is a new science. It has been stated that, "Though the roots of today's [public relations] practice extend far back, the definite beginnings date from the early 1900's."¹ And Marion Corwell asserts that, "Since World War II, the necessity for a well-defined blueprint for public relations has been increasingly recognized by management of profit and nonprofit organizations alike."²

PUBLIC RELATIONS DEFINED

When the subject of "public relations" is introduced, it is necessary to define the term as one chooses to use it. Not only is the term relatively new, but it lends itself to different interpretations, since it involves varied areas, skills and techniques.

At the outset of any public relations study, it should be understood that, as Cutlip and Center point out, ". . . public relations as a concept and practice is still in the fluid state of defining itself."³ A review of various

¹Scott M. Cutlip and Allen M. Center, Effective Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 30.

²Marion Corwell, "Personalized PR," NAEP Journal, Vol. 29, No. 2 (July-August, 1962), p. 23.

³Cutlip and Center, p. 3.

definitions of the term "public relations" reveals its nebulousity.

The Corporate Definition

Merriam-webster defines "public relations" as

The activities of a corporation, union, government, or other organization in building and maintaining solid and productive relations with special publics such as customers, employees, or stockholders, and with the public at large, so as to adapt itself to its environment and interpret itself to society.¹

A similar definition states that

. . . public relations is a two-way interpretation and communications undertaking. It interprets the viewpoint of the public to management and it communicates the resulting policies and activities of management to the public. The purpose being, of course, to win public favor for the business, the industry, or the union as the case may be.²

A little less complex is the definition of Church, who concludes that public relations is " . . . that course of action which guides an institution, or an individual, in a course which will earn and hold the favorable opinion of the public."³

Harwood L. Childs' 1940 definition stated that "Public Relations may be defined as those aspects of our personal

¹ Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1960), p. 663.

² John Cameron Aspley and L. F. Van Houten, The Dartnell Public Relations Handbook (The Dartnell Corp., Chicago, 1960), p. 433.

³ David M. Church, The Public Relations Committee--Why and How It Works (National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, Inc., New York, 1949), p. 4.

and corporate behavior which have social and public significance. . . . Public relations is based on public interest."¹

These are representative definitions of the term as interpreted by commercial concerns. But, as should be apparent below, there is a slightly different connotation of public relations in the realm of the educator.

The "Academic" Definition

Elmer Sulzer, Director of Radio-Television at Indiana University, has said, "Good public relations is the practice of instilling and maintaining the most favorable attitudes possible among the greatest number of people possible on a continuing and permanent basis."²

Professor Byron Christian sees PR as the " . . . conscious effort to motivate or influence people, primarily through communication, to think well of an organization, to respect it, to support it, and to stick with it through trial and trouble."³

Another educator, Miss Marion Corwell, chairman of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters'

¹Harwood L. Childs, quoted in Edward L. Bernays, Public Relations (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952), pp. 109-110.

²Elmer Sulzer, "Educational Broadcasting and Public Relations," NAEB Journal, Vol. 18, No. 5 (Feb., 1959), p. 6.

³Byron Christian, quoted by Cutlip and Center, p. 6.

public relations committee, reports that, "Public relations has been defined as 'merely human decency . . . which flows from a good heart . . . genuine and sturdy enough to be reflected in deeds that are admirable and praiseworthy.'"¹

Finally, Cutlip and Center interpret the use of the term public relations to mean, " . . . the planned effort to influence opinion through acceptable performance and two-way communication."²

Judging from the comments above, there seems to be no common agreement on a definition of public relations suitable for general usage. Even though a common thread may be woven throughout the several preceding definitions, Harlan and Scott have declared that

It would be impossible to get agreement on one definition of public relations. Printer's Ink, in an attempt to arrive at a uniform definition, sought the answer from leading public relations organizations, and each one had a different interpretation of the term.³

The problem of defining "public relations" may then evolve into the problem of choosing that particular descriptive phrase which most closely describes the particular situation in question and which can be communicated to others with the highest possible correlation of understanding.

¹Marion Corwell, p. 28.

²Cutlip and Center, p. 4.

³Gene Harlan and Alan Scott, Contemporary Public Relations--Principles and Cases (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955), p. 3.

A PR DEFINITION FOR THIS STUDY

For the purpose of this study, "public relations" is defined as the planned effort to motivate or influence opinion favorably toward the station.

This definition, specifically intended for use in studying the public relations of educational television, is simple enough to be understandable, yet comprehensive enough to prove valid in usage throughout all areas of this study. It can mean any act of the station that promotes favorable opinion, from personal, human relationships to the more calculated strategies of public relations.¹

THE IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Television and modern public relations are contemporaries. They have come into existence to serve a function or fill a need created by changing times.

Perhaps Outlip and Center best describe the existence and importance of public relations in our society in the following paragraphs:

The function of public relations will continue to grow in scope and importance as the American environment accelerates in interdependence and complexity. And accelerate it will. Once the needs are understood, PR's purpose and place become clear. Moreover, as the nature of the function as a direct response to its environment unfolds, its inevitability and permanence can be easily seen.

.

¹By "calculated strategies" is meant the planned publicity campaign, promotion, advertising, press relations, and other communication tools of PR.

Any public enterprise to prosper and endure today must (1) accept the obligations of public responsibility imposed by an increasingly interdependent society; (2) find ways and means of communicating with unseen, remote publics over lines lengthened by physical distance and psychological difference and complicated by multiplying barriers to communication; (3) find ways of achieving integration into the community that the organization was created to serve.¹

Public relations then becomes very much a part of both its age and its environment. Certainly the foregoing paragraph must be accepted as a basic condition for existence by any organization that depends upon public support. Public relations is the science designed to help an organization meet these requirements through planned effort and calculated strategies.

And as Cutlip and Center conclude:

The common purpose of all that is labeled public relations is to influence public opinion. . . . The practice of public relations is predicated on the belief that only an informed public can be a wise public. . . . The basic problem is to adjust the institution to the climate of social change in a way that will serve both the public and private interests insofar as this is possible.²

THE IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS TO ETV

In speaking of the implications of the complex society in which we live, Elmer Sulzer asserts that " . . . educational stations require good will even more than our commercial brothers . . . [as] . . . basic support must come

¹Cutlip and Center, p. 46.

²Ibid., p. 8.

from having many, many friends."¹

Sidney Eiges, although a commercial broadcaster, would seem to support Mr. Sulzer's view when he says

Maintaining good public relations is nothing less than good business for a television or radio station. Good public relations increase a station's acceptance by its public. It is this public, and no one else, that in the final analysis determines the success or failure of a station.

The progressive broadcaster voluntarily assumes and discharges to the fullest his responsibilities to his public and to his community. To do so is common sense, good business, and good public relations.²

These statements add further credence to the views expressed earlier by Cutlip and Center. The importance of public relations to ETV is summarized by two other ETV broadcasters.

William Dempsey notes that, "Whether you like it or not, whether you planned it or not, your community has a stereotyped picture of your operation fixed in mind!"³ To which Thomas Petry adds, "The value of good public relations and continuing publicity and promotion must not be underestimated for any ETV station which ultimately

¹Elmer Sulzer, p. 20.

²Sidney H. Eiges, "Public Relations for Television and Radio Stations," Chapter 25, Public Relations Handbook, ed. Philip Lesly (2nd ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), pp. 410-411.

³William C. Dempsey, "He who Steals by Curse Steals Trash," RAED Journal, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Jan.-Feb., 1961), p. 4.

depends on active viewer response."¹

Educational television needs good public relations basically to (1) meet the obligations of the public responsibility it shares; (2) communicate with its many publics; and (3) achieve integration into the community it serves and thereby win public acceptance for its programming.

Yet how well is ETV developing its public relations programs? John P. Highlander says:

We have often failed to make ourselves felt in our community. Perhaps one of the reasons this may be so is because we have never really studied our community. . . . We have tended to stand apart rather than to get "mixed-up" with the people and the affairs of the community. Indeed, we may be guilty of a "you come to me" attitude which is likely to spell doom for a broadcaster.²

By investigating the public relations practices of our nation's educational television broadcasters, this study attempts to provide some needed answers in this important area of public relations and ETV.

¹Thomas Petry, "On Blowing One's Own Horn," NAEB Journal, Vol. 19, No. 2 (March-April, 1960), pp. 45-46.

²John P. Highlander, "Educational Broadcasting Needs Reappraisal," NAEB Journal, Vol. 21, No. 5 (Sept.-Oct., 1962), p. 34.

CHAPTER II

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The preceding chapter contained statements of fact and knowledgeable opinion regarding the important interrelationships of public relations and educational television. A careful analysis of these data has led to the following conclusions:

1) The practice of public relations is designed to motivate and influence favorable opinion toward an organization through acceptable performance and two-way communication of the organization with the publics it serves.

2) As the American environment grows continually more complex and interdependent, the function of public relations constantly grows in scope and importance.

3) Because of the nature of its function in this complex contemporary society, educational television depends upon public support for its very existence.

4) Therefore, for continued survival, ETV should through the practice of public relations meet the obligations of serving the public interest always; achieve integration within the community it serves; and communicate with its publics constantly to provide for an optimum climate of understanding.

The insufficiency of data and reliable, recent research makes it impossible to know whether the importance of PR is recognized by the administrators of educational television, or whether the majority of ETV broadcasters even provide for a public relations program.

THE HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis for this study can be stated as follows:

The majority of educational television broadcasters have not yet recognized the importance and value of a sound public relations program, as defined in this study, and do not presently conceive of public relations as an integral element of station operation.

Stated more simply, educational television is not adequately public relations conscious.

This basic hypothesis appears to be supported by the following theories:

- 1) Only a small minority of the total number of ETV stations have full-time public relations directors or departments.

- 2) The majority of stations have no written public relations policy set down for staff and management alike to follow.

- 3) The majority of the "public relations" programs of ETV stations which state that they do have such programs are primarily promotional or publicity programs.

4) Those stations that depend upon constant fund-raising activities for their existence have better developed public relations programs and staffs than do stations which are supported by state appropriation or other similar and regular grants.

5) Similarly, those stations which are school-system or school-board owned and primarily broadcast instructional programs for in-class use generally have the least developed public relations effort in the entire field.

Since FCC regulations require educational broadcasting to be noncommercial, most ETV stations are supported by some type of appropriation. There are those stations that depend entirely or in part on the solicitation of funds from the public or from foundations or other philanthropic organizations, but these remain in the minority.

Since ETV does not have to sell its time to sponsors (and legally can't), and thereby does not have necessarily to produce programs with mass popular appeal, theoretically ETV has much greater freedom of choice in programming. As such, the administrators of ETV may come to feel that they are programming for a special audience (which they are undoubtedly) or a captive audience. If they feel theirs is a captive audience, however, these educational telecasters perhaps may not be as concerned with their public acceptance, or public relations, as a commercial broadcaster.

To continue this line of reasoning, it might be a

valid contention that ETV has been so concerned with winning intellectual and governmental support for the medium that it has largely ignored (or has been less concerned with up to the present) winning the support of its other publics.

The relative absence of recent and significant research data in these areas indicates the definite need of findings to support or disprove these hypotheses and thereby provide new knowledge for further research.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In summary, these were the overall objectives of this study:

- 1) To explore the public relations history of ETV as could be determined from published resources;
- 2) To conduct a current survey of the field to provide new data about the public relations practices of ETV, and also in doing so,
- 3) To report the current PR practices of ETV, in order to:
- 4) Prove or disprove the basic hypothesis that the administrators of ETV are not adequately public relations conscious;
- 5) Prove or disprove the related theories concerning the practice of public relations by educational telecasters which are derived from the basic hypothesis;
- 6) Provide educational telecasters with the

opportunity to express their public relations philosophies;

7) Predict the future of the practice of public relations within the field of educational television;

8) Suggest new areas for research in public relations for ETV as indicated by conclusions drawn from this data.

SUBJECT AREAS FOR INVESTIGATION

In carrying out the objectives of this study, it was necessary to survey and analyze definite areas within the organizational framework of the administrative function of ETV to determine the scope of the public relations practice.

These areas specifically include the overall PR function; the public relations process as currently determined; the tools of communication in use; the publics of ETV; and the financial basis of support.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION

Cutlip and Center say, "Public relations is a staff function."¹ Yet William C. Dempsey contends, "Only the manager (or top official) can set the image goal (of the station), and only the manager is in the position of having both the perspective and the authority to see that the right efforts are made to achieve his selected image. . . ." ²

¹Cutlip and Center, p. 174.

²William C. Dempsey, p. 5.

If some confusion exists here, it is likely that this confusion also exists in the minds of the educational telecasters. More than likely it is a matter of semantics, but a matter which was subjected to study in this report. It seemed important that the attitudes of those in ETV be analyzed with respect to this matter of interpreting public relations as a management or staff function, or both.

The Management Function

For the purposes of conducting the survey contained in this study, the public relations of ETV was considered to be a management function with the survey directed to ETV management. The basic reason for this decision is explained in more detail later in the study.

The Staff Function

An important part of this study concerned an investigation of the staff function of the public relations departments (if any) of the ETV stations. Among these important areas were included an analysis of the working of the PR department or division; the size of the PR staff; the scope of the PR function; the PR department's handicaps and advantages; and the division of responsibility for the PR department or officer.

THE PROCESS

The actual public relations process of ETV, as

determined by the station managers, is important. That is to say, it seemed much could be learned from what the station managers consider "public relations" to be, and what functions belong to this process.

Among these subject areas are the planning and communicating processes of the stations' public relations programs which determine the strategies and tactics they use; the kind of planning they have (if any) and how long-range it is; the PR man's role in the overall setting; and the manner in which the station communicates with its publics other than by the use of its own medium.

THE TOOLS OF COMMUNICATION

Important to public relations always are the tools of communication used in promotional and publicity campaigns, including the amount of personal contact, and the use both of controlled media and public media. Press relations is significant since the systems of effecting good press relations or relations with other members of the mass media are integral elements of good PR.

THE PUBLICS

The publics of an organization are important to it, for without support from its publics an organization is doomed to extinction. The general public incorporates all of a station's or organization's publics, but among the general public there are such further groupings as employee

publics, the community publics and other special publics.

FUND-RAISING

William Dempsey says, "fund raising, I believe, is an important area of public relations. . . ."¹ To some ETV stations which exist solely on their ability to raise funds from the general public, it would seem to be the most important area of public relations. A special effort was made in this study to analyze the impact of fund-raising upon a station's overall PR program.

SUMMARY

As expressed in the title of this study, this was an initial effort to investigate both the public relations programs and practices of educational television stations. Basically, it was hoped that this study would serve the purpose of gathering data to show exactly how ETV is handling its public relations now, and what is indicated for the area of public relations within educational television in the years to come.

¹ibid., p. 8.

CHAPTER III

A REVIEW OF NOTABLE SURVEYS AND REPORTS CONCERNING PUBLIC RELATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

It is true that there have been limited studies conducted and reports written concerning the practice of public relations as it is related to educational television. It has already been noted that various specialists in the two fields have examined the practice in efforts to define terms and set standards for development.

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters through its Public Relations Committee has done a great deal to bring the importance of public relations to the attention of educational broadcasters. Other efforts have been made in lesser degrees by individuals interested in this aspect of broadcasting.

