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ABSTRACT
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This thesis is an investigation of campus/community radio in Canada and an exploration of its motivations and methods of using social media as a tool to interact with listeners. It develops and applies a methodology referred to as S.M.I.L.E.S., a methodology to create triangulation and validate results when researching in areas involving social media and minimal previous literature available. Radio station staff and volunteer programmers use social media, traditional digital and non-digital methods to gather feedback about the show and/or station, promote the show and/or station, provide additional content to the listener off-air, communicate about the station itself, and achieve personal, station, and community growth. Results suggest that campus/community radio members use social media very differently than commercial or public radio station. As a whole, the campus/community radio sector is generally slow in providing support and policy when facilitating technological change, which has resulted in tentative use and lack of support for social media. Geographical location is also irrelevant as regards the utilization of social media. Also, programmers must be careful in identity management when engaging in online communication, as well as using social media as a fundraising tool and forum for information dissemination. Finally, stations need to consider implementing policy surrounding social media in order to facilitate growth within the industry.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF THE TOPIC

The National Campus/Community Radio Association (NCRA) includes 82 of the approximately 164 Campus/Community radio stations in Canada (NCRC, 2010; CRTC 2012). The association unites stations across the country, giving them a forum to discuss concerns, and connect to other like-minded stations of similar broadcasting licensing requirements for a stronger voice within the industry. However, funding is limited within the campus/community sector, and often the technological innovations available to private broadcasters fail to find their way into the campus/community radio with any significant impact. As a result, the interaction and impact made between broadcaster and listener has largely been a one-way transmission of information. One area of technology use that has yet to be implemented to its fullest capacity by campus/community radio is that of social media (Facebook, Twitter, blogging, YouTube, etc.).

The study will assess stations across Canada to review the current and unique communication techniques already undertaken by those stations and broadcasters. Both qualitative and quantitative information has been gathered, from within the community radio sector and outside the sector whose communication goals are similar or related to those of community radio. The research goal is to develop a recommended framework for future use within community radio in Canada, as well as add to the body of literature for non-profit marketing and community building.

RESEARCHER’S BACKGROUND

In the summer of 1999, I contacted the University of Guelph’s campus/community radio station CFRU 93.3 FM after it was suggested when my interest in hosting a radio show was apparent. Between 1999 and 2003, I hosted two radio shows weekly, one hour of dance music followed by one hour of more down-tempo “chill-out.” Amplified Radio is currently still on the air, and as of April 2012 has over 600 episodes in total, airing four hours of new dance music weekly on twenty internet and three FM stations around the world. I have hosted over 400 other live shows, which include all-request, all-news and talk shows on both CFRU 93.3 FM and CJIQ 88.3, which are located in Southern Ontario. Upon graduating from high school in 2003, I applied to college and was accepted into Conestoga College’s Radio and TV Broadcasting program. While in college, I worked as a producer at the commercial radio station CHYM FM for three years, and completed a co-op term at Robeter Productions, a recording studio in Toronto, during the spring of 2006. Graduating in 2006 with distinction and the CJCS production award, I continued onto university where I completed my undergraduate research in general studies at the University of Guelph in 2009. While in university, I joined CFRU 93.3 FM as a staff member, first as
technical coordinator for six months, then as administrator for one year, followed by a six month term as station manager before attending Conestoga College for a Human Resources Management post-graduate degree in 2009-2010. In 2010, I returned to CFRU for a six month contract as interim-station manager to help locate a full-time station manager. Upon completion of my contract, I was nominated to the board of directors for CFRU and assumed the role of vice-chair, where I have remained to this date. In the fall of 2010, I returned to the University of Guelph to complete my Masters of Science in Capacity Development and Extension, of which this paper is the concluding graduating thesis. My class focus included research methods, development communications, university teaching and digital biography.

I am also the manager and owner of Paradigm United, an umbrella company which focuses on electronic dance music. Within the company, I run a promotions company launched in 2004, three record labels launched in 2007, and a booking agency that began in 2009. Each of these endeavors maintains a social media presence, with my main DJing “FanPage” on Facebook having over 10,000 followers.

RESEARCH RATIONALE

There is currently no standard best practice or guidelines for campus/community stations in Canada to use in order to effectively connect and communicate with the communities they serve through a digital/online platform. This includes recommended procedure to better inform the listenership about important information, connect like-minded listeners to the radio station, acquire content to be used on the air and receive feedback on materials broadcasted.

Commercial radio has tapped into the use of social media as a way to better communicate and interact with its listeners. Campus/community, aboriginal stations and not-for-profit organizations with a broadcast focus can learn to do the same with research and dissemination of information from one form to another, in order to remain competitive in the industry.

It is important to compare and analyze the difference between community radio stations here in Canada and their counterparts lying outside the country, as well as with other classifications of radio within Canada, in order to better understand the marketing and community connections that can serve the broadcasters goals. By researching other markets, this study is better able to understand the shift towards social media around the world, and the necessity to support the Canadian campus/community networks when dealing with technological changes.