It is one purpose of this chapter to pull together these isolated studies and reports in an effort to ascertain both the current trends in public relations for educational television, and the earlier patterns for its practice as set by the pioneering ETV stations.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS "IMAGE" OF ETV

Educational television, like any other medium, is judged by the "image" or the mental conception that the

general public has of it. Thus, ETV on both the national and local level is judged by what the general public comes to know of it through countless impressions. Whether or not this "image" is the one that ETV administrators would wish to be projected, it is a vital factor in public relations planning and practice.

As William Dempsey has said:

"Image" by any other name would still exist. Whether you like it or not, whether you planned it or not, your community has a stereotyped picture of your operation fixed in mind! . . . My concern here is with the broadcast station as a whole--what it personifies, if you will, to most of your community.¹

The image of ETV, then, is a product of everything that a station does that is recognized by the public. This may involve the station operation itself, the role of the station manager, programming, press relations, community service, and numerous other day-to-day functions that combine to make the station known to its publics.

To quote a further salient point of Mr. Dempsey's, "Everything a man does and everything a man is makes up his character. Similarly, everything your station does and everything it is makes up its image."²

Since public relations is designed to influence opinion favorably toward the station, the "image concept"

¹William C. Dempsey, pp. 4-5.

²Ibid., p. 5.

as interpreted here becomes synonymous with public relations itself. That is, public relations attempts to set the image of the station, which in turn influences the public's knowledge and judgment.

Therefore, Mr. Dempsey states:

There are two rudimentary steps necessary before any order can be made out of the "image" chaos. First, you must learn just what kind of picture your operation conjures in the minds of men. Second, what kind of picture do you WANT them to have?¹

The point is, then, that a station inevitably has some type of image, but the practice of public relations can do much, if not everything, to produce the desired image.

Once it is understood that public relations is serving the purpose of creating (or attempting to create) the proper image goal, the overall activities of the station and its employees can then be viewed in the context suggested by Mr. Dempsey, that everything a station does and everything a station is makes up its image.

Perhaps this is the reason that Elmer Sulzer maintains that " . . . public relations is a mental attitude that must permeate the stations' every action. . . ."² The proper state of mind will find fruition in the proper types of public relations methods and media."³

¹ Ibid.

² Elmer Sulzer, p. 7.

³ Ibid., p. 20.

Marion Corwell reaffirms that, before the practiced strategies and techniques of public relations come into play, there must be a setting of the mind toward the image goal. She mentions the more emotional qualities of "personalized PR" when she states that:

Interaction of the employer serving the best interests of his employees, and the employees, imbued with spirit and enthusiasm to sell a quality product, cannot fail to produce personalized public relations--resulting in manifold good will.¹

To which she also adds the comment, " . . . solid public relations embodies more than the . . . calculated promotion strategies employed by the public relations pro. It is high-caliber public statesmanship from top management on down."²

Elmer Sulzer supports Miss Corwell in her statement when he asserts that " . . . educational station public relations is more an attitude of mind than it is the pinpointing of specific PR activities. And our educational directors must think public relations twenty-four hours a day."³

In this context, public relations becomes something more than a business practice. It is a quality rather than a mere action, and its practice becomes a qualitative matter

¹ Marion Corwell, p. 30.

² Ibid., p. 29.

³ Elmer Sulzer, p. 7.

in addition to a quantitative function. The station, too, has a personality.

Public relations then becomes personal, human relations. And when personal, human relations are involved, so are the emotions that guide men in all areas of life. As Elmer Gulzer succinctly phrases it, "Public relations is not just a collection of techniques. Rather, public relations is something that must be lived."¹

Based on these observations, it would seem to be the opinion of these people that the public relations of ETV is made up of every activity of the station. It seems obvious that the proper practice of public relations requires a constant, unrelenting emphasis on the personal, human relationships involved in everyday life, in addition to the calculated strategies that belong to the realm of the PR practitioner.

These personal, human relationships are fairly obvious to us, as Marion Corwell points out:

Everyone practices public relations in his association with others every day. The cheerful "good morning" of the boss greeting his secretary, or the pleasantries exchanged with the elevator operator, the word of encouragement to the janitor all add up to public relations--personal, human relations.

In the same personal way, every employee is

¹Elmer Gulzer, A Public Relations Guide for the Educational Broadcasting Station, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Urbana, Ill., 1960, p. 1.

a public relations representative of his organization. The attitudes reflected by these "ambassadors"--regardless of their positions in the organization--are noted and judged accordingly.¹

This is undoubtedly what Mr. Bulser means when he says public relations must be lived.

THE CALCULATED STRATEGIES

Once the concept of public relations as a humane quality is understood, or at least put forward, most ETV public relations writers concentrate on outlining the basic techniques that are calculated to support the in program through communicating understanding of the stations' goals and purposes.

Before these strategies are examined, however, it is necessary at this point to mention the two important factors of program content and audience that serve further to separate educational broadcasting from commercial broadcasting.

John F. White, president of the National Educational Television and Radio Center (NET), points out that the program content of ETV is unique because of the fact that, "During mornings and afternoons, educational stations primarily broadcast classroom material for local schools and colleges."²

¹ Marion Corwell, p. 28.

² John F. White, "Educational Television," Public Relations Handbook, Chapter 31, p. 500.

Thus, the ETV station in many instances has what has been termed a "captive audience" for its programming. But in spite of this, Mr. White asserts:

Generally speaking, NET stations have the same audience potential as the commercial stations in their respective localities. The actual audiences, of course, are dependent on the quality or drawing power of the program.

The audiences watching the community educational stations do so with a serious purpose.¹

The audiences of ETV and the program content of the medium are special qualities that deserve consideration in a public relations program.

With these considerations in mind, the following material is submitted as an analysis of various writings in the field of public relations for ETV, with respect to the subject areas of investigation outlined earlier in Chapter II: the overall public relations function; the public relations process as currently determined; the tools of PR communication in use; the publics of ETV; and the financial basis of support of the medium.

SOME ETV-PR VISTAS

Sidney Eiges is director of public relations and promotion for the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) in New York City. He is very definitely a commercial broadcaster. Yet Mr. Eiges is one of the few authors (if not

¹Ibid., p. 561.

the only one) of a generally complete and current outline of public relations practices for television and radio stations. His treatise, written in 1962,¹ is a timely and valuable outline for PR in broadcasting, and much of it can also be applied to educational television.

Mr. Eiges finds most facets of station operation are also integral elements of a public relations program. Those most applicable to ETV include the station itself, the manager, and the station's programming as constituents of the overall PR function.

Of the station Mr. Eiges says, "The station should be something more than a . . . channel on a TV dial; it should be quickly identifiable in the public's mind as a physical part of the community."²

This immediately points up the recurring theme that public relations per se involves the image or personality of the station and constitutes or attempts to form a favorable attitude in the mind of the general public toward the station.

The image of the station is then transferred to the public through programming, Mr. Eiges believes. He says:

The station can achieve its best or suffer its worst public relations through [programs].

¹Sidney H. Eiges, "Public Relations for Television and Radio Stations," Chapter 25, Public Relations Handbook.

²Ibid., p. 411.

Needless to say, a station interested in the best public relations must maintain the highest program standards consistent with its economic security.¹

Service to the public is still the best kind of public relations.²

It is in this context of public relations that Mr. Eiges sees the station manager as " . . . an active community leader . . . he must accept and discharge his responsibilities to the community."³

Since many ETV stations are actually owned and/or supported by the community financially, this PR philosophy of service to the community seems especially applicable. ETV stations have been created and licensed to serve the public. Mr. Eiges simply maintains that serving the public is public relations at its best . . . regardless of other tactics of the practice.

But there are numerous tactics that should be included in the planned public relations program. The most important of these as outlined by Mr. Eiges included the following: maintaining proper relations with the press; competing for awards; receiving visitors properly and answering all mail; conducting tours of the station and supplying free broadcast tickets; responding to criticism; and maintaining membership in industry associations. Among

¹Ibid., p. 411.

²Ibid., p. 413.

³Ibid., p. 412.

"important little things to do," he enumerates:

. . . Make your officials freely available for appearances as guest speakers. . . . Make your local talent available for entertainment at worth-while city functions and for outstanding local groups. . . . When sufficient space is available, you should offer some of your studios for meetings of your women's clubs, civic organizations, and similar groups. . . . Wherever possible, your station should make financial contributions to all worth-while community undertakings.¹

But in the final analysis, Mr. Eiges still summarizes the overall public relations function in one statement, "The best public relations for a station can be achieved by giving the best public service possible."²

This returns to the concept of public relations as an all-pervading element of station operation. It refers perhaps most specifically to Mr. Dempsey's proposal that "Everything we ARE and everything we DO contributes to our station's image."³ To which he adds:

. . . Building a desirable image takes time and consistent effort. Since the total station operation involves so many people and so many departments, only a top management individual can have the perspective overview and therefore the ability and the responsibility for Operation Image Buildup.⁴

Mr. Dempsey then puts management in perspective in the overall PR function as responsible for the image

¹ Ibid., p. 425.

² Ibid., p. 426.

³ William C. Dempsey, p. 10.

⁴ Ibid.

of the station achieved through a public relations program. However, this is only true insofar as the manager is the person with the authority to mold the program into a joint effort of the entire staff, and as such he then becomes, by the nature of his office, the chief officer.

It is in communicating with its public that a station uses the planned strategies or tools that are the devices of publicity and promotion. As Jacob Evans puts it:

The dissemination of information about programs is the primary basis for stimulating viewer or listener interest and action. Promotion and publicity are the station's "voices" to the public.¹

And Church integrates the function by stating:

Publicity is the exposition of an idea, and good publicity can only be based on sound public relations.

Public relations and publicity go hand in hand. They are interdependent.²

Petry likewise finds it important to consider the public relations/promotional function as a single, integrated practice. As he says,

The value of good public relations and continuing publicity and promotion must not be underestimated for any ETV station which ultimately depends on active viewer response.

We first had to learn that good programming and adequate reception did not in themselves guarantee an audience. . . . If we do have a better

¹Jacob A. Evans, Selling and Promoting Radio and Television, (New York: Printer's Ink Publishing Co., 1954), p. 275.

²David M. Church, p. 5.

product, as we firmly believe, we have all the more reason and responsibility to advertise.¹

And Mr. Eiges reiterates, "Continuing and good publicity is a vital ingredient of any good public relations program."²

The best tool of communication for a particular station to use may depend on many factors. Evans claims that, "The use of the station's own facilities should be its primary method of building audiences,"³ while Mr. Dempsey believes that, "The single most important outside organization is, of course, the press."⁴ But whatever the method, the use of promotion and publicity as an integral part of the practice of public relations cannot be emphasized enough. Thomas Petry summarizes this quite succinctly by stating the lesson learned by KAME's early failure to attract the interest of the public:

. . . a great part of the initial failure was due to lack of effective and persistent promotion. The potential audience had not been reached, its interest had not been aroused.

. . . Interest in the station grew in direct ratio to the involvement that each new viewer felt. The public was made to feel responsible for the end product. KAME created an image which in a very real sense reflected the community to itself.

.

¹Thomas Petry, pp. 45-46.

²Sidney Eiges, p. 416.

³Jacob A. Evans, p. 219.

⁴William C. Dempsey, pp. 8-9.

"Public relations" proved to be the prime (if obvious) answer to building initial support and convincing key citizens and agencies to do much of the groundwork for the station.¹

Making the public feel responsible for and involved in the station's activities is good public relations, and it can be achieved through gaining financial support for the station at the same time.

Speaking of fund-raising as an important area of public relations, William Dempsey says, " . . . The people who give money toward your operation have a feeling of belonging--in fact, at times they have a feeling of downright ownership."²

And David S. Ketchum summarizes fund-raising as a PR function by saying:

Certainly campaign direction is allied to the practice of public relations as it is practiced in other fields. It utilizes practically every channel of publicity. It depends on strategic decisions at the board level. The success of a fund-raising campaign depends on action.³

A Recapitulation

These, then, are some of the major ideas expressed about the scope of public relations practice for educational television. It is the intention now to turn toward surveys

¹Thomas Petry, pp. 38-39.

²William C. Dempsey, p. 8.

³David S. Ketchum, "The Professional Director in Fund-Raising Campaigns," Public Relations Journal, Vol. XIV, No. 8 (August, 1958), p. 8.

of the actual practice of public relations by the nation's educational broadcasters. To meet this end, data were collected that indicated the practices of PR at strategic and important times in the development of ETV. Two of these surveys will be reported below. The other survey, that which forms the current basis of this thesis, will be reported in Chapter V.

SURVEY REPORTS

This study has been undertaken to report the public relations programs and practices of educational telecasters at the close of the first ten years of ETV broadcasting. To provide a perspective for the present study, the general findings and conclusions of two surveys conducted near the mid-point of this period, or in 1957-58, will be reported below.

Both of these surveys were undertaken by educational broadcasters to investigate the activities of these broadcasters in the field of public relations and/or promotion, depending upon the definition of "public relations" chosen.

Since the findings and conclusions of these surveys carry the most import here, much of the material will be quoted in full, to report the exact conclusions of the respective authors.

THE SULZER STUDY

In November, 1957, Elmer G. Sulzer undertook a study

of educational broadcasting which resulted in a paper entitled "Promoting Educational Broadcasting," published in 1958.¹ The express purpose of this study was outlined by Mr. Sulzer:

Station promotion in one form or another is a favorably recognized activity by a large number of the nation's educational broadcasting outlets. However, nothing approaching a systematic study of these activities has ever been undertaken nor have there been any plans placed in operation for research or promotional ideas.

Recognizing this need, James S. Miles, while Chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, requested the writer to conduct a preliminary survey which would indicate, to a partial degree at least, the extent and types of promotional media and methods employed by the member stations. This paper is a result of that assignment.

Since this has been a pioneer venture, the results indicate many areas where further research and investigations are extremely desirable.²

It should be apparent that this study was designed to determine primarily the promotional efforts of educational broadcasting. It was limited to member stations of the NAEB; and the study was conducted among both educational radio and television stations. However, as Mr. Sulzer notes above, the results of his study are of a pioneer venture in this area of research and are valuable in this respect.

¹Elmer G. Sulzer, "Promoting Educational Broadcasting," Urbana, Ill.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1958.

²Ibid., p. 1.

The conclusions of the Bulzer study are indicative of the public relations efforts of educational broadcasters in late 1957 and early 1958. These conclusions are reported below:

1. The participation in public relations activities by educational broadcasting stations is spotty, and ranges from an intense program by some stations, to situations where there is little or nothing done.
2. In general, the community-type stations exhibit more professionalism in public relations than the others. The college stations would rank second. The availability of money, apparently, is the most important factor in making this situation extant.
3. The lack of recognition of the trade press as a means of publicizing educational broadcasting stations' activities is evident.
4. Plainly, educational broadcasting stations are not doing their duty by the NAB publications.
5. For the most part, processed program schedules are frowned upon by those who must put them out.
6. Wide discrepancies in the printing costs of program schedules would seem to indicate that the NAB could sponsor some helpful research along these lines.
7. This preliminary survey indicates a large area of possible research in the public relations activities of educational broadcasting stations that should be explored on a systematic and scientific basis.¹

Of these conclusions, the ones most applicable to a study of ATV would seem to be numbers one, two, and seven.

¹IBB, pp. 15-16.

THE SANDERSON STUDY

Another study, conducted about the time of the Sulzer study, surveyed public relations activities of ETV. Entitled "Public Relations in Educational Television," it was conducted by Richard A. Sanderson, who stated in his introductory note:

This is the report of a limited inquiry into public relations activities of educational television stations, showing how educational broadcasters have at least one problem in common with their commercial brethren--namely, the need to publicize their efforts.¹

Mr. Sanderson states the belief that ETV has been intent mainly on programming and production. But he asked these questions:

In performing their services for the public, have educational telecasters established a good two-way communication between the station and the public? Is the public fully aware of the offerings of such stations and are these stations performing services their publics need and want?

To answer these questions and solve the problems they imply, an educational station needs a well-organized and effective public relations program. . . .

.
. . . But how can an educational station, operating on a small budget, organize and build an extensive public relations program which will maintain this two-way communications channel with the public?²

To answer these questions, Mr. Sanderson surveyed

¹Richard A. Sanderson, "Public Relations in Educational Television," Journal of Broadcasting, Vol. II, No. 4 (Fall, 1958), p. 345.

²Ibid.

all ETV stations broadcasting on regular schedules prior to July, 1957. His findings indicate replies from 19 stations and one network of three stations. The most pertinent findings are included below:

Seventeen of the twenty stations surveyed reported they had definite need for an organized, full-time public relations program.¹

• • • • • The importance of public relations activities for educational stations is reflected by the fact the eighteen stations reported personnel were specifically assigned to public relations work. However, only half of these stations had at least one person assigned to public relations in a full-time capacity.²

Other findings by Mr. Sanderson:

Thirteen of the stations surveyed had a formal written statement of station policies and objectives.³

He also noted that ETV did not aim its programming at the entire potential audience, but:

The public relations director (ETV) is therefore involved in arousing, maintaining, and building the attention and interest of various groups within the potential audience.⁴

• • • • • Educational television stations are attempting to know their audience and to discover how programming is being received. Fifteen stations had taken some type of audience poll or survey or were in the process of doing so.⁵

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 330.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 331.

⁵Ibid., pp. 331-332.

Mr. Sanderson also surveyed the particular promotional devices in use by the ETV stations. His findings indicated that the media most effective in promotional campaigns were the press, personal contact, and the station's own programming, in the order listed. Other promotional devices included speaker's bureaus and station announcements.

In his conclusions he reported that:

This survey of public relations policies and objectives of twenty educational television stations revealed seven major items which appeared significant in a majority of reports:

- (1) Sufficient public or professional acknowledgment should be given persons or organizations assisting the educational station in its programming.
- (2) An important phase of the educational station's operation is participation in some type of civic or institutional television workshop or training program for which station facilities are made available. These programs offer opportunities and means for good public relations.
- (3) The proper handling of visitors at the educational station necessitates the use of a receptionist and guide. . . .
- (4) Programming should include some shows in which the audience can in some way directly and actively participate.
- (5) The publication of an annual progress report of some type has been found to be a useful tool for public relations.
- (6) The most effective media for reaching the educational station's audience have been found to be the press, personal contact, and the station's own programming.
- (7) Many stations have conducted some type of survey or poll to determine audience opinion and reaction towards the station, the general programming or towards certain programs.¹

Following these general conclusions, Mr. Sanderson summarized his survey by stating:

¹Ibid., pp. 333-334.

If the educational station is to be devoted to public service and wishes to provide this service to the largest number of persons possible, it should feel obligated to establish and maintain a two-way flow of communications between the station and its audiences. Only through understanding the needs and desires of its public, then attempting to fulfill these needs through programming and by giving its viewers a feeling of personal participation, can the educational station accomplish its complete objective.¹

A SUMMARY

The preceding pages have surveyed the historical materials and current thinking of those in the field toward the practice of public relations in educational television. It has been a review of the published data available about this subject as gathered from research in books, journals, and periodicals pertaining to the field.

In analyzing this material, there seem to be these recurring themes among the several reports and surveys: public relations seeks to create a favorable image that is more an abstract quality than a concrete quantity; public relations is personal, human relations, as much as it is the practice of calculated strategies; and the best public relations for broadcasters, educational especially, is public service responsibly administered.

¹Ibid., p. 334.

CHAPTER IV

A SURVEY OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN 1963

THE SUBJECT FOR INVESTIGATION

Preliminary investigations in the fall of 1962 indicated that there were no recent sources of information readily available regarding the current practice of public relations by educational television stations in the United States. It was further determined that there apparently had been no such overall studies conducted in the area of public relations for ETV in the past five years, and therefore what information was available was for all practical purposes completely outdated.

Believing this lack of data constituted an alarming void, and believing in the important interrelationships of public relations and ETV as outlined in the preceding chapters, the writer determined to initiate a research project designed to examine current PR practices of the nation's educational television stations.

The subject was submitted to a graduate research seminar and to administrators and teachers in TV-radio and public relations at Michigan State University, both to get opinions concerning the value of such a study and to form a definitive course of action.

In addition, the proposed study was outlined to two national educational broadcasting organizations, and comments were requested, as a further check on the potential worth of the project.

Letters were therefore personally typed and sent to Miss Marion Corwell, Chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and to the Information Office of the National Educational Television and Radio Center. Both sources expressed encouragement for such a study.

Edward J. Pfister, Information Services Chief of NET, stated, "Certainly I feel any such study as you plan for your thesis project would be not only worthwhile but of very great value to NETV on the national level. I know of no such studies that have been done in this area. . . ."¹

Miss Corwell replied, "You are right in your premise that NETV stations, in general, could do a better job in the area of public relations."²

Following these exploratory seminars and personal investigations, it seemed apparent that 1) a need for such a study was definitely established, and 2) the study could

¹Letter from Edward J. Pfister, Information Services Chief, National Educational Television and Radio Center, New York, New York, April 22, 1963.

²Letter from Marion Corwell, Chairman, Public Relations Committee, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Dearborn, Michigan, February 1, 1963.

conceivably prove of importance to ETV broadcasters on the national level.

THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Because of the lack of information pertaining to public relations and ETV, it was decided that the survey approach would constitute the best research method for conducting such a study. Both the case study method and the questionnaire method were considered as the research tools, and both offered unique advantages and disadvantages.

It was thought that the case study method might provide more depth reports than a questionnaire, but the research project would then be limited to only a few selected stations. On the other hand, while a questionnaire could be distributed to all broadcasting ETV stations, there was reason to believe the response would be limited. As Miss Corwell stated:

Concerning your proposed study: I am sure you are aware that everyone in business is weary (I am being kind; I could use a much stronger word) of graduate students' surveys. The feeling is that, in many cases, the professionals are asked to do the writing for the student--and the result is, the survey questionnaire is deposited in the round file.¹

But as Miss Corwell further stated, "The survey may be essential to your thesis; in fact, it might be useful to the industry to have this information."² It was decided

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

that the use of the questionnaire approach would be essential and this approach was used to gather data for the study, the decision made largely on the basis that only a complete survey of the field would prove statistically valid in making conclusions from the study.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The need was evident for a questionnaire that would be manageable on the part of the interviewee and also provide information in some depth. Thus, the design of the questionnaire was considered one of the most important elements of the study, if not the most important single factor.

For this reason, several months went into the preparation of the instrument on the part of the writer. Several such questionnaires were designed and revised after consultations with the major professor on the study and other colleagues in the field. The resulting questionnaire (see Appendix) consisted of a total of 40 questions, including 35 questions to be answered by all respondents and five supplementary questions to be answered only by those to whom they specifically applied. (The latter pertained to matters of fund-raising not applicable to all stations.)

These 40 questions were primarily of the multiple choice type. They demanded a minimum of time to answer and provided for a uniformity in compiling data. Open-end questions were used wherever it was deemed necessary and advisable, however.

The total questionnaire consisted of eight duplicated pages with ample space at the end of the 40 questions for additional comment by the respondents. The length of the inventory was purposely kept as short as possible in order not to discourage the interviewees from answering, and also to facilitate in the handling and mailing of the instruments.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYZED

The inventory of public relations practices was designed to seek information in the following four general categories:

I) The scope of the overall practice of public relations as currently determined by the station managers of the RTV stations, including the staff function, the division of responsibility, the overall goals, and the organizational setting of the practice;

II) The efforts being made by the stations in the specific areas of promotion and publicity, including press relations;

III) The amount of community involvement and service of the stations as a factor in station public relations; and

IV) The function of fund-raising (where applicable) as an element of the public relations practice of the stations.

Specific questions were then designed to gather

information concerning these four general areas. The inventory included instructions to the station manager as well as the definition of public relations chosen for this study. The latter was incorporated to provide a common background for answering the questions on the part of differently oriented respondents.

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 were designed to gain general background information about the station and its physical organization.

Questions 5-14, plus questions 26, 34, and 35, were designed to compile information sought in the General Category I, or the scope of the overall PR practice.

Information pertaining to General Category II, or the areas of promotion and publicity, was intended to be derived from questions 15-25.

Questions 27-33, or General Category III, were designed to determine the involvement of the station in its own community.

And the final five questions, 36-40, were devoted to the area of fund-raising, or General Category IV.

An open-end space at the close of the inventory was designed to obtain opinions by managers that they may have been unable to report elsewhere in the inventory.

THE SAMPLE

In the light of the suggestion by Miss Corwell and others that the questionnaire is frowned upon by some, it

was decided to use a special approach in sending the questionnaires to the ETV stations.

First, it was decided to send the questionnaire to the station managers of the ETV stations for the reason stated earlier that only the manager is in the position of setting policy and having the perspective to see how his overall programs are carried out.

Secondly, the study was being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Walter B. Emery of the Michigan State University Television-Radio Department, and because of his belief in the validity and worth of the study, he suggested that his name be used in conjunction with the survey.

The writer then sent an individual letter to each station manager, together with a questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. A copy of this letter is included in the Appendix.

These personal letters and questionnaires were sent to the station managers of a total of 72 educational television stations (plus three affiliate or satellite stations) in 32 states and the District of Columbia, listed as being on the air with a regular schedule of programs as of January, 1963. The source used to confirm the number of broadcasting stations on the air and the names and addresses of station managers was the January, 1963, Educational Television Directory of the National Educational Television and Radio Center cited earlier.

The letters and questionnaires were sent to the station managers in late April, 1963. After approximately one month, in late May, 1963, individually typed and personalized follow-up letters (see Appendix) with questionnaires were sent to a small percentage of station managers who had not yet responded to the first letter and questionnaire.

The response to the survey and the resulting data are reported in the following pages.

CHAPTER V

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

SECTION I

RESPONSE TO THE INVENTORY

Questionnaires were mailed to the managers of 72 educational television stations (plus three affiliate or satellite UHF stations which were operated under the same organizational policies as their sister VHF stations) listed as being on the air as of January, 1963.¹ A response of 91.7 per cent was received to the inventories, with questionnaires returned from 66 of the 72 station managers. (A 67th manager returned his inventory unanswered because of a personal policy of not answering survey research questionnaires.)

Thus, usable questionnaires were received from 66 stations in 32 states and the District of Columbia, or in other words, from every state in the United States with an operating open-circuit ETV station, and from most of the educational TV stations in the country. Of the six stations not replying, three of these were in New York, one in Illinois, one in Louisiana, and one in Wisconsin.

¹Educational Television Directory, National Educational Television and Radio Center.

However, replies were received from other stations in these states to form a completely representative sample of station activities in the field of public relations in all states throughout the nation with either VHF and/or UHF broadcasting educational television stations.

SECTION II

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The data, the hypotheses projected and the instrument used to make the investigation suggested a summary of data in terms of percentages of responses to particular items, general averages, numerical listings and tables, and direct quotations where practicable.

The data were therefore analyzed in this manner with respect to the four general categories of information sought from the station managers.

For reasons of clarity and accuracy, it was necessary to classify the returned inventories according to the type of ownership of the stations. That is, because of the hypotheses projected, it was deemed necessary to categorize stations by ownership to show public relations practices of stations in various ownership groups. Therefore, the following divisions of stations were made:

- A) Community owned stations;
- B) School system or school board owned stations;
- C) University or college owned stations; and

D) A general division of stations owned by miscellaneous groups, such as ETV authorities, foundations, cities, and so on.

In the analysis of the data reported, an effort was made to present complete responses of stations in each ownership division where practical, as well as the total results of the survey.

SECTION III

THE DATA--GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION¹

As stated earlier, the first four questions on the inventory were designed to get basic information about the stations to form a basis for further evaluation purposes.

The total of 66 stations replying to the survey included 21 stations which were listed as university or college owned; 18 stations owned by community organizations; 18 stations owned by school systems or school boards; and nine (9) stations which were owned by a variety of organizational groups. This latter division included three stations under the ownership of a State ETV Commission, two stations owned by a State ETV Authority, a station owned by a municipality, a station under the ownership of a library

¹Note: Since the station managers were told the information they supplied would be treated confidentially, in an effort on the part of the writer to gain more complete and open replies, no stations were specifically identified in this analysis. Where necessary, general descriptive phrases were supplied to clarify geographical locations of some stations.

and another owned by a foundation, and one station owned jointly by a university and a school system.

In addition, there were two community owned and one school system owned satellite or affiliate stations that were not counted as separate stations because the stations were determined to be under the same organizational setup as their parent stations, at least for the purposes of this study.

Of the 66 stations, there was a total of 45 VHF stations, and 21 UHF stations. The number of broadcast hours per week of each station varied greatly, ranging from a low of 10 to a high of 77 hours per week, or from a minimum average of the four divisions of stations of 25 hours to a maximum average of 73 hours per week. The approximate average number of broadcast hours for the 66 stations was 45 hours per week.

Eighteen of the 66 TV stations had sister FM radio affiliates, two stations had AM radio affiliates only, and seven stations had both AM and FM radio affiliates.

A total of 59 of the stations reported they devoted some percentage of their broadcast time to instructional television (meaning here "in-school" lessons only), while four stations did not answer this question and two stations reported no "in-school" programming. Since there was no apparent reason why the four stations did not answer the question, it was assumed that the four also did not devote any time to this form of instructional television.

The percentage of "in-school" programming of the total amount of programming ranged from 24 per cent to 66 per cent in the division of community owned stations; from 23.1 per cent to 75 per cent in the miscellaneous grouping of stations; from 15 per cent to 100 per cent in the division of school system owned stations, and from 5 per cent to 100 per cent in the university owned group of stations. The average percentage of "in-school" programming of the 59 stations was 48.5 per cent.

These approximate percentages and ranges of percentage of "in-school" programming are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. RANGE OF PERCENTAGES OF "IN-SCHOOL" PROGRAMMING

Station Classification:		Average Per Cent
Community	24% — 66%	44.4%
Miscellaneous	23.1% — 75%	46.0%
School System	15% — 100%	66.1%
University	5% — 100%	37.8%
PERCENTAGE	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100	

SECTION IV

GENERAL CATEGORY I

Questions 5-14, 26, 34, and 35 on the inventory were designed to gather data pertaining to the scope of the overall practice of public relations as currently

determined by the station managers, and here classified as General Category I.