The current and longstanding financial struggles chronically challenge the campus/community radio sector and the transitory nature of workers in the field have resulted in the delay of adopting new technologies in the communication fields (AMARC Link, 2010; Bohlen, Beal, 1957, p.75). Outside of a few individual innovators or early adopters, very few stations have the capacity or knowledge to present a
unified and tested social media or communications platform along with their on-air broadcaster to engage with listeners (Waters, Burnett, Lamm & Lucas, 2009, p.105).

Randy Taylor (2008) acknowledges the link between regulation and technology driven by particular cultural attitudes on the part of broadcasters, and suggests that the mechanism employed by private broadcasters to assist them in defining ‘good’ radio is a process of adopting values centred on practices used by commercial radio (p.9). These values permeate the industry, and thus are viewed as the only correct way to employ a technology. Central to this theme are the basic shared conventions that assist in defining professional programming that are communicated orally, largely though mentoring relationships in commercial radio (ibid.). However, campus/community radio does have a major impact on society (see Chapter 2, campus/community radio in contemporary Canada in comparison to the world and history of campus/community radio in Canada), and thus the role of its technology use needs to be addressed when regulation is adopted industry wide. This can help enhance industry appreciation of the role which campus/community radio plays in providing a service in the Canadian radio industry.

**RESEARCH GOAL**

The goal of this study is to provide insight into the methods and motivation to why campus/community radio stations and programmers in Canada use/wish to use social media as a tool to create interaction between broadcaster and listener.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. To create a “best practice” or framework to assist campus/community radio in Canada to better connect to the communities it serves.
2. To determine the strengths of communication techniques within campus/community radio in Canada, in order to better support other community networks.
3. To contribute to the body of literature with respect to community building through social media and technological advances in other non-profit sectors.
4. To design a methodological framework to assist in future communication studies involving social media research.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The major limitation of this study is a result of the lack of previous research and literature available about community radio in connection to social media. The NCRA identifies around sixty publications based on campus/community radio (NCRA, 2009), with none of them focusing on the impact of social media. Furthermore, information published about campus/community history and structure is sporadic and does not include a detailed summary of the industry in Canada.
Furthermore, research looking at the use of social media is relatively new, as platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and blogging have only recently become engrained within greater society in the past few years. The result is a body of literature that is relatively young in history, rapidly becomes dated and is limited in the information published through academic channels. This forces information to be gathered from areas of “grey literature” such as online websites, blogs and newspaper articles that are not reviewed which are viewed as less credible sources then academic peer-reviewed papers and publications.

The complex nature of this research problem require a balance of careful research design, maintenance and ability to adjust mid-stream to ensure that useful information was gathered. Research design was completed in advance of the implementation of the surveys and interview (as well as the internet metrics) so that the capture of data matches the initial research goals. However, due to the organic needs of the research, methods were adjusted and updated as information was gathered and knowledge of the situation is generated to capture areas of relevant interest to the study.

Additionally, when doing research in the public domain on the internet, it was also important to respect the laws of public privacy. As a result, this study did not use any personal information that could identify any individuals or groups associated with the material that was directly collected. This has made it harder to break down the demographics being used, but without permission and guaranteed security to those taking part in the study, it would have been unethical to gather and report such information.

Surveys are typically quite effective in finding the data or insight that one is looking for, especially when they are produced with careful consideration in the goals and boundaries of the study in case. However, questions asked in early trial surveys were not identical to those in later surveys. When comparing surveys with probing interviews however, the interview process allowed an effective method for further gathering of information that was missed in the earlier survey period. It also was more time consuming and difficult to arrange and conduct interviews than to administer surveys and, as a result, a combination of both at the response rate received was estimated to be the most effective and efficient way to gain the most insight into the result.

The use of internet metrics for gathering data via websites can be a source of reliable data, however data collection was limited based on technical restrictions and both Twitter and Facebook privacy policies. The less than anticipated amount of data gathered may not allow for a true representation of the study, as individual results will have a large bearing on the overall ratios and findings.

With the limitations represented here, This study can conclude that the findings and recommendations are a generalization of the industry and may include biases (Epstein & Kernberger, 2006, p.77-85). The sample for station staff is representative of the population which means the results are statistically viable.
as a sample of the industry. Also of importance is that all stations within the NCRA were contacted and were provided opportunity for each station to participate in the study. However, the programmer survey is below the 20 percent recommended sample level, and therefore may not be a proper representation and subject to biases. As a result, the programmer survey should be viewed as a non-random sample, as only stations that chose to forward on the request for information to their programmers were asked to participate in the study (Epstein & Kernberger, 2006, p.80).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It is critical to find out what issues and successes individuals and stations are faced when reviewing or implementing a new communication strategy in order to design a “best practice” for future community engagement in other markets. At the conclusion of the study, a combination of mixed methods have supported each other that formulated a strong correlation between the data, information and needs of staff an programmers to aid in dealing with this “complex” problem both stations and programmers are faced with (Cillers, 1998, preface). A complex problem is one where the interaction between system and environment are of such a nature that the system as a whole cannot be analysis by simply looking at the individual components and combining the result to produce an solution (ibid). By combining this with previously researched information (not specifically related to social media use within campus/community radio, but broader trends), commercial radio practices and professional opinions, we can determine what the best practice is for campus/community programmers and broadcasters in the Canadian radio sector.