Thus, the first question in this section was designed to learn how many ETV stations had one or more full-time people assigned to a public relations function.

FULL-TIME PR PERSONNEL

Of the 66 stations, a total of 19 stations had one or more full-time public relations personnel, while 47 stations had no full-time people assigned to the public relations function. Thus, only 28.8 per cent of the nation's educational television stations now have full-time public relations officers or departments.

Of the 19 stations with full-time PR people, nine stations have a single PR person, while 10 stations have more than one person.

The community owned stations reported the highest percentage of full-time public relations personnel, with 10 of the 18 stations in the group, or 55.5 per cent of the stations, with one or more people assigned full-time to the public relations area.

Nineteen per cent of the university owned stations, 16.6 per cent of the school system owned stations, and 28.6 per cent of the miscellaneous group of stations had full-time PR people.

These figures, as shown in Table 2, lend support to the hypothesis that only a small percentage of the

nation's ETV stations currently have full-time public relations personnel.

TABLE 2. NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF FULL-TIME PR PERSONNEL

Station Classifi- cation:	Number of Stations	With Full- Time PR	% With	with One PR Person	with More Than One PR Person
Community	18	10	55.5	4	6
Miscellaneous	9	2	28.6	1	1
School System	18	3	16.6	1	2
University	21	4	19.0	3	1
TOTAL	66	19	28.8	9	10

Of the 10 stations with more than one full-time PR person, the largest staff, five full-time and one half-time persons, was kept by a West Coast station. An East Coast station had four people. Five stations had two people on the PR staff, two stations had three people, and one station had one full-time person and another assigned half-time.

The titles of these people varied from station to station, but included directors of public relations, assistant directors of PR, directors of development and assistants, audience promotion assistants, publicity and promotion directors, and special projects coordinator.

CONTROL OVER PR PERSONNEL

Question number seven was designed to determine the

amount of authority these full-time public relations people had, and conversely, to determine how much control the station managers kept over the PR departments.

The results, as shown in Table 3, show the station managers split about evenly in supervising their PR departments, with eight managers being asked their decision on nearly all matters pertaining to station relations with the public, and eight managers consulted only on matters of major policy (defined as involving significant capital expenditures, policy changes, etc.). Three managers reported their decision was asked on most matters considered to involve major policy.

It is apparent, however, that of the stations with full-time PR people, the manager kept a firm hand in policy decisions.

TABLE 3. PUBLIC RELATIONS MATTERS REQUIRING MANAGERS' DECISION

Station Classification:	Nearly ALL Matters	MOST "Major Pol- icy" Matters	ONLY "Major Policy"	TOTAL
Community	4	4	2	10
Miscellaneous	1	1	0	2
School System	2	1	0	3
University	1	2	1	4
TOTAL	8	8	3	19
TOTAL PER CENT	42.1%	42.1%	15.8%	

PART-TIME PR PERSONNEL

Since the majority of stations did not have full-time public relations personnel or departments, it was important to learn who, if anybody, handled the PR duties of the station. Again there was a wide range of answers and these are reported in Table 4.

From these data, it appears many ETV stations let their public relations duties fall in almost any direction. Certainly there is no general pattern that can be reported concerning the type of personnel handling PR duties when no full-time person is available.

THE PR BUDGET

Since it seems that many times the public relations effort is largely dependent upon the amount of money available to it, information was sought concerning the amount of money budgeted annually for the public relations function on the part of the ETV stations. Here again there were wide individual differences, but the figures provided some interesting computations for analysis.

The public relations budget of the community-owned stations ranged from a low of \$250 to a high of \$82,000; the miscellaneous group of stations from zero to \$10,000; the school system-owned stations from zero to \$20,000; and the university-owned stations from zero to \$15,000 per year.

Fourteen stations reported no budget for public relations at all, while ten stations did not answer the question and several stations gave only partial answers.

TABLE 4. STATION PERSONNEL HANDLING PR DUTIES WHEN STATION HAS NO FULL-TIME PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Station Classification:	Manager	Program Director	News Director	Students	Other
Community	1			1	Operations Director (1) Operations Committee (1) Pgm. Informa- tion Dir. (1)
Duties split fractionally (3 stations): $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ as- sistant manager; $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ program director; $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ director of development					
Miscellaneous	3				Producers- Directors (1) Director of ETV (1)
Duties split fractionally (2 stations): $\frac{1}{3}$ manager- $\frac{1}{3}$ program director- $\frac{1}{3}$ producer-director; $\frac{1}{2}$ assistant program director- $\frac{1}{2}$ part-time PR person					
School System	4	4			School PR Director (1) Director of Personnel (1) Radio-TV Re- source per- son (1)
Duties split fractionally (4 stations): $\frac{1}{4}$ program director- $\frac{1}{4}$ news director- $\frac{1}{4}$ student- $\frac{1}{4}$ administrative assistant; $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ program director; $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ secretary; $\frac{1}{2}$ man- ager- $\frac{1}{2}$ program director- $\frac{1}{2}$ news director- $\frac{1}{2}$ continuity depart- ment					
University	2	3			University PR Dept. (2) Continuity or Traffic (2) Operations (1) No one in par- ticular (1)

Duties split fractionally (6 stations): $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ program director; $\frac{2}{3}$ manager- $\frac{1}{3}$ program director- $\frac{1}{3}$ continuity- $\frac{1}{3}$ producer-director; $\frac{2}{3}$ manager- $\frac{1}{3}$ traffic-continuity, public relations-promotion coordinator; $\frac{1}{3}$ manager- $\frac{1}{3}$ program director- $\frac{1}{3}$ university PR dept.; $\frac{1}{2}$ manager- $\frac{1}{2}$ writer-director-promotion person; $\frac{1}{3}$ administrative assistant- $\frac{1}{3}$ university PR dept.- $\frac{1}{3}$ program director

TABLE 5. THE PUBLIC RELATIONS BUDGET

Station Classification:	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	Actually Budgeted or Estimated
Community Station Allocations*	7%	\$15,000	Estimated
STATION # 2	13%	63,000	Budgeted
STATION # 3	10%	25,000	Estimated
STATION # 4	3%	10,000	Estimated
STATION # 5	5%	3,500	Estimated
STATION # 6	5%	20,000	Estimated
STATION # 7	4%	No Answer	No Answer
STATION # 8	2%	250	No Answer
STATION # 9	1-2%	500	No Answer
STATION # 10	1%	2,400	Budgeted
STATION # 11	5%	35,000	Budgeted (And includes salaries)
Community	5%	25,000	Estimated
STATION # 13	3%	17,000	Budgeted
STATION # 14	No Answer	2,500	Estimated
STATION # 15	7.5%	\$2,000	(Includes bud- get for fund- raising activities)

*Three stations did not answer or said they had no set amount of money set aside for public relations activities.

Station Classification:	Per Cent of Station Budget for FM	Amount in Dollars	Actually Budgeted or Estimated
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--------------------------------------

Miscellaneous Station Group*	No Answer	\$3,000	No Answer
STATION # 2	No Answer	500	No Answer
STATION # 3	.1%	No Answer	No Answer
STATION # 4	No Answer	10,000	No Answer

*One station had no FM budget, four stations did not answer.

School System Stations*	1.5%	6,000	Budgeted
STATION # 2	No Answer	1,000	Budgeted
STATION # 3	4.7%	13,000	Estimated (includes applicable salaries)
STATION # 4	No Answer	250	No Answer
STATION # 5	1%	2,500	No Answer
STATION # 6	3%	20,000	Estimated
STATION # 7	5%	No Answer	No Answer
STATION # 8	.6%	1,500	No Answer
STATION # 9	.15%	1,000	Estimated
STATION # 10	2%	No Answer	No Answer

*Seven stations had no budget, one station did not answer.

University Owned Stations*	2%	2,500	Estimated
STATION # 2	1%	2,000	No Answer
STATION # 3	3%	8,000	No Answer
STATION # 4	4.7%	13,000	Estimated (includes applicable salaries)
STATION # 5	1%	1,000	Estimated
STATION # 6	10%	8,500	Budgeted
STATION # 7	4%	15,100	Budgeted

Station Classification:	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	that less policy or pro-
Miscellaneous Station Group*	No Answer	\$8,000	
STATION # 2	No Answer	500	
STATION # 3	.1%	No Answer	
STATION # 4	No Answer	10,000	

*One station had no PR budget, four stations

School System Stations*	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	the total number
STATION # 2	No Answer	1,000	
STATION # 3	4.7%	13,000	

STATION #	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	Without PR Programs	Total % WITH PR Programs
STATION # 4	No Answer	250	14	22.2%
STATION # 5	1%	2,500	7*	22.2%
STATION # 6	3%	20,000	14*	22.2%
STATION # 7	5%	No Answer	16	23.8%
STATION # 8	.6%	1,500		
STATION # 9	.15%	1,000		
STATION # 10	2%	No Answer		

*Seven stations had no budget, one station

University Owned Stations*	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	Without PR Programs	Total % WITH PR Programs
STATION # 2	2%			
STATION # 3	1%			
STATION # 4	3%			
STATION # 5	4.7%			

STATION #	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	Without PR Programs	Total % WITH PR Programs
STATION # 5				
STATION # 6				
STATION # 7				

Station Classification:	Per Cent of Station Budget for PR	Amount in Dollars	Actually Budgeted or Estimated
STATION # 8	7%	\$11,000	Budgeted
STATION # 9	1%	450	No Answer
STATION # 10	6%	1,500	Estimated
STATION # 11	Less Than 1%	45	Budgeted
STATION # 12	No Answer	1,000	Estimated

*Six stations reported no budget, and two stations did not answer. One station reported no budget other than salary for full-time PR Director.

Perhaps the only conclusion that could be made from the figures in Table 5 is that there was no general pattern of budgeting for public relations by ETV stations across the nation. While a few stations seemed to budget quite adequately, the reports of the majority of stations revealed an alarming lack of budgeted funds for the public relations area.

Of course, it was impossible to make any definite conclusions based on the somewhat incomplete returns received. This matter of the PR budget should undoubtedly be given more serious study.

PR POLICY

In determining the scope of the overall public relations function, it seemed important to ask whether stations had an organized program or policy of public relations recorded for all members of the station staff to become

familiar with and follow. The results showed that less than one-quarter of the stations had such a policy or program.

Of the 66 stations, 15 reported they did have such a policy, 49 stations reported they did not, and two stations did not answer. If it can be assumed that the two stations that did not answer the question also do not have such a program, then only 22.7 per cent of the total number of stations report an organized public relations program. These data are reported in Table 6.

TABLE 6. STATIONS REPORTING AN ORGANIZED PR POLICY OR PROGRAM

Station Classification:	Number of Stations	With PR Programs	Without PR Programs	Total % With PR Programs
Community	18	4	14	22.2%
Miscellaneous	9	2	7*	22.2%
School System	18	4	14*	22.2%
University	21	5	16	23.8%
TOTAL	66	15	51	22.7%

*Includes one station not answering, assuming that station had no public relations policy or program.

It was interesting to note that there was practically no difference in the percentage of stations with PR programs among the four divisions of stations, and that

while 20.8 per cent of the total number of LTV stations had full-time public relations people, only 22.7 per cent of this total had an organized public relations program or policy. The latter obviously indicates that at least a few LTV stations have full-time public relations personnel, but have no PR policy with which to guide them in their efforts.

SPECIFIC PR GOALS

Those stations that reported they had organized public relations policies or programs were asked to outline briefly their specific public relations goals. Since each station answered this question differently, the greatest benefit might be derived here by reporting the unedited quotations of the station managers.

Community Stations¹

Specific Public Relations Goals:

- STATION # 1 "Courteous service, encourage visits, build image of community interest; an active interest."
- STATION # 2 "1. A non-commercial community service 'image' to indicate public usage and support.
"2. To create an impression that (the station) is 'Big and Getting Bigger,' Everybody loves a winner."
- STATION # 3 "Audience and donations, favorable image, regular viewing."
- STATION # 4 "Get all residents of the area to view at least one of our programs each week."

¹Consecutive station numbers merely are used to identify the comments of different station managers.

One additional station that said it had no organized public relations program said its PR goals were: "To inform the public about the offerings of an ETV station, thus building an awareness of the value of such a facility as a community cultural asset."

Miscellaneous Station Group

Specific Public Relations Goals:

- STATION # 1 "To maintain a constant projection of positive information as well as a real sensitivity to felt needs."
- STATION # 2 "Build up audience, emphasize service aspects of station."

School System Owned Stations

Specific Public Relations Goals:

- STATION # 1 "Maintain favorable image of station through 1) quality programming; 2) adequate news coverage; 3) considerate handling of all calls, letters, etc., and following this obtaining a broadened base of financial support for the station."
- STATION # 2 "Create a favorable image of the station . . . inform community re programs on the air . . . establish close relationship with community leaders . . . establish favorable editorial support for the station."
- STATION # 3 "Create image of station as one with good programs that offer enlightenment with showmanship. Build understanding of economic need of station."
- STATION # 4 "Good communication as to objective of TV . . . encourage parent participation where possible . . . through use of 'rich' resource person, show program on ball and related to current society."

University Owned Stations

Specific Public Relations Goals:

- STATION # 1 "All program publicity should emit from P.R. Office. Any publicity concerning personnel should emit from office. Better promote [the station] through cooperation with Civic organizations and groups (Library, Clubs, etc.)."
- STATION # 2 "1. Inform general public of service and purpose of station.
 "2. Inform general public of specific programs being broadcast.
 "3. Keep University administration and faculty informed of our activities.
 "4. Provide internal communication among staff of station.
 "5. Promote the image of the University and the station nationally."
- STATION # 3 (No full-time PR person) "Inform general & specific audiences of our general & specific program services--serving all media."
- STATION # 4 " . . . We design programs for segmented audiences--our main goal is to pass information about specific programs to those for whom these programs are intended--and generally to make the public aware. The specifically directed promotion is most important."

A fifth station reported an organized PR policy, but listed no specific public relations goals.

While these stated PR goals may not be entirely indicative of the stations' public relations policies or programs, at least they add some support to the hypothesis that the majority of PR "programs" are primarily promotional or publicity programs. There is a recurring indication here that publicity and promotion of the station and its programs are possibly the prime elements of the majority of stated PR goals.

FREQUENCY OF SETTING OR EVALUATING PR POLICY

Although only 15 stations reported they had specific PR programs written down for the staff to become familiar with and follow, nearly all stations reported they made some effort to set or evaluate public relations policy. This discrepancy may have been caused by the fact that while few stations had written policy, many may have had word of mouth policy or other more informal policies. In any case, the data in Table 7 should be reviewed with the caution in mind that the foregoing discrepancy did occur.

TABLE 7. FREQUENCY OF SETTING OR EVALUATING PR POLICY

Policy Set or Evaluated:	Station Classification:				Total	%
	Com- munity	Miscel- laneous	School	Univ.		
Occasionally	5	3	3	5	16	24.2%
Monthly	1	0	1	0	2	3.0%
Annually	3	1	3	0	7	10.6%
Irregularly	7	1	5	10	23	34.9%
Not since sta- tion signed on	1	1	1	2	5	7.6%
Never	0	2	5	3	10	15.2%
No Answer	1	1	0	1	3	4.5%
Total	18	9	18	21	66	

KEEPING STAFF PR CONSCIOUS

To determine the station managers' efforts at keeping

their staffs public relations conscious, the managers were asked with what kind of frequency they attempted to keep staff members aware of their PR responsibilities. As reported in Table 8 by station classifications, a total of 25 managers reported occasional efforts, while 25 stated they attempted to keep their staffs PR conscious at all times, 10 at regular intervals, and three station managers said never. Three stations did not answer the question.

The evidence here would indicate that ETV station managers are aware of the importance of keeping staff members PR conscious, since 92.5 per cent reported efforts in this area, from occasional attempts to regular and constant attempts.

TABLE 8. EFFORTS MADE TO KEEP STAFF MEMBERS PR CONSCIOUS

Station Classification:	At All Times	regu- larly	Occa- sionally	Never	No Answer
Community	9	3	5	0	1
Miscellaneous	3	2	3	0	1
School	7	2	8	1	0
University	6	4	9	1	1
Total	25	11	25	2	3
Total Per Cent	37.9%	16.7%	37.9%	3.0%	4.5%

METHODS OF KEEPING STAFF PR CONSCIOUS

There was, of course, a great deal of individual

difference in the methods of keeping staff members public relations conscious. These methods are summarized in the paragraphs below.

Community Owned Stations

A West Coast station manager stated this method of keeping his staff aware of PR responsibilities: "Through periodic staff meetings, personal contacts with those most often in direct touch with the public, and through staff news bulletins." An East Coast station manager said, "Not by any 'program,' but by working closely and personally with other members of the staff." And a third manager said, "1. Assign projects appropriate to positions which are part of overall plan. Policy of involvement. 2. Constant flow of information."

Other methods mentioned by stations were staff meetings (by nine stations), memos (3), personal contact (2), publications and bulletin boards (3), precept and example, ask staff participation, staffers in pay envelopes, and by calling for assistance with civic groups, speakers, and meetings in and away from studios.

Miscellaneous Station Group

One station keeps its staff PR conscious

Through modifying offerings to meet the needs and criticisms of the public; also we try to impress upon them that they are representing education to the public in a way that has not been possible before, and that the image of education may be good or bad as they impress the public.

A second station said by "Making them feel individually part of [the station]." Other methods mentioned were staff meetings (by three stations), personal relationships (by five stations), and memos (1).

School System Owned Stations

The manager of a southeastern station said, "Inform staff members of new programs and projects--keep staff in touch on Fund Drive activities--encourage staff members to let friends and neighbors know about the station."

Other methods used were staff meetings (by six stations), conferences, and precept and example on the part of the station manager.

University Owned Stations

Generally these stations used such methods as staff meetings (eight stations), personal contact, memos, "courtesy, conduct and cheerfulness," seminars, and informal methods to keep staff members aware of PR. More specifically, six stations made these comments:

- STATION # 1 "Meeting the public, both in and out of the station; appearances at meetings; distribution of monthly program booklets."
- STATION # 2 "Present public relations problems have 2 aspects--campus-wide and community-wide. Campus problems handled in staff meetings--community ignored by regular staff."
- STATION # 3 "1) To keep I.R. Director informed of program information concerning local productions for publicity purposes.
"2) Try to stress the importance of one news outlet for publicity."

STATION # 4 "Regular staff meetings include interpretation of program and public relations approaches for up coming months in order that staff may be aware and use in contacts with public."

STATION # 5 "Explanations of station policy and the purpose of University & station decisions and actions. Pointing out the need for two-way information exchange."

STATION # 6 "They are told by the president of the University and by me to become involved in as many professional, state and local organizations as possible and to contribute to these organizations. They are always advised to speak & publish as much as possible."

FREQUENCY OF STAFF MEETINGS

Station managers who conducted staff meetings were asked to report the frequency of these meetings in Question #26, in order that a judgment might be made as to the amount of regular contact by the manager with his entire staff.

TABLE 9. FREQUENCY OF STAFF MEETINGS

Station Classifi- cation:	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Bi- Monthly	Irregu- larly	No Meet- ings	No An- swer
Community	0	5	2	0	9	0	2
Miscellaneous	3	2	0	0	4	0	0
School System	0	3	3	1	9	0	2
University	0	5	2	1	9	1	3
Total	3	15	7	2	31	1	7
Total Per Cent	4.6%	22.7%	10.6%	3.0%	47.0%	1.5%	10.6%

The figures in Table 9 indicate that the majority,

or 47 per cent, of these station managers meet only irregularly with their entire staff, while 22.7 per cent conduct weekly staff meetings, with the remainder split in much smaller percentages. It is interesting to note, however, that only one manager of the entire 66 reports no staff meetings at all.

To judge the stations' involvement in industry affairs, as well as their efforts in national promotion and publicity, station managers were asked whether their station competed actively for industry awards and honors (Question #34). Only 14 stations, or roughly 21 per cent, reported regular competition for these honors, while 25 stations, or 37.9 per cent, reported occasional efforts. Eighteen stations, or 27.3 per cent, never competed.

One station manager of a western station, in reporting that his station never competes for awards, said, "We exist to provide quality educational opportunities to our pupils and staff, not to enter contests."

TABLE 10. STATIONS ENTERING COMPETITIONS FOR INDUSTRY AWARDS

Station Classification:	Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
Community	7	8	3	0	18
Miscellaneous	2	5	0	2	9
School System	1	4	3	10	18
University	4	8	3	6	21
Total	14	25	9	18	66
Total Per Cent	21.2%	37.9%	13.6%	27.3%	

MOST VALUABLE PR EFFORT

In an attempt to summarize the General Category I pertaining to the overall scope of the public relations function, station managers were asked to describe their most valuable public relations effort (Question #35). Of course, each station manager answered this question differently, but the comments of the individual managers are worth noting here. Where possible, unedited quotations were used to summarize this area.

Community Owned Stations

Most Valuable Public Relations Efforts

An East Coast station manager said, "No one project; just a great deal of day-to-day hard work. We try to make sure that everything that leaves this office is useful to the people to whom we send it." Another East Coast station manager was more specific, when he said his station's best effort was:

Establishment of a community fund-raising campaign in our 2nd year of operation. This involved cooperation with 4 area commercial TV stations, heavy newspaper support, corporate and associations support and a strong push for subscribers on a personal level.

Several stations mentioned outstanding programs as their best public relations, three stations value an annual fund-raising auction, one station's best effort was a 1963 Open House which attracted 5,000 people, and one manager said his best effort was "575 speeches . . . preceding opening of the station."

Five stations had no answer to the question, one station said, "Can't single one out," and a midwestern manager reported, "Each of the 18 [board] members of [the station] would give a different answer depending on the circumstances. The station has P.M. activities in addition to member P.M. activities."

Miscellaneous Station Group

Most Valuable Public Relations Efforts:

Only five stations answered this question in this station classification. The answers:

STATION # 1 "Difficult to say. Perhaps best was to bury announcements in programs during political conventions to see if people would tire of said conventions & turn to our stations. Booklet we offered was HOW TO CATCH BIGGER FISH. We gave away about 350 of these with a promo for LTV attached."

STATION # 2 "Acceptance by the 2 major educational agencies in city that responsibility for getting station going was theirs."

STATION # 3 "Good programming, excellent press relations, 'Meet the Press' type public affairs program."

STATION # 4 "Public LTV Report over the station's facilities."

STATION # 5 "Too new yet to make any estimation."

School System Owned Stations

Most Valuable Public Relations Efforts:

STATION # 1 "Editorial support by the press and local commercial TV--a good reputation in the community."

STATION # 2 "Quality program production."

Other stations mentioned quality programming and

the program guide; word of mouth, meetings and speakers; TV Guide, news releases, speakers; ads in local papers (2 stations); outstanding lessons (programs); promotional campaign when station came on air; an in-service program for teachers; the purchase of the station from commercial interests; and a brochure put out before the station signed on.

University Owned Stations

Most Valuable Public Relations Efforts:

- STATION # 1 "Programming is the key to audience building. Unless viewers can find satisfaction in the cultural, information programming being supplied, promotional efforts are to no avail. Good programs are good public relations. Our most valuable promotion piece is our monthly program guide."
- STATION # 2 "The initial and only fund-raising campaign, in which [the vice-president of the University] raised nearly \$2,000,000 in money, goods, and services to build and equip the station."
- STATION # 3 "News stories, both factual and feature, about the growth of the station which were published in area newspapers."
- STATION # 4 "Having special meetings at studio with representatives of all local civic groups. The mailing out of promotion bits on a monthly basis to 200 local civic leaders."
- STATION # 5 "1. Talks made by the manager and director of community relations before service clubs, PIA's, etc. 2. Newspaper advertising."

Other stations mentioned promotional efforts in behalf of particular programs, the establishment of better working relations with the newspapers, advertising in newspapers, the reputation of a sister FM station, an annual open house, and the stations' program guides.

Again it is very evident that many of these station managers speak entirely in terms of publicity and promotion when supposedly speaking of their stations' entire public relations efforts. The evidence would indicate, as hypothesized in this study, that public relations per se remains indistinguishable from publicity and promotion to much of the management of ETV.

SECTION V

GENERAL CATEGORY II

Questions 14-25 on the inventory were designed to determine the scope of the promotion and publicity efforts of the stations, including press relations and relations with other media. This area of publicity and promotion was included under General Category II for the purposes of this study.

Question #15 asked, "Do you make use of press releases, feature stories, program guides and/or other devices to promote your programs?" and station managers were asked to note their use of these devices.

Of the 66 stations, a total of 55 stations, or 83.3 per cent, reported regular use of such devices, while eight stations made occasional use, two stations said they seldom used such devices, and one station did not answer.

This high percentage of regular use indicates that these ETV station managers recognize the importance of publicity and promotion to their stations.

A fact of some interest is that of the two stations that reported infrequent use of promotional devices, one station was in the community owned category and one was in the school system owned category of stations.

USE OF COMMUNICATION DEVICES

To get an indication of what promotional devices stations used across the country, and which were most and least popular, the managers were asked to check the communication devices used by their stations.

It was discovered that the printing of program logs in local and area newspapers was the device used most by the stations. Sixty-three of the 66 stations reported their logs were printed by local papers. Studio tours, station promotion announcements, letters and bulletins, news releases, and program guides were also extremely high in popularity.

The complete breakdown of these communication devices as used by the four divisions of stations is reported in detail in Table 11.

WRITERS OF PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS

Question #17 was somewhat similar in nature to question #8 on the inventory. That is, question #8 sought information regarding the personnel handling PR duties when no full-time PR personnel were employed, while question #17 sought information concerning the personnel assigned to write publicity and promotional materials. Thus, some

TABLE 11. THE USE OF PROMOTIONAL AND PUBLICITY DEVICES

Devices Used:	Station Classification:				Total Using Devices
	Com-munity	Miscel-laneous	School	Univer-sity	
Program logs in papers	18	9	16	20	63
Program Guides	15	7	13	19	56
Station Promo's	17	7	14	18	56
News releases	17	9	9	19	54
Letters, etc.	17	6	13	16	52
Studio tours	17	7	10	15	49
TV Guide	16	5	10	16	47
Advertisements	13	2	10	15	40
Posters, etc.	12	4	8	12	36
Speakers	15	6	7	7	35
Meetings	13	5	9	7	34
Stories to trade press	14	5	7	7	33
Displays	11	3	7	8	29
Special Events	11	2	5	9	27
Inserts	10	2	5	8	25
Stories to NAEB publications	8	2	5	8	23
Cross-promotion	4	3	3	9	19
Infor. racks	3	3	4	6	16
Contests, etc.	4	4	3	2	13
Auto stickers	6	0	2	2	10
Stories to AFBE publications	1	1	2	2	6
Others*	3	1	3	1	8

*Other devices included cross-promotion with commercial UHF station; car cards; personal appearances; spots on commercial TV; utility bill stuffers; special high school bulletin boards; and the distribution of materials in the schools.

stations without full-time PR personnel reported much the same personnel involved in each area. The data is reported in Table 12.

It is difficult to make any conclusions concerning the data included in Table 12, but it seems apparent that most stations depend on piece-meal efforts in getting promotion devices written. A number of stations depend on part-time public relations/promotional personnel, with only 15 of the stations, or 22.7 per cent of the 66 stations, having a full-time public relations person in charge of this area.

Interesting here is that in Table 2 the data showed that 25.8 per cent of these stations had full-time public relations people. The apparent discrepancy in the two percentages is assumed to lie in the fact that in some stations, the full-time PR people are not the sole source of promotional and publicity materials.

PROGRAM GUIDES

It was assumed that many stations would depend upon program guides for regular promotional uses, and the fact that more than 80 per cent of the stations reported they published guides validated this assumption. Station managers were then asked to report the frequency of publication of these guides, the size, the printing process used, and the cost of printing.

TABLE 12. WRITERS OF PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS

Station	Station	PR	Program	
Classification:	Manager	Director	Director	Others
Community	1	7	0	Asst. Manager (1) Operations Mgr. (1) Program Information Director (1)
Duties split fractionally (7 stations): 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 part-time PR person-1/3 producers-announcers; 1/5 manager-1/5 program director-1/5 part-time PR person-1/5 Trustee volunteers-1/5 president of Corporation; 1/3 manager-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 part-time PR person-1/3 foundation members; 1/3 director of development-3/4 operations coordinator; and 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 part-time PR person				
Miscellaneous	1	2	0	Director of ETV (1)
Duties split fractionally (4 stations): 1/3 manager-1/3 program director; 1/3 producer-director-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 program director-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director				
School	4	2	3	Director of Traffic & Continuity (1) Part-time PR person (2)
Duties split fractionally (6 stations): 1/3 program director-1/3 news director-1/3 students-1/3 administrative assistant; 1/3 program director-1/3 network clerk; 1/3 program director-1/3 part-time PR person (2); 1/3 manager-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 news director-1/3 part-time PR person				
University	2	4	1	Traffic (1) Part-time PR people (3)
Duties split fractionally (10 stations): 1/3 manager-1/3 production manager-1/3 secretary; 1/3 continuity department-1/3 university PR department; 1/3 program director-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 continuity department-1/3 producer-director; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 traffic department; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director-1/3 university PR department; 1/3 operations department-1/3 university PR department-1/3 students; 1/3 manager-1/3 program director; 1/3 manager-1/3 part-time PR person; 1/3 administrative assistant-1/3 part-time PR person-1/3 university PR department				

A total of 55 stations reported they published program guides with some regularity, 12 stations reported they did not publish guides, and one station did not answer.

(Since 55 stations were reported as using guides in Table 11, it was assumed that the loss of the three stations in this category was due to the fact that the three stations did not publish guides regularly.)

A total of 81.8 per cent of the 66 stations publish program guides regularly, while only 18.2 per cent do not publish guides. These data are further analyzed in Table 13.