This study laid the groundwork for academic research in the fast-paced social media environment, so researchers can apply a proven method when examining non-profit sectors that facilitate social responsibility (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.189). The S.M.I.L.E.S. method (as outlined in Chapter 4) can be adapted to meet the needs of those who study areas with highly “grey” literature, providing a solid platform for triangulation of data gathering and results.

Inside media development, it is vital to focus on campus/community radio as an influential source of empowerment, especially for disenfranchised and marginalized groups in society. Research efforts to quantify, analyze, and draw conclusions regarding the impact of campus/community radio are essential to serve as a sound basis for assistance advocacy (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.4). The Center for International Media Assistance Working Group report goes on to identify the need for community radio to develop through digitization and the internet, explore how new technologies and the web can contribute to community radio development, as well as research the long-term commitment and coordinated efforts for the institutional development of community media (p. 4-5, p.20).
GUIDE TO THE REST OF THE THESIS

This thesis will begin with a review of the relevant literature and provide the reader with background context on the campus/community radio industry in Canada, as well as social media in Canada. Chapter Two also outlines the conceptual framework for the study. Chapter Three presents the methods called S.M.I.L.E.S. which was developed in the study to aid in data and information collection from across Canada for comparison purposes. Chapter Four presents the as research findings, broken down into motivations of programmers and/or staff and the methods they used to interact with listeners. Chapter Five introduces the reader to some unique findings about the study, which includes discussion around motivations of programmers, geographical preferences, learning environments, diffusion and adoption processes and information transformation. Chapter Six concludes the study with a discussion of best practices and recommendations for industry changes, specifically related to the use of different platforms and methods directed towards individual programmers and for staff to help support their individual stations’ goals. The concluding chapter summarizes this thesis, as well as looks at areas of future research within academia, social media and campus/community radio in Canada.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

As the spread of wireless and internet media grow, traditional sources of information and entertainment such as terrestrial radio and cable television are becoming less of a staple in world culture (Christoffersen, 2011). These new sources of information and entertainment, combined with a growing trend where stations that sound more and more alike (and feature the same content, both musically and as discussion points), are resulting in listeners tuning out (ibid). The solution, according to Christoffersen (2011) is a shift to local radio as “listeners want their own truly local radio that reflects their own space and place on the air.” Logically, the blending of information, entertainment and social interaction within a local setting is necessary for campus/community radio to exist and thrive in the lives of those who look to it for such reasons. This chapter reviews the history of campus/community radio in Canada, the role of the National Campus/Community Radio Association (NCRA), campus/community radio in Canada as well as key aspects of station funding, structures and radio as an intimate medium. It also explores social media and its use, mobile media, changes in social media, podcasting and online radio. This chapter concludes by introducing us to the ideas surrounding the researcher’s conceptual framework view of campus/community which includes the use of technology for developmental purposes and the importance of campus/community radio in the Canadian landscape. It argues that information and communication are inseparable, and have a decisive impact on programmers and stations.

HISTORY OF CAMPUS/COMMUNITY RADIO IN CANADA

Campus and community radio in Canada was established early in the 1970’s as a recognized sector in the media industry in comparison to many other countries or regions that now have growing or established community radio industries (Meadows, Forde, Ewart, & Foxwell. 2005, p.173). As a result, the Canadian campus/community sector has had a longer period of growth, as compared to other countries’ community radio sectors, and thus has had more time to settle into its role inside the radio landscape (Khan, 2007, p.1). Regulation of communications in Canada began in 1852 with the inception of the Telegraph Act, and later in 1905 with the Radio Telegraph Act (CRCT, 2008). In 1918, XWA, then later CFCF, became the first Canadian radio station licensed to broadcast. Shortly after, other stations began to start broadcasting on the airwaves, with local community groups or organizations (like the agricultural club in Guelph) hosting special interest programs (Elliot & Whig, 2006, p.3; Personal communications, Ian McDirmid, February 21 2011). These programs appeared to be created based on the need to help
marginalized groups such as French Canadians, rural Canadians, those in the outlying regions, labour, women and farmers (Raboy, 1984, p.18).

Amendments to the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act in 1936 created a Crown Corporation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), which is still responsible for providing a national radio service in Canada (CRTC, 2008). The CBC is a way for Canadians to look at “themselves through its information, entertainment and talk-back”, however access is restricted to CBC employees and provides limited space for community input (Monk, 2008, p.44). Between 1958 and 1968 the power and profits of commercial broadcasters in Canada grew steadily, as did the need to create a stronger regulating act (Raboy, 1984, p.11). In 1968, the Broadcasting Act was passed which reconfirmed the CBC’s position as the country’s national broadcaster. This act also as required that Canadian programming be shaped mainly by Canadian talent, coupling the idea that Canadian broadcasting systems can strengthen cultural, social and economic structures (CRTC, 2008). The Act therefor established the Canadian Radio-television Commission, a new regulatory agency that later became the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) in 1976 (ibid). Changes in the act, as well as new philosophies that emerged out of the 1960s, sparked the initial movement of alternative or “community” radio, which was a shift away from a centralized, state-owned, hierarchical model, or the commercial model (Raboy, 1984, p.12).