TABLE 13. FREQUENCY OF PROGRAM GUIDE PUBLICATION

Frequency of Publication:	Station Classification:				Total	%
	Com- munity	Miscel- laneous	School	Uni- versity		
Weekly	1	2	6	2	11	16.7%
Semi-monthly	1	0	1	0	2	3.1%
Monthly	13	2	4	16	35	53.0%
Quarterly	0	0	1	1	2	3.1%
Bi-monthly	1	0	0	0	1	1.5%
Thrice yearly	0	2	0	0	2	3.1%
No Guides	2	3	5	2	12	18.0%
No Answer	0	0	1	0	1	1.5%
Total	18	9	18	21	66	

SIZE OF GUIDES

The number of pages of the individual guides varied from station to station and among each division of stations.

In the community owned division of stations, the number of pages of the guides varied from one to 32 pages, with the average being approximately 11 pages.

In the miscellaneous group of stations, the number of pages ranged from one to eight pages, with the average being about four pages.

The size of the guides of the school system owned stations varied from two pages to 24 pages, with the average being approximately six pages.

The university owned group of stations had program guides ranging from one page to 20 pages, but the average was eight pages. The range of sizes of the guides is included with the method and cost of printing in Table 14.

PRINTING METHODS AND COSTS

Most stations (30) used the offset printing process for publishing their guides, while the letterpress method finished a poor second with 12 users. The costs of printing the guides varied from methods used to the size of the editions. Specific information is included in Table 14.

Many variables exist which cause the wide differences in the cost of the printing of the guides, including the number of pages, the dimensions of the publications, the method of printing, the locale of the station, and so on.

TABLE 14. PRINTING METHODS AND COSTS OF PUBLISHING PROGRAM GUIDES

Community Owned Stations	Size of Edition	Number of Pages	Method of Printing	Cost of Printing (Includes Postage)
Station # 1	3,500	3	Offset	\$150.00
Station # 2	16,000	3	Letterpress	1,200.00
Station # 3	5,000	6	Letterpress	475.00
Station # 4	2,000	24	No Answer	205.00
Station # 5	1,200	10	Offset	175.00
Station # 6	8,000	8	Offset	No Answer
Station # 7	60	1	Duplication	10-15
Station # 8	2,700	4	Offset	No Answer
Station # 9	4,000	12	Letterpress	575.00
Station # 10	15,000	8	Offset	350.00
Station # 11	1,000	6	No Answer	No Answer
Station # 12	6,000	16	Letterpress	220.00
Station # 13	3,200	32	Offset	350.00
Station # 14	450	15	Duplication	No Answer
Station # 15	17,000	12	Offset	1,000.00
Miscellaneous Station Group				
Station # 1	4,000	4	Offset	75.00
Station # 2	4,000	4	Offset	75.00
Station # 3	No Answer	8	Duplication	No Answer
Station # 4	No Answer	1	Duplication	No Answer
Station # 5	1,400	5	Duplication	140.00
School System Stations				
Station # 1	15,000	4	Offset	425.00
Station # 2	4,600	4	Offset	250.00
Station # 3	400	4	Duplication & Offset	No Answer
Station # 4	40,000	8	Letterpress	350.00 (sic)

School System Stations	Size of Edition	Number of Pages	Method of Printing	Cost of Printing (includes mortgage)
Station # 5	5,000	No Answer	Offset	\$500.00
Station # 6	12,000	24	Offset	Donated
Station # 7	5,000	12	Offset	250.00
Station # 8	13	3	Duplicated	No Answer
Station # 9	1,000	3	Offset	10.00 (sic)
Station # 10	400	2	Duplication	No Answer
Station # 11	50	2	Duplication	5.29
Station # 12	75	3	Duplication	7.50
Station # 13	15,000	8	Letterpress	360.00 (At Cost)
Station # 14	6,000	8	Offset	180.00
University Owned Stations				
Station # 1	3,000	5	Letterpress	200.00
Station # 2	825	18	Offset	40.00
Station # 3	2,500	7	Offset	250.00
Station # 4	4,000	1	Offset	250.00
Station # 5	650	4	Duplication	15.00
Station # 6	1,200	6	Offset	65.00
Station # 7	3,000	18	Offset	300.00
Station # 8	5,000	10	Offset	100.00 (sic)
Station # 9	14,500	12	Offset	450.00
Station # 10	7,000	1	Duplication	150.00
Station # 11	2,500	8	Letterpress	350.00
Station # 12	3,500	4	Offset	200.00
Station # 13	2,000	4	Offset	135.00
Station # 14	1,000	8	Letterpress	220.00
Station # 15	900	8	Offset	160.00
Station # 16	4,500	4	Letterpress	350.00
Station # 17	14,000	2	Offset	350.00

Thus, the figures in Table 14 should be accepted as overall approximations of these factors for general information purposes.

MAILING LISTS

All but four stations of the total of 66 had mailing lists of some size. Two of the community owned stations, and two of the university owned stations had no such lists.

These lists varied in size from 450 to 60,000 among the community stations, from 300 to 3,500 among the miscellaneous group of stations, from 60 to 12,000 among the school system stations, and from 200 to 14,000 among the university-owned stations. There seemed to be no general pattern of an "average" size mailing list, since here again no two situations were truly alike.

Stations also noted many different ways in which their mailing lists were compiled. Many reported a combination of methods.

TABLE 15. THE FORMULATION OF MAILING LISTS BY NTV STATIONS

Station Classification:	Subscription tations	Requests (Mail & Phone)	Requests (Other)	Original Mailings	Other*
Community	13	6	9	4	4
Miscellaneous	0	4	5	1	4
School	2	12	6	9	5
University	5	15	13	12	4
Total	20	37	33	26	17

*Other included memberships in associations, lists of legislators and prominent persons, list building and swapping, visitor registrations and contributors, lists from other stations, AAT, and schools, fan mail response, response to speakers, lists of probable interest persons.

PRESS RELATIONS

Thirty-six stations reported regular, personal contact with members of the press, while 16 stations reported the holding of press conferences when there was news of significance. Fourteen stations reported irregular contact with the press, but only seven stations seldom meet the press.

Thus, slightly more than 50 per cent (54.5 per cent) of the 66 stations have regular contact with the press, while only 10.6 per cent seldom meet with the press.

Notable is that 16 of the 36 stations that had regular contact with the press also held press conferences, and three stations that met only irregularly or seldom with the press found that the press also had little time for them and their projects.

Of the publicity and news items that the stations send the press, 43 stations, or 74.2 per cent of the total, reported that the press used these items regularly. Twelve stations reported the press used their items occasionally, while only three stations reported the press used them seldom. Two stations did not answer this question.

If any summary statement could be made here about the use of promotion and publicity by the 66 LTV stations, it would be that the majority apparently recognize the value of getting the word out about their programming.

More than 80 per cent of all stations used many

TABLE 16. FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH THE PRESS BY STATIONS

Station Classification:	Regu- larly	Held Press Conferences	Irregu- larly	Seldom	Press Seldom had Time
Community	16*	8	2	0	0
Miscellaneous	6**	1	0	2	0
School	7	7	6	2	5
University	7	5	6	3	2
Total	36	21	14	7	7

*Seven stations reported regular contact plus press conferences, one reported press conferences but otherwise only irregular contact.

**One station reported regular contact plus press conferences.

Six of seven stations reported regular contact plus press conferences; one station reported regular contact plus press conferences, but still found the press had little time for its projects; one station reported press conferences but otherwise only irregular contact, and two stations seldom met with the press and found that the press seldom had time for them.

Two stations reported regular contact plus press conferences; two stations reported press conferences but otherwise only irregular contact; one station met irregularly and found that the press seldom had time for its projects.

TABLE 17. USE OF STATION PUBLICITY AND NEWS ITEMS BY THE PRESS

Station Classification:	Regu- larly	Occasion- ally	Seldom	Never	No Answer
Community	18	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	6	2	0	0	1
School System	10	5	3	0	0
University	15	5	0	0	1
Total	49	12	3	0	2
Total per Cent	74.2%	18.2%	4.5%	0.0%	3.1%

different kinds of publicity and promotional devices regularly, which included the publication of program guides; more than 90 per cent of the stations reported mailing lists of varied sizes; 54.5 per cent reported regular, personal contact with the press; and 74.2 per cent of the 66 stations reported that the press used on a regular basis news and publicity items sent them.

These figures, compared with those in other categories of the study, would seem to indicate support further for the hypothesis that ETV makes its greatest "public relations" effort in the field of publicity and promotion.

SECTION VI

GENERAL CATEGORY III

The third general category of questions on the inventory was concerned with identifying the amount of community involvement and service of the ETV stations in a public relations capacity. Questions 27 through 33 sought information in this category.

To determine whether viewers of the station were welcome guests, station managers were asked whether or not viewers were freely invited to attend studio broadcasts.

Nineteen of the 66 stations answered that viewers were invited to attend all studio broadcasts, while 20 stations said viewers were invited to selected broadcasts. Twenty-three stations never invited guests to attend broadcasts, but eight of these qualified the answer by stating

they had no room. Four stations did not answer the question.

TABLE 18. STATIONS INVITING VIEWERS TO ATTEND STUDIO BROADCASTS

Station Classification:	All broad- casts	Selected Broadcasts	Never Invited	No An- swer	Total
Community	7	6	3*	2	18
Miscellaneous	2	4	3*	0	9
School System	4	5	9*	0	18
University	6	5	8*	2	21
Total	19	20	23	4	66
Total Per Cent	28.8%	30.3%	34.8%	6.1%	

*A total of eight of these stations said they had no room for viewers

All divisions of stations seemed to be split fairly evenly in this area, in that there were no great differences in policy noted between any of the classes of stations.

This plus the fact that 49 of the 66 stations reported earlier that they conducted studio tours indicated that where there was room for guests in the studios, guests were invited to visit stations in the majority of cases.

FAN LETTERS

As another check on community involvement in the station, managers were asked to estimate the number of "fan" letters their stations received on the average each week, and whether or not their promotional efforts actively

encouraged letter writing on the part of their viewers.

Nearly all stations received some fan mail each week, but the majority, 28 stations or 42.7 per cent, said they only encouraged letter writing on occasion. Seventeen stations, 25.8 per cent of the total, answered "yes" to actively encouraging letter writing, while 20 stations, 30.3 per cent, reported they did not actively campaign for letters. One station did not answer.

The range of letters received varied from station to station and among the different classifications of stations. Among the community stations the range of letters received was from 5-10 to 700-800 per week; among the miscellaneous group from zero to 400 per week; among the school system stations from zero to 500 per week; and zero to 300 per week among the university owned stations.

These percentages and average numbers of letters received per week are further analyzed in Table 19.

STUDIO SPACE OFFERED

It was interesting to note that while many stations conduct tours of their studios and nearly 59 per cent of the stations invite viewers to attend at least some studio broadcasts, only 13 stations, 27.3 per cent, offered studio space for meetings of local civic groups and clubs. Again no great differences were noted in policies between different classes of stations, with the exception that the community stations made their studios available a much greater

TABLE 19. REPORT OF FAN MAIL RECEIVED EACH WEEK BY STATIONS

Letters Encouraged:	Station Classification:				Total	%
	Com- munity	Miscel- laneous	School	Univ.		
Range Received	5-800	0-400	0-500	0-300		
Yes Letters received*	6 208	4 163	5 119	2 50	17	25.8%
No Letters received*	6 29	0 0	8 5	6 13	20	30.3%
Occasionally Letters received*	6 63	5 63	5 27	12 41	28	42.7%
No Answer	0	0	0	1	1	2.2%

*Indicates average number of letters received each week by the number of stations given immediately above.

TABLE 20. STATIONS OFFERING STUDIO SPACE FOR LOCAL GROUP MEETINGS

Station Classification:	Studios Offered	Studios NOT Offered	No Answer	Totals
Community	9	9	0	18
Miscellaneous	1	8	0	9
School System	2	16	0	18
University	6	13	2	21
Total	18	46	2	66
Total Per Cent	27.3%	69.7%	3.0%	

percentage of the time than did any of the other station divisions.

TALENT AVAILABLE

Station managers were asked whether or not station personnel were made available for community activities. The majority of station managers, 29 of the 66, said this was an individual decision on the part of the talent or personnel, but 20 stations said their talent was available.

TABLE 21. AVAILABILITY OF TALENT OR PERSONNEL FOR LOCAL FUNCTIONS

Station Classification:	Talent available:			Individual Decision
	Yes	No	Occasionally	
Community	8	2	2	7
Miscellaneous	3	3	1	2
School System	5	2	4	9
University	4	4	4	11

NOTE: No totals or percentages are given here since many stations answered in more than one category in qualifying their answers.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHARITIES

stations were almost unanimous in their responses to question #32 asking whether or not they made financial contributions to charities or community undertakings. As a group they do not. Actually, the answer might have been anticipated since these stations as non-commercial enterprises generally have no such funds for contributions.

A few stations noted regular or occasional contributions on the part of employees, but not a single return indicated that any station made regular contributions to outside organizations.

However, many of the comments of the station managers concerning their policy in this matter were of some interest. The station managers of the university, school system-owned, and the miscellaneous station group either said that they had no funds for donations or that school or state policy forbade such contributions.

Among the community owned stations, the consensus was that no funds were available there either. As one station manager put it, "Since we depend on contributions ourselves we feel our funds should be used for our own work." To which another added, "As a community supported station, we feel we are not authorized to divert gifts to other uses."

Two other station managers, with tongues-in-cheek perhaps, said, "We are close to a charity ourselves!" and "We believe that it is more desirable for non-profit corporations to receive than to give."

However, a West Coast station came up with the answer of how to contribute to other non-profit organizations without making financial contributions. Said the station manager, "Our contributions are in the form of special programs to train their volunteer solicitors."

PROGRAMS RELATED TO COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

Thirty-eight stations, or 57.6 per cent of the total, reported they regularly presented programs related to community problems or issues. Twenty-seven stations, or 40.9 per cent, reported they had no such programs. One station did not answer the question.

TABLE 22. STATIONS WITH PROGRAMS RELATED TO COMMUNITY NEEDS

Station Classification:	Stations with Programs	Stations without Programs	No Answer
Community	12	6	0
Miscellaneous	4	4	1
School System	8	10	0
University	14	7	0
Total	38	27	1
Total Per Cent	57.6%	40.9%	1.5%

Programs mentioned by those stations presenting them included local public affairs programs, documentaries, panel discussions, community affairs programs, a community calendar, a telephone panel discussion show, and other programs produced in behalf of specific civic and community groups.

SECTION VII

GENERAL CATEGORY IV

The final five questions on the inventory were

intended primarily for community-owned stations, or those stations that depend on financial contributions from the public or outside organizations to support their stations. In addition to the community stations, however, two stations in the division of school system-owned stations, and two university-owned stations reported some fund-raising activities.

All four of the latter stations reported that only 5 to 10 per cent of their income came from outside contributions and none of the stations had a full-time person in charge of solicitations only. Three of the four stations, however, considered fund-raising an integral part of their public relations programs.

Community Stations

Of the 13 community stations in this division of stations, 12 stations provided partial or total answers to Question #36 which sought a breakdown on their financial support. Six stations did not answer this question. Of the 12 stations responding to the question, there was a variety of answers. The analysis of this financial pattern is presented in Table 23.

Ten of the community stations had a planned fund-raising campaign in operation at all times, five conducted campaigns annually, one stated it would begin its campaign shortly, and two stations did not answer this question.

TABLE 23. ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY STATIONS

STATIONS		Percentage of station income from:			Other
		The Public	Foundations	Government	
Station #	1	30%	No Answer	No Answer	30% (Public Schools) 30% (Miscellaneous)
Station #	2	60%	No Answer	No Answer	No Answer
Station #	3	10-15%	10%	No Answer	20-25% (Operations)
Station #	4	10%	20%	25%	10% (Commercial TV) 35% (Miscellaneous)
Station #	5	30%	5%	0%	65% (Programming Contracts)
Station #	6	60%	10%	0%	30% (Public Schools)
Station #	7	4%	6%	0%	80% (Public Schools) 10% (Operations)
Station #	8	25%	0%	0%	75% (Public Schools)
Station #	9	25%	0%	75%	0%
Station #	10	10%	5%	30%	55% (Schools, colleges, business & industry)
Station #	11	20%	20%	3%	57% (Public Schools & county grant)
Station #	12	60%	25%	0%	15% (Business & Miscellaneous)

Similarly, ten stations reported they employed full-time fund-raisers, while seven stations reported they did not, and one station did not indicate an answer.

The full-time fund-raiser was known as the director of development at six stations, and as business manager, director of community relations, community coordinator, and assistant general manager for community relations and finance at each of the other four stations.

Of the stations without full-time fund-raisers, this duty was handled by the general manager at three stations, and by an assistant general manager, administrative assistant, and a finance committee at three of the other four stations. The fourth station made no designation of who handled this duty.

Twelve of the 18 stations considered fund-raising to be an integral part of their public relations programs. Three stations did not, although one of these said it was closely related. One station said, "PR is an integral part of our fund-raising program," and one station did not answer this question.

The fund-raising activities used to best advantage by the community stations included direct TV appeals (by nine stations); campaigns conducted by volunteer solicitors (8); direct mail appeals (7); auctions (3); personal contact (2); solicitation by corporate team and persons of community stature (1 each). Two stations did not answer.

In summary, 67 per cent of these station managers considered fund-raising to be an integral part of their public relations programs, while one station considered public relations integral to its fund-raising program.

Most stations, or 83.3 per cent, had a fund-raising program in operation either at all times or annually, and 55.5 per cent of these stations had a full-time person in charge of fund-raising activities.

SECTION VIII

SOME ADDITIONAL COMMENT

At the end of the inventory, station managers were given the opportunity to express their opinions concerning any phase of the study they felt might be worth additional comment. Many of these opinions were of great interest, and the most valuable are included here, as much as possible in their unedited form.

Concerning the importance of public relations to educational television, the manager of a metropolitan community-owned station said:

One of the greatest problems facing ETV today is the fact that too many ETV stations undervalue the importance of a planned and well executed public relations program for their station's programs. If station managers do not do a better job in this area, or do not employ the professional personnel needed to do this job properly the entire ETV movement will suffer. The image of educational television now being projected is calculated in many communities to disinterest the public rather than intrigue it. This is a fatal flaw. It is a top principle of progressive education that the student must be intrigued and titillated if he is to learn.

A deep-south university owned station had a similar comment on this situation from its station manager:

Public Relations in ETV has a special duty. It must erase the preconceived ideas of educational television and activate interest in the ETV of today.

The Public Relations person or persons must work closely with other communications media and ETV staff members to promote the operation in the community. Each person working for ETV must do his share of P.R.

It would be interesting to note how many ETV stations in the country have one person assigned to P.R. duties alone.

The director of a two-station network in the midwest said:

P.R. for most ETV stations is a luxury which they can't afford but which is sadly needed. I don't think any one knows just what brand of P.R. is most acceptable. We are working on the problem now and hope to arrive in the not too distant future at what we believe will be a true answer to what is the best approach to P.R. for ETV stations. I think the present approach both for ETV & Commercial interests is all wrong.

Several stations noted their lack of public relations efforts by explaining the cause of such obstacles to good public relations and what their plans were for the future.

Said the manager of a university-owned West Coast station:

We are a small, new station owned by a public junior college district. We hope shortly to remove some of the legislative restrictions on our programming and promotion.

Public relations & promotion is an area on which we will begin to concentrate much more heavily next season. We felt we needed something to promote first.

The manager of a midwest university-owned station had similar problems:

It is envisioned that the present somewhat limited staff of [the station] will be greatly expanded when it is provided with permanent quarters in about two years. That expanded staff will provide, as will the greatly enlarged quarters, for the carrying out of many public relations procedures which are deemed advisable by [the station's] present management but which cannot be carried on because of the comparatively limited staff and physical facilities.

Two other university-owned stations also had financial and personnel problems. A midwest station manager said, "This station has been on the air less than 4 months. Time and personnel are not available to do what needs to be done." And a West Coast station manager reported:

We are having to operate our TV stations on a shoestring, a situation I do not recommend. As a result, our public relations and promotional efforts are limited although this is not as serious as the limitation imposed on our local program productions.

A southwestern station presented a more unusual situation:

Interesting local problem: management feels it would be unwise politically to have a Public Relations Department labeled as such and so budgeted. This is one reason for lack of organization in this area.

A bi-monthly program guide, formerly published, has been discontinued to save money, feeling that our coverage in commercial publications is sufficient.

We were formerly carried in TV GUIDE but voluntarily withdrew our schedules because of their insistence on listing us as "educational" and our insistence on being listed as RMT, paralleling NBC, CBS, ABC, etc.

The PH director of an East Coast station, community owned and in a large metropolitan center made this statement:

We feel strongly that practical newspaper training (not public relations theory) is essential for the publicity work. Since our advertising and promotional budget is severely limited, the emphasis here has to be on using our wits, not our pocket-book.

Finally, some rather surprising comments were made by three school system-owned stations in noting that their UHF facilities were located in predominantly VHF markets. One station manager, with his station located in a large metropolitan East Coast area, seemed to sum up the opinions of all three stations:

Since our station is UHF in a VHF market at the present time we are not spending much money on promotion. Our chief effort is directed to classroom programming--in due time more serious effort will be directed toward community programming as interest develops in UHF receiving equipment. (Underscoring mine.)

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

SUMMARY

This study was conducted to investigate the public relations programs and practices of educational television stations in the United States, after it was established that recent research findings were lacking in the area of public relations and educational television, and that this lack of data constituted a void in the general knowledge of the field.

"Public relations" was defined, for the purposes of this study, as meaning the planned effort to motivate or influence opinion favorably toward the station.

The study was instituted as an initial step in exploring the public relations of ETV by: 1) investigating the public relations history of ETV, from published sources; 2) reporting a current survey of public relations practices as conducted by educational telecasters; and 3) suggesting new areas for research as indicated by the conclusions drawn from the data.

In determining the important interrelationships of public relations and educational television, it was concluded that:

- 1) The practice of public relations is designed

to motivate and influence favorable opinion toward an organization through acceptable performance and two-way communication of the organization with the publics it serves.

2) As the American environment grows continually more complex and interdependent, the function of public relations constantly grows in scope and importance.

3) Because of the nature of its function in this complex contemporary society, educational television depends upon public support for its very existence.

4) Therefore, for continued survival and prosperity, ETV should, through the practice of public relations, meet the obligations of serving the public interest always; achieve integration within the community it serves, and communicate with its publics constantly to provide for an optimum climate of understanding.

A review of the literature in the field of public relations and educational television pointed out these recurring themes among the several reports and historical surveys: public relations seeks to create a favorable image that is more an abstract quality than a concrete quantity; public relations is personal, human relations, as much as it is the practice of calculated strategies; and the best public relations for broadcasters, educational especially, is public service responsibly administered.

The recognized importance of public relations in contemporary society and the lack of recent, significant

research data available led to the hypotheses upon which this study was based.

These hypotheses were tested in a survey of the current public relations programs and practices of educational television stations broadcasting a regular schedule of programs as of January, 1963. The findings resulting from this survey were reported in Chapter V, with the results analyzed here relative to the hypotheses projected in the study. A summary of the important overall findings is included, along with conclusions made and suggestions offered for further research.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

Questionnaires were sent to a total of 72 educational television stations listed as being on the air with a regular broadcast schedule of programs as of January, 1963. A response of 91.7 per cent was received to the questionnaires, with inventories returned from 66 of the 72 stations.

The responses to the survey were analyzed with first consideration being given to the basic hypothesis that:

The majority of educational television broadcasters have not yet recognized the importance and value of a sound public relations program, as defined in this study, for their industry, and as such, do not presently conceive of public relations as an integral element of station operation.

In general, the data reflected the validity of this hypothesis.

It was determined that only 19 of the 66 stations,

or 23.8 per cent of the total, had full-time public relations personnel or departments. It was also discovered that of the remaining 47 stations without full-time PR people, there was no general pattern of handling public relations duties, and the majority of these stations seemed to delegate "public relations" duties almost in a random manner.

A majority of stations made some provision for a public relations budget, although 14 stations reported no PR budget and ten other stations did not indicate whether or not funds were budgeted for public relations. The conclusion was that while a few stations seemed to budget quite adequately, the reports of the majority of stations revealed a lack of budgeted funds for the PR area.

It was further determined that only 22.7 per cent of the total number of stations had an organized, written program or policy of public relations, with the indication that some stations with full-time PR personnel had no written public relations policy.

Those stations that reported specific PR goals indicated that many of these goals were primarily related to publicity and promotion rather than the entire area of public relations. Similarly, the results of the survey indicated that many stations considered their most valuable public relations effort to be one connected with publicity, promotion, and/or press relations.

Of those stations that reported efforts at setting or evaluating PR policy, the majority, 34.9 per cent, did so only irregularly, with 24.2 per cent reporting occasional efforts at policy evaluation.

A majority of the stations, 31 of the 66 or 47 per cent, reported only irregular contact with station personnel through staff meetings, but all but one station conducted staff meetings.

About one-third of the stations, 30.3 per cent, invited viewers to attend selected studio broadcasts; 34.8 per cent of the total never invited viewers to attend broadcasts. Similarly, only 27.3 per cent of the total number of stations offered studio space for meetings of local civic groups and clubs.

On the other hand, 50 of the 66 station managers reported they either made efforts at all times or occasionally to keep staff members public relations conscious. Similarly, 59.1 per cent of the stations said they competed either occasionally or regularly for programming awards on a national level; a total of 83.3 per cent of the stations reported regular use of publicity and promotional devices; 36 stations reported regular personal contact with the press; and 57.6 per cent reported the regular scheduling of programming related to community issues or needs.

Thus, the evidence indicated that 1) the majority of the educational telecasters either did not, or were unable

to, support a comprehensive public relations program, and that 2) only in the areas of publicity and promotion, in efforts made at keeping staff members PR conscious, and in presenting programming of community service did the majority of replies indicate a significant public relations effort and awareness of PR responsibilities.

The general results of the survey would seem to indicate rather conclusively that public relations is not yet considered to be an integral element of educational television station operation by the majority of ETV station managers.

Two other hypotheses proposed in the study were proved to be valid when survey results were analyzed.

It was stated in the second hypothesis that:

Only a small minority of the total number of ETV stations have full-time public relations directors or departments.

The survey results showed that only 19 of the total of 66 stations, or 28.8 per cent, had full-time public relations personnel or departments, proving the validity of the hypothesis.

Another hypothesis proposed was that:

The majority of stations have no written public relations policy set down for staff and management alike to follow.

The data showed that 51 of the 66 stations, or 77.3 per cent of the total, had no such written public relations policy, thus proving this to be a valid hypothesis also.

A fourth hypothesis was proposed with respect to the theory that:

The majority of "public relations" programs of TV stations which state that they have such programs are primarily promotional or publicity programs.

The results of the survey were not so conclusive in this area.

It was noted that of the stations which listed specific goals, the majority indicated an emphasis on publicity and promotion, but it could not be stated finally that this was the only element of their overall goals. As a matter of fact, most stations listed several comprehensive goals.

However, of the stations which listed a most valuable public relations effort, the greatest number of efforts in any single category was noted to be in the areas of publicity and promotion.

Thus, indications were that good publicity and promotion were mentioned by a majority of station managers as their public relations goals and single most valuable effort, but it could not be definitely established that the hypothesis was completely valid when projected for the entire industry.

Two final related hypotheses were proposed to the effect that:

Those stations that depend upon constant fund-raising activities for their very existence have better developed public relations programs and staffs

than do stations which are supported by state appropriation or other similar and regular grants; and

Similarly, those stations which are school system or school board owned and primarily broadcast instructional programs for in-class use generally have the least developed public relations efforts in the entire field.

These hypotheses were related specifically to two of the four divisions of stations catalogued in the survey, the community stations and the school system stations.

The overall results of the survey indicated the hypotheses to be valid.

It was discovered that 55.5 per cent of the community owned stations, the highest per cent of any station division, had full-time personnel. Only 16.6 per cent of the school system owned stations, the lowest of any station division, had full-time public relations personnel.

Only three of the 16 community owned stations made no provision for a PR budget, while seven of the 12 school system stations reported no budget for PR. However, while the community stations reported the greatest percentage of stations budgeting for PR, there was little difference noted in this area between the school owned stations and the other two station divisions.

Of the stations reporting an organized public relations policy or program, there was no significant difference between any of the station divisions.

There was little significant difference in the

frequency of setting or evaluating public relations policy between any of the station divisions, with the exception that five school system stations reported they had never set or evaluated policy, while all community owned stations reported some frequency of efforts in this area.

In other areas, there was little difference noted in the efforts made in any station division to keep staff members in conscious, or the frequency of conducting staff meetings.

However, on a national recognition basis, all of the community owned stations competed on some basis for industry awards, while ten of the 18 school system stations never competed, and only one station competed on a regular basis as opposed to seven of the 18 community stations regularly competing.

In areas of community involvement, only three of the 18 community stations never invited viewers to attend studio broadcasts, while nine of the school system stations did not invite viewers. Nine of the community stations offered studio space for club meetings, but only two of the school system stations did. And 12 community stations reported programming related to community needs, while eight of the school system stations reported such programming.

Thus, these overall results indicated that, in general, community owned stations, or that group of stations depending largely on the regular solicitation of funds for

continued existence, have better developed overall public relations efforts, while school system stations, largely supported by state appropriation, generally were noted to have the least developed public relations efforts in those areas where significant differences in policy and execution were noted among the different divisions of stations.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

The results of this study indicated the following general conclusions:

- 1) In spite of the important interrelationships of public relations and educational television, the majority of educational telecasters have not yet adopted the practice of public relations as an integral element of station operation.
- 2) The majority of ETV stations have neither full-time public relations personnel nor organized, written public relations programs or policies.
- 3) Of those stations without full-time PR personnel, public relations duties are generally assigned in apparently random fashion by the majority of station managers.
- 4) The majority of ETV stations reveal an alarming lack of regular budgeted funds for the public relations area.
- 5) Publicity and promotion continue to serve as the main "public relations" tools of the majority of educational telecasters.

6) Those types of stations which depend upon the solicitation of funds from the general public for financial support generally have better developed public relations departments and programs than do those types of stations which are supported by regular appropriation.

7) In spite of the above factors, there is an indication that there is a growing awareness of the importance of the practice of public relations to ETV, especially on the part of the managers of stations in larger metropolitan areas, and on the part of the leaders of educational broadcasting organizations.