In the early 1970s, the CBC began experimenting with local programming through CBC Access and native programming on terrestrial radio (Monk, 2008, p.54; Khan, 2007, p.2; Lehr, Bartlett, Tabvahtah & Daniels, 2007, p.85). Soon after, the CRTC created a special license for an FM campus station in Winnipeg in 1975, followed by stations in Waterloo, Quebec City and Ottawa that converted closed-circuit radio clubs to campus-wide terrestrial broadcasters (Monk, 2008, p.55, 67). These and other stations started to cover more information than just student and campus affairs, and as a result brought in local groups to broadcast special interest programs to the community at large (ibid, p.59). Support from the NCRA later led to the classification of campus/community, and community licensed stations under the Broadcasting Act in 1991 (Monk, 2008, p60-16; Khan, 2007, p.2).

The National Campus/Community Radio Association (NCRA) is a network of campus/community, campus, community, high school and low-powered radio stations across Canada established in 1981 (NCRA, 2010).

The organization facilitates the exchange of programs and creation of national news program, provides research into the reduction of barriers for women in broadcasting, as well as assesses and advocates for policy that affects campus/ community radio at a national level to the CRTC (Kant, 2007). According to the CIMA Working Group Report in 2007;
Professional associations can play a vital role in establishing professional codes of ethics, identifying training needs, and establishing training programs. They can also serve as advocates for the sector, soliciting more funds for development. Associations and networks can thus become focal points for donor assistance (p.5).

The NCRA also works towards realistic licensing fees for the non-profit sector of radio, as well as dissemination of information through other organizations. The NCRA teams up with a campus/community station each year to organize a conference that brings station staff, volunteers and board members together in a physical location for community building and industry growth (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.16).

CAMPUS/COMMUNITY RADIO IN CONTEMPORARY CANADA IN COMPARISON TO THE WORLD

In the early 1970s, many activists in European countries such as France, Belgium and Italy began to discover the public space between state and private capital as a place for community building and space for social justice (Raboy, 1984, p.344). As such, community radio in the form of radio libres began to “provide a concrete basis for the reflection on the pertinence and effectiveness of alternative broadcast media” (ibid.). Clemencia Rodriguez (2001) defined emerging “citizens’ media”, as a result of three intersecting elements:

[T]he citizens’ will to appropriate the media to satisfy their own needs and to seek their own information and communication goals; a historical, social and cultural context that poses unique obstacles while also offering specific options for the implementation of citizens’ media; and citizens’ enactment of creative strategies to exploit to exhaustion every fissure in the dominant media system. (p.64)

Community media are thus resources for building multiple and complex media and cultural literacies through participation on a localized and personalized scale (Meadows et al, 2005, p.179). Community radio, from an international standpoint reinforces these notions that citizens have the power and ability to stand up to capitalist media and represent themselves and their communities in a generally antithetical manner (Fairchild, 1993, p.v). Community radio can be viewed as a way to challenge dominant discourses in mainstream media, providing alternative options for social action through democratic means as well as entertainment through the voices of those who would not otherwise have access to media production (Khan, 2007, p.1, 3; CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.19). On a global scale, the “impact of community radio is most evident in areas having practically no other access to information” (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.11). Its influence on a local population has been empirically proven in countries across Africa, Latin-American and Asia through community development, education, news and entertainment methods (ibid, p.9; McKay, 2003; Yordy, 2007, Girard, 1992; Gumucio-Dagron, 2001; Hambly Odame, 2005). Its key components serve the needs of socially, culturally, politically and
economically disadvantaged groups in society and as a result have the potential to empower communities and build a democratic society (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.19).

According to the Center for International Media Assistance Working Group Report in 2007:

The most important aspects of community radio, which serves a geographic group or a community of interest, include the broad participation by community members—often on a volunteer basis—and the ownership and control of the station by the community through a board of governors that is representative of the community and responsive to the diversity of its need (p.4).

The key component is the volunteer nature of community radio (ibid. p.12), as it sets campus/community radio apart from corporate radio or the CBC, relying on listeners to also be broadcasters. The old community radio slogan "Don't hate the media, become the media" is taken very seriously as volunteers lend their time to produce media that would otherwise not be broadcast (Khan, 2007, p. 1). The volunteers empowered by the ability to communicate with others build the microcosm that community radio provides, especially when national media is unable to reach remote areas according to George Papagiannis of the Internews Network (p.10-11). Jean Ogilvie (1983) argues that community radio "provide access to the airwaves by non-professionals considered under-represented by the traditional mass media", and "is seen as an important correction to an inherent imbalance in mass media content" (p. 1). Community radio programmers create their own shows based on the needs and interest of the listeners and constituents in the communities to which they broadcast (Monk, 2007, p.5, 6). Their knowledge and interest in hosting dialogues is a showcase for volunteers to inspire others to create their own community media information and networks (Paranjape, 2007, p.464-465). With the reduction of CBC local programming in 1990s and early 2000s, this is critical to maintain vibrant and informed communities (Kahn, 2007, p2).

In 1997, Lisa Monk provided one of the first in-depth looks at campus/community radio in Canada and the power relations that the CRTC’s broadcasting policy effect that of the stations within the act during her Master’s thesis.

Radio can be used not only as a linear means of transmitting information, but as a vehicle of self-expression by users (senders) who are also part of the community of listeners (receivers). In this sense, campus and community radio are tools for expression and information from individuals and groups in society... by this I mean the sharing back and forth of ideas, information and artistic output rather than merely its production and dissemination by those not necessary informed as of the relevancy of issues and tastes of the listeners they purport to serve (p.47).
Although years ahead of the birth of web 2.0 and social media, Monk argues that campus/community radio provides a vehicle of expression through its ability to allow for feedback of ideas, sounds and information, not its linear broadcaster to receiver path (ibid, p.35). She argues that commercial broadcasters conceived radio in a linear manner (sender to receiver) whereas community-type stations, “because of those access offered to community members where receivers are also senders; recreate the use of broadcasting as method of circular, or two-way communication” (ibid, p. 35). With the support of new technology, scholars and others interested in maintaining radio space as means of two-way campus/community radio can alter the dominance of commercial radio (ibid, 114-115).

Social media has an important impact around the world on community radio, as proven with the use of Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and a blog in Africa’s oldest community station, Bush Radio, which now maintains a strong presence in the community (Mudzingwa, 2012). Individual stations in the United Kingdom reported to the industry that social media in community radio is being viewed as more popular and important to success of a station meeting its goals and staying solvent (OFCOM, 2011, p97, 98, 111).

**FUNDING**

With a recent report stating that nearly half of the community stations returning financial statements to OFCOM\(^1\) report a net loss in revenue, the average income falling by nineteen percent between March 2009 and 2010 adds additional pressure on stations to boost fundraising efforts through social media use (OFCOM, 2011, p.3; Plunkett, 2011). As a result, stations are looking to attract and retain life-long donors to the station, and in most cases, the users of social media and blogs are younger and therefore have a larger amount of time to engage and donate. Additionally, with a growing percentage of revenue traditionally gathered through terrestrial advertising means decreasing due to a movement where youth listening habits switch from analogue to online digital sources, advertising revenue must adapt to an internet system that utilizes websites or blogs, targeting listeners of niche genres and not mass-audience listeners (Carvajal, 2006, p. C7). This requires advertisers to determine the listening characteristics of online listeners and readers to properly market their products or services in an efficient and economical manner though a sustainable business model (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.13). This knowledge of listener or reader characteristics can help to generate new streams of revenue previously not obtained, especially if the balance of advertising versus content is maintained and in line with the policy and goals of the broadcaster (Hewitt, 2005, p. 134).

The CRTC also restricts the amount of time on-air that commercial advertising can be aired, allowing campus/community licensed radio a maximum of 4 percent time allotted to paid advertisements, in comparison to 15 percent for commercially licensed stations (CRTC, 2010). One result of this is that

---

\(^1\) OFCOM is the regulatory body for radio within the United Kingdom
advertisers gravitate to commercial stations in order to secure larger audiences of listeners, reducing funding opportunities for campus/community stations (Monk, 2007, p. 47 & 57).

Overall, financial sustainability is a major challenge for community radio stations, as stations struggle to achieve sustainable practices and maintain proper broadcasting equipment (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.12). Stations can no longer can rely on the inconsistent and short term, project-driven nature of donor assistance, funding grants from universities, or continued membership support due to economic hard times (ibid, p.14; Elliot & Whig, 2006, p.3). Additional support is now provided by the Community Radio Fund of Canada, which commercial stations fund as a requirement of their licensing agreements with the CRTC (Community Radio Fund of Canada Inc, 2009). However, funding is based upon acceptance and implementation of one time goal-oriented proposals and not around long-term funding for a station’s overall stability (ibid). Possible solutions to boost struggling community radio efforts include a well-coordinated pool of funding (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.4).

Finally, only a handful of conglomerated media companies control the opportunity to broadcast information to the public, with fewer broadcasters at the grassroots level able to respond to community concerns as a result of technical requirements for broadcast technology, and frequency availability on the broadcast spectrum (Taylor, 2008, p.6; Monk, 2007, p.47). As a result, gaining access to new frequency, new broadcast sites and listeners is always a competition between unequally funded sectors of the industry.

**STATION STRUCTURES**

Structures in campus/community radio vary based on a variety of reasons, such as mandate, vision, funding, ownership/association, management and programming (Monk, 2007, p.18). Generally, each station is a collective of like-minded radio enthusiasts which employs an accessible and non-hierarchical structure (Fairchild, 1993, iv). Structure and policy typically “…mandates participation in programming and policy-making by disadvantaged groups in society, but also reinforces the notion of determination through self-identification” (Monk, 2007, p. 64). Stations are typically run by a Board of Directors (BOD), elected at an annual general meeting by its membership to represent the stations best interest as well as set the vision, goals and structure of the station during a two year voluntary term (CIMRA, 2007, p.6). The BOD can be made up of a combination of student, community and faculty members, as well as additional seats designated based on associations or partnerships within the individual organization. Stations are non-profit corporations registered in their respective provinces, with a few being registered charities (Monk, 2007, p. 70-75; CRTC, 2010).
Typically, paid staff (or volunteers who take on a designated role) maintain specific areas essential to broadcasting, including administration, programming, outreach, technical and music services. Staff and other volunteers in each station support the efforts of programmers to produce on-air content that matches the stations’ mandates, as well as off-air content that supports the goals of the individual programmers. Such content includes a minimum amount of Canadian music being aired based on category of music, a minimum amount of non-traditional style of music being played, and minimum of 15 percent airtime being spoken-word which is produced in-house (CRTC, 2010). Committees, BODs, Staff or working groups identify community needs and interests that inform programming decisions and evaluate the effectiveness of the programming (CIMA Working Group Report, 2007, p.6). They ensure broad participation in programming, giving value to communication among the people to facilitate positive change, ensuring that the service is trustworthy, accurate, and independent of outside influences, not simply relaying information to the listener as it was received by the presenter (ibid).

**RADIO AS AN INTIMATE MEDIUM**

“Radio affects most people intimately, person-to-person, offering a world of unspoken communication between writer-speaker and listener. That is the immediate aspect of radio. A private experience (McLuhan, 1964, p.261).” Nonetheless, the evolution of radio, technology and most importantly, the impact of the internet and web 2.0 technologies is changing the way radio acts as a single one-way transmission of information, and it can no longer be viewed as a one-on-one experience.

Radio, by its nature, is still an intimate medium: users in many industrialized countries today such as Canada rarely listen to it as a collective social activity, unlike in past traditions of the 1930s and 1940s when families and community members gathered around the receiver/stereo and later engaged in post-broadcast discussion (Sims, n.d.). In a fast-paced world with increasing availability of multiple media sources, radio listeners may be alone in the car or on the bus, using portable devices to access broadcasts in real time, or via Webcast (Berry, 2006, p. 146). Users of new technologies receiving web-based broadcasts are known as the “digi-life generation,” sometimes referred to as the lost radio generation (Gallie & Robson, 2005). These individuals are typically comfortable with using technology such as mobile internet devices to access information. Historically, commercial radio programming involves generic material mass marketed to generate advertising revenue while building and maintaining the largest possible listening audience. Podcasting, which has roots in open source technologies (as does blogging), grew up alongside blogs and has helped to allow non-mass market audiences access out of market and niche market genres and shows (Berry, 2006, p.151,p.157). This “wirefree” generation has been credited with the movement of audiences away from traditional listening or viewing habits from commercial radio to national radio and/or to streaming web stations and podcasts (ibid. p. 150). In one study, online internet based TV stations in Scotland increased viewership by of approximately 17 percent
when newscasts were provided over the internet for local niche markets (Hamacher, 2011). The same can be seen with internet radio or podcasting around the world.

**SOCIAL MEDIA**

Social networking sites on the internet implicate what is known as social media. According to Mike Thelwall and David Wilkinson (2010), Social Networking Sites (SNS) are generally used for:

> making initial contact and keeping in touch occasionally such as at birthdays and other important dates. Although about half of the dialogs seem to exchange some gossip, the dialogs seem typically too short to play the role of gossip-based “social grooming” for typical pairs of Friends, but close Friends may still communicate extensively in SNSs with other methods (p.392).

Along with gossip, there are now hundreds of social networking sites that are used as a strategy to network individuals by establishing and maintaining contact with an increasingly larger set of friends and acquaintances (ibid, p.402; boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.2). Those who connect with friends, family, organizations or are “fans” or “followers” use social media to stay informed and entertained from the “inside,” according to Donald Robichaud, (2012). Some sites cater to diverse audiences, while others attract people based on common language or shared racial, sexual, religious, or ethnic group identities (boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.2). With more communities available through technology diffusion, Fischer & Reuber (2011) constructed the idea of “community orientation,” which argues that the more open an individual is to community building, the more likely one is to interact via social media (p.2). This connection allows for a growing response to a crisis, both international and local incidents, as news and entertainment from around the world is brought to the attention of niche communities, whether indigenous or relocated (Coombs, 2008; Sweester & Metzgar, 2007).

Social media is truly a global phenomenon and has become mainstream in North American society through specific sites or platforms tend to be more popular based on geographical areas, resulting in the necessity for one to assess the viability of each platform potentially being used (boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.9).

Social media use has experienced exponential and steady growth since the inception of the first recorded platform, 6degrees.com in 1997 (boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.6). Facebook itself is projected to have over one billion users by 2013, which is half of all internet users, that is estimated to sit at approximately two billion people (Bullas, 2011). Facebook is not only for individuals, as proved when more than 4000 organizations joined the platform within two weeks of opening its registration process in April 2006 (Facebook, 2007). Not only is social media highly integrated in social use, but organizations and business companies utilize the various platforms, with approximately 10 percent of American employers requiring their employees to market themselves online (Madden, Fox, Smith, & Vitak, 2007).
However, with hundreds of platforms and so many options, people tend to pick their favourite platforms and spend most of their social media time on a select few, rather than maintaining multiple platforms, accounts or identities (Coomans, 2011).

Blog communities tend to attract users who appear to be clustered around preferred subjects, but mix between subjects when a post becomes popular (Mitrovic & Tadic, 2009, p.301). Often users appear in waves on a site, most likely related to the external events or blog site management, with interaction at its highest for most users just after they join (ibid, p.594). Some users persist over long time periods, while others either reduce frequency or stop writing on blogs altogether if they are not invested in the community (ibid.). Research also finds that postings become less interesting to the general public, typically after only a few hours, depending on content, popularity and relevancy of the post (ibid, p.596).

Twitter’s platform of 140 characters or less, frequent posts gained the attention of approximately 200 million users as of January 2012 (Knowlton, 2012). The social platform is also used as a communication too for entrepreneurs to both directly create interaction and action, as well as indirectly build brand (Fischer & Reuber, 2011, p.1). However, engaging too extensively in social interaction runs the risk of irritating their followers (ibid).

The platform Facebook tends to receive the most attention when it comes to social media use for non-profit interaction with stakeholders, though most organizations have failed to incorporate the vast majority of applications available to them (Waters et al. 2009, p.105). Even though non-profit organizers recognized the value and importance of employing social media as a way to improve an organization’s competitiveness and image, they are skeptical about its ability to advance organizational goals (Hill & White, 2000; Waters et al. 2009, p.105). The result is that instead of learning through active participation and taking advantage of the interactive nature of social networking, they abandon the platform, and gain only minimal exposure for the organization while potentially turning off supporters when they witness inactivity on the platform (Waters et al. 2009, p.105). Moreover, due to this lack of understanding on the technical and tactical side of the site, organizations feel overwhelmed by the task at hand and lack the time or resources to provide constant attention to a Facebook page (ibid). As a result, sites are rarely updated with multimedia files and press releases or summaries of their campaigns which are helpful in detailing the organizations successes to those who receive information through social media (ibid). It is concluded that “nonprofits must begin to understand how to use social networking sites as their membership numbers continue to expand,” or risk alienation of its stakeholders (sic., Walters et al., 2009, p.105).
MOBILE AND REMOTE INTERNET USE

Mobile use refers to accessing information wirelessly through platforms such as Wi-Fi internet on a laptop, smart phones, tablets or pads and cell phones. Canadian mobile phone subscriptions increased almost a million to 25.5 million by the third quarter of 2011, with 40 percent of those upgraded to smartphone services like a BlackBerry, iPhone or Google Android device (The Canadian Press, 2012). The result is that approximately 4.4 percent of all internet traffic is going through a non-computer device like phones, tablets or TVs, which is lower in comparison to Singapore (7.2 percent), the United States and United Kingdom (6.8 percent), Japan (5.8 percent) and Australia (5.3 percent). Less than one third of all Canadian mobile users are using the internet on their phone, but of those that do, almost three quarters are smartphones owners. The result is that social media use on mobile is still fairly undeveloped in Canada, according to comScore statistics from March of 2011, but is growing in popularity and ability due to the addition of JavaScript into multiple platforms (ibid; boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.11). Only about one in four Canadian mobile users are on social networks such as Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn, while rates are higher in the U.S. (28 percent) and the U.K. (31 percent) (The Canadian Press, 2012).

As a result, the ability to tap into mobile use for remote listening and interaction possibilities continues to grow, with the potential to increase active participants in non-profit social media interaction. According to a Mobile Posse’s Survey, of the 89 million weekly listeners that tune into online radio, many are not willing to pay for a commercial-free music service (TechJournal, 2011). The report states that 63 percent of consumers would consider paying for a music service, while nearly 20 percent adamantly refuse; preferring free ad-supported music thought online channels, platforms or radio streams (ibid). Revenue and listenership in terrestrial radio remains somewhat strong, though the online broadcasts and/or on-demand listening option show growth in popularity and listenership. As a result, Mobile App’s may become the means to connect listeners, through social media, to radio stations (ibid, Braiker, 2012).

According Michael Dewing (2009) for the Library of Parliament (Canada), people in urban settings used the internet in general more often than their counterparts in rural locations (76 percent to 65 percent), and of those, 21 percent of urban Canadians contributed content to the internet in comparison to only 16 percent of rural Canadians (p.4). Michael Dewing and Douglas Hindman (2000) argue this is partly due to the lack of high-speed broadband internet connections (p.4; Hindman, 2000, p.551). Hindman (2000) claims that innovative users of information technology remain closely associated with social indicators (p.549). Traditional indicators of social status, such as income but not necessarily education and occupation, are related to the early adoption of innovative technologies (ibid., p.552). In general, non-metropolitan users emphasize the use of traditional methods over innovative methods to complete tasks, such as the preference for gathering information from newspapers over television (ibid, p.551; Beaudioin, 2004, 393). The gap between users of multiple types of information technology and those that do not embrace technology as quickly continues to grow, except for the adoption of home computer ownership
(Hindman, 2000, p.553). When looking at social media use, rural users had less friends on Facebook and communicate with individuals located within a closer geographical location then those reside in an urban setting (Gilbert, Karahalios & Sandvig, 2008, p.610-11). However, both rural and urban users seem to communicate with roughly the same proportions of strong and weak ties (ibid.). We can conclude that the increased growth of internet use by rural individuals is potentially linked to increasing access of broadband and mobile internet, as well as the overall affluence of wealth spread-out within Canada in comparison to other countries (Hambly & Prasad Pant, 2010).

**PODCASTING AND ONLINE RADIO**

At the dawn of internet streaming in 2003, at least four in ten Americans had listened to radio online, and almost half of all Internet users had accessed streaming media (Ren & Chan-Olmsted, 2004, p.6). Listeners turn to internet-based radio stations as they offer alternative, non-mainstream music, typically commercial free (ibid.). However, it is difficult for such stations to monetize online streams and act legally based on licensing requirements in Canada under Re:Sound2. The result is that many stations have shut their streams off, or closed down broadcasting (ibid. p.7).

However, there are now portals or services that listeners can use to find unique and niche market programs through community radio all across the world, such as RadioFlags which uses its “live radio content search engine” to suggest shows for listeners (Careless, 2012). As a result, broadcasters (both as campus/community jocks, and unlicensed “podcasters”) can provide very unique programming that may have little to, no impact on the local market, but serve a sector of the aggregate world-wide interest of a specific topic.

In his article “Canadian Content Regulations and the Formation of a National Scene,” Scott Henderson (2008) concludes that Canadians often listen to material online that is much different than what is compiled on new music charts that are published by the commercial radio industry (p. 312). He states that in recent years, several commercial stations have switched away from contemporary music to adult-oriented station as the number of teens and young adult listeners have moved to other platforms of music (such as podcasts, on-demand streaming and portable music players) (ibid, p.312). However, private broadcasters have not truly embraced the changes in technology and listening habits, and continue to rely on older means of identifying music consumption and understanding national culture (ibid, p. 314).

---

2 Re:Sound officially collects royalties from broadcasters who stream or provide music online, which does not fall under another licensing restriction, on behalf of its members. Legally licensed stations in all forms of radio in Canada who broadcast via terrestrial means pay SOCAN, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada who collect royalties on behalf of their members. Different licenses are required based on the methods of distribution of copyrighted music and programming.
Furthermore, by offering the option to download mp3s via a podcast on a blog, broadcasters allow for listeners to take with them a copy of what they may have heard to listen to again, or provide new and informative content which a listener might have missed in the past. Podcasting allows programmers greater flexibility when listening (due to the fact they are portable, small in size and compatible in format), as well as reduced interruption from advertising typically found on terrestrial radio (Berry, 2006, p.146; Crofts et al, 2005). The Radio Advertising Bureau in the UK has identified two types of listening in broadcast radio: ‘habitual’ and ‘discretionary’. Habitual listening is peak-time or potentially ‘wallpaper’ listening and discretionary listening occurs in leisure time, with programs seen as ‘appointments to listen’ (Radio Advertising Bureau, 2004). The growth in podcasting has polarized these two types of listening behaviour, pushing habitual listeners to standard terrestrial radio listening in a passive manner, such as in a car or at work as background noise, whereas discretionary listeners have turned to podcasts to allow for flexibility in their listening times so that focus on the content can be achieved at a preferred time and in a preferred listening environment.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Literature surrounding campus/community radio and social media fails to provide a concrete environment for study. As a result, the conceptual framework presented below helps to address the gaps in previous research, allowing the reader of this thesis to better understand the reasoning for the conclusions drawn by the primary researcher.

This study builds upon the framework originally published by Philip D Savage (1989) and his Master of Arts Thesis Doing community radio: the practices of information programming at community stations in comparison to a commercial radio station, as one of the first studies into Canadian community radio (Figure 2.2). In his framework of the Canadian radiosphere, Savage argues that individuals may see the radio sector (D) as a whole, whereas it is broken down into (a) [campus/community] stations, (b) commercial radio stations and (c) public radio stations (with (B) Representing for-profit businesses and (C) Policy or Agencies dealing with Radio). (A) Represents non-profit