8) This growing awareness of the importance of public relations to ETV will continue to spread among other educational telecasters as continued practice and research indicate the relative value of PR to ETV.

9) The practice of public relations for ETV will not grow, however, as long as the idea is prevalent that the practice of public relations denotes only the use of the tools of publicity and promotion.

10) Much more research of both a general and specific nature is needed to investigate fully the many implications that the practice of public relations has for educational television.

ADDITIONAL AREAS FOR RESEARCH

Since this study was an initial investigation into the area of public relations for educational television,

much additional research is needed in this field of investigation.

This study indicated the following specific areas as among the most important needing additional research:

1) The precise location of the overall public relations function in the hierarchy of administrative elements of station operation.

2) The financial budgeting of station funds for public relations.

3) The educational background and training needed for public relations personnel in ETV.

4) The overall impact of fund-raising on a station's public relations program.

5) The future of the practice of public relations in the field of educational television.

A FINAL WORD

This study must be viewed as an initial and exploratory attempt to investigate the public relations programs and practices of the nation's educational telecasters. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize specific findings for an entire industry on the basis of these first probings.

Certainly this study is at best a beginning for further research. It is believed, however, that once the vital interrelationships of public relations and educational television are grasped on an industry-wide basis, significant and constant research will be devoted to this area

as it already is being done in many other areas of ETV.

Such contemporary subjects as public relations and ETV need time both for development and research. Now that the first decade of educational telecasting has laid the groundwork, the future should provide an interesting and important climate for the practice of public relations in the field of educational television.

APPENDIX I

PART A

April 29, 1963

Dear Sir:¹

We are interested in studying the public relations practices of educational broadcasters.

One of our graduate students, Mr. Lee Giles, is undertaking a study of the public relations practices of ETV. We are asking you to assist in making this worthwhile project a success by completing the enclosed inventory and returning it as soon as possible in the stamped pre-addressed envelope.

I realize that you are busy and that you especially are over-burdened with surveys and questionnaires. However, we have formulated the questionnaire in such a way that it should not take much of your time.

We hope to publish the results of this study in one of the educational journals and we believe that the findings will be most informative and useful to you. Your identity, of course, will not be disclosed and the overall results only will be publicized.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Walter B. Emery, Professor

Encl: 2

¹Each letter was individually typed and carried a personal greeting to the station manager to whom it was addressed.

APPENDIX I

PART B

May 27, 1963

Dear Sir:¹

A few weeks ago we asked your assistance in completing an inventory of the public relations practices of your station as part of a general survey of the public relations of ETV. We have now heard from most of the other stations we queried and we are most anxious to include (your station) in the survey.

Since you may have misplaced our earlier material we are enclosing additional copies and hope that you may find time to relay this information to us.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Walter B. Emery, Professor

¹ Each letter was individually typed and carried a personal greeting to the station manager to whom it was addressed.

APPENDIX II

AN INVENTORY OF PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICES

Instructions to the Station Manager: Please complete this inventory by checking the appropriate spaces and/or supplying the desired information.

Public Relations Defined: For the purposes of this study, "Public Relations" is defined as meaning, the planned effort to motivate or influence opinion favorably toward the station.

- 1) What are the call letters of your station, what is its channel and location, and the number of its broadcast hours per week?

_____ Call Letters _____ Channel

_____ Broadcast hours per week Location _____

- 2) Is your station (Please check appropriate spaces):

____ University or college owned? ____ Community owned?

____ School-system owned? ____ Member of a Network group?

Other, or combination of above (Please explain) _____

- 3) Do you have either an AM or FM radio affiliate? (Please check): ____ AM affiliate ____ FM affiliate

- 4) If this question is applicable, what percentage of your programming is devoted specifically to instructional TV (in-school lessons)?

_____ % Devoted to in-school lessons _____ Not applicable

- 5) Does your station have a full-time public relations officer or department under your supervision? (Please check):

____ Yes _____ No

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO NEXT PAGE

- 6) If the above answer is "yes," how many people are assigned to the public relations division or department specifically?

___ One

___ Two or more (Please specify number assigned and the titles of each member) _____

- 7) If you have a public relations officer or department, does your chief PR officer ask your decision on (Please check):

___ Nearly all matters pertaining to station relations with the public?

___ Only those matters considered to be "major policy" decisions (involving significant capital expenditures, PR policy changes, etc.) of the station?

___ Most matters considered to involve "major policy" decisions?

- 8) If your station has no full-time public relations officer, who handles the public relations duties? (Please check):

___ Station Manager ___ News Director

___ Program Director ___ Student Personnel

___ Other staff member (Please note his regular job _____.)

- 9) What portion of your total station budget do you allocate for public relations/promotional functions?

___ %, which amounts to \$ _____ (Please note whether this is actual dollars budgeted or an estimate.)

- 10) Do you have an organized program or policy of public relations involving specific strategies and tactics and set down for all members of the staff to become familiar with and follow?

___ Yes ___ No

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO NEXT PAGE

- 11) If your answer to the above question is "yes," what do you consider your specific public relations goals to be?

- 12) In the past, how often has your station set or evaluated public relations policy? (Please check appropriate spaces):

☐ Occasionally ☐ Monthly
☐ Annually ☐ At irregular intervals
☐ Not since the station ☐ Never
 signed on the air

- 13) Do you make an effort to keep staff members aware of public relations responsibilities (Please check):

☐ At all times? ☐ Regularly?
☐ Occasionally? ☐ Never?

- 14) If you attempt to keep staff members public relations conscious, please explain briefly how this is done:

- 15) Do you make use of press releases, feature stories, program guides, and/or other devices to promote your programs (Check):

☐ Regularly? ☐ Occasionally?
☐ Seldom? ☐ Never?

- 16) Which of the communication devices below does your station use? (Please check applicable items)

<input type="checkbox"/> Program Guides	<input type="checkbox"/> General News Releases
<input type="checkbox"/> Program logs in local paper(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stories and pictures to the trade press
<input type="checkbox"/> Program schedule in <u>TV Guide</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Stories to the <u>NAB Journal and Newsletter</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Letters or bulletins	<input type="checkbox"/> Stories to <u>Journal of Broadcasting and Feedback</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Posters and billboards	<input type="checkbox"/> Cross-promotional campaigns with sister station(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Advertisements	<input type="checkbox"/> Information racks
<input type="checkbox"/> Auto stickers or "plates"	<input type="checkbox"/> Inserts and enclosures
<input type="checkbox"/> Speaker's bureau	<input type="checkbox"/> Meetings
<input type="checkbox"/> Special events	<input type="checkbox"/> Displays
<input type="checkbox"/> Studio Tours	<input type="checkbox"/> Station promotional spots
<input type="checkbox"/> Give-aways, contests	<input type="checkbox"/> Others _____

- 17) Who writes the material or supervises the handling of the above applicable items? (Please check)

<input type="checkbox"/> Station Manager	<input type="checkbox"/> Public relations or promotion director
<input type="checkbox"/> Program director	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, or depends on item (Please explain): _____	

- 18) If you publish and mail out a program guide to your viewers, is this guide published: (Please check)

<input type="checkbox"/> Weekly?	<input type="checkbox"/> Semi-monthly?
<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly?	<input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly?
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please explain): _____	

- 19) What is the average size of each edition of your program guide?

_____ (Number of pages)

- 20) What is the size of your mailing list?

_____ (Number of addresses on your mailing list)

- 21) What process is used in printing or duplicating your program guide?

_____ Letterpress printing process

_____ Off-set process

_____ Duplication (mimeo or ditto) process

_____ Other (Please explain): _____

- 22) What is the average cost per edition of your program guide and the total number of copies of guides printed?

\$ _____ (Including postage) for _____ (Number of copies).

- 23) How are your mailing lists compiled? From (Please check):

_____ Subscriptions?

_____ Mail and telephone requests?

_____ Requests from follow-ups of station promotional announcements?

_____ Original mailings to faculty and staff?

_____ Student enrollment mailings?

_____ Other (Please explain): _____

- 24) In your relations with the press, do you (Please check):

_____ Have regular personal contact with the reporters of your local papers or news outlets?

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO NEXT PAGE

- ☐ Conduct press conferences when you have news of major significance? (Such as the acquisition of a new VTR which will have great meaning for expanded program offerings.)
- ☐ Meet with the press or reporters only irregularly?
- ☐ Seldom meet with the members of the press?
- ☐ Find that the press seldom has time for you and your projects?
- 25) Of the items that your station sends, do the local and regional press use these items (Please check):
- ☐ Regularly? ☐ Occasionally?
- ☐ Seldom? ☐ Never?
- 26) If you conduct staff meetings with your personnel, are these meetings scheduled (Please check):
- ☐ Daily? ☐ Weekly?
- ☐ Monthly? ☐ At irregular intervals?
- 27) Are your viewers freely invited to attend (Please check):
- ☐ All studio broadcasts? ☐ Selected studio broadcasts?
- ☐ Never invited to attend studio broadcasts?
- 28) In your estimation, how many "fan" letters does your station receive during an average week?
- ☐ (Number estimated per week)
- 29) Would you say that your promotional efforts actively encourage letter writing by viewers? (Please check):
- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ On occasion only
- Comment? _____
- 30) Does your station offer studio space for meetings of local clubs, organizations, civic groups and the like? (Please check):
- ☐ Yes ☐ No

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO NEXT PAGE

- 31) Is your talent or station personnel available for entertainment for city or community functions? (Please check):

☐ Yes

☐ Occasionally

☐ Decision rests with individual staff members

☐ No

- 32) Does your station make financial contributions to worthwhile community undertakings (such as the Community Chest, New March of Dimes, other charities, school projects, etc.)? (Please check):

☐ Regularly

☐ Occasionally

☐ Only when requested

☐ Never

If you have a policy governing the above, please explain:

- 33) Do you have any regular program features that are especially related to community problems or projects (such as the production of local documentaries, a policy of "editorializing" on community issues, "specials" to boost some local endeavor, etc.)?

☐ Yes (if so, Please explain) _____

☐ No

- 34) Does your station compete actively for awards or honors (such as the Ohio State awards and awards presented by trade publications and public service organizations) (Please check):

☐ Regularly?

☐ Occasionally?

☐ Rarely?

☐ Never?

Comment? _____

- 35) What do you consider your single most valuable public relations effort to be or to have been?

NOTE: The next five questions will apply to some stations only. Please check and answer if they apply. If these questions do not concern you, please check Not Applicable.

- 36) If you must solicit funds from outside agencies, organizations, and individuals, both public and private, to support your station, how much of the station's income is derived from this source?

____ % From foundations ____ % Government (local or other)

____ % Contributions from the general public

____ % Other (Please explain): _____

- 37) Do you have a planned fund-raising program in operation

____ Monthly? ____ Annually? ____ At all times?

- 38) Does your station employ a full-time person or persons whose main duty is to solicit funds or grants for station operation (Not just funds to underwrite specific program series)?

____ Yes (If so, what is the title(s) of this person(s)

____ No (If not, who oversees this duty? _____

PLEASE CONTINUE ON TO NEXT PAGE

39) Do you consider fund-raising an integral part of your public relations program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comment? _____

40) What fund-raising activities have been used to best advantage by your station? (Please check applicable items):

☐ Direct TV appeals ☐ Direct mail appeals

☐ Benefits (Dinners, ☐ Rallies
Bazaars)

☐ Campaigns conducted by ☐ Contests
corps of volunteer
solicitors

☐ Other (Please explain): _____

Please add any comments that you believe might prove valuable and applicable to this study:

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Please mail the inventory now in the enclosed, pre-addressed, stamped envelope to: Walter B. Emery, Professor, Television and Radio Department, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Aspley, John C., and Van Houten, L. F. (eds.) The Dartnell Public Relations Handbook. 3rd ed. revised. Chicago: The Dartnell Corporation, 1961.
- Bernays, Edward L. Public Relations. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952.
- Canfield, Bertrand H. Public Relations: Principles, Cases, and Problems. 3rd ed. revised. Homewood, Illinois: R. D. Irwin, 1960.
- Center, Allen H. Public Relations Ideas in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1957.
- Cutlip, Scott M. (Compiler) A Public Relations Bibliography and Reference and Film Guides. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.
- _____ and Center, Allen H. Effective Public Relations. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Evans, Jacob A. Selling and Promoting Radio and Television. New York: Printer's Ink Publishing Co., 1954.
- Fletcher, Leon C. TV's New Engagement: Showmanship and Scholarship. San Francisco: Pearson Publishers, 1958.
- Golden, Hal, and Hazeon, Kitty. How to Plan, Produce and Publicize Special Events. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1960.
- _____. The Techniques of Working with the Working Press. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1962.
- Harlan, Gene, and Scott, Alan. Contemporary Public Relations--Principles and Cases. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Lesly, Philip (ed.). Public Relations Handbook, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Lundberg, Louis B. Public Relations in the Local Community. New York: Harper, 1950.

Melcher, Daniel, and Larrick, Nancy. Printing and Promotion Handbook. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1955.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Corwell, Marion. "Personalized PR," NABE Journal, Vol. 21, No. 4 (July-August, 1962), 26-29, 30.

Deasey, William C. "He Who Steals My Purse Steals Trash," NABE Journal, Vol. 20, No. 1 (January-February, 1961), 4-10. (Paper read before the 1959 NABE Convention in Detroit, Michigan.)

Ketchum, David S. "The Professional Director in Fund-Raising Campaigns," Public Relations Journal, Vol. XIV, No. 8 (August, 1958), 8, 10.

Petry, Thomas. "On Blowing One's Own Horn," NABE Journal, Vol. 19, No. 2 (March-April, 1960), 37-46.

Sanderson, Richard A. "Public Relations in Educational Television," Journal of Broadcasting, Vol. II, No. 4 (Fall, 1958), 329-334.

Sulzer, Elmer G. "Educational Broadcasting and Public Relations," NABE Journal, Vol. 18, No. 5 (February, 1959), 6-7, 19-20.

PAMPHLETS

Church, David H. The Public Relations Committee--Why and How It Works. New York: National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, Inc., 1949.

Sandage, Charles H. Building Audiences for Educational Radio Programs. Urbana, Illinois: Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1961.

Sulzer, Elmer G. A Public Relations Guide for the Educational Broadcasting Station. Urbana, Illinois: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1960.

Promoting Educational Broadcasting. Urbana, Illinois: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1958.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Broderick, Gertrude. Radio and Television Bibliography. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

Federal Communications Commission. Sixth Report and Order. 17 Federal Regulations, 3905-4100. Washington, D.C., May 2, 1952.

OTHER SOURCES

Letter from Marion Corwell, Chairman, Public Relations Committee, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Dearborn, Michigan, February 1, 1963.

Letter from Edward J. Pfister, Information Services Chief, National Educational Television and Radio Center, New York, New York, April 22, 1963.

Television Bureau of Advertising, Inc. How To Reach People. A Report on Television Audience Composition. Printed in the U.S.A., 1950.

ROOM USE ONLY

~~APR 12 1985~~

~~AUG 2 1985~~

~~SEP 1 1985~~

~~SEP 2 1985~~

~~SEP 20 1985~~ 311

I ~~2811~~ 75

D ~~159~~ 159

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103189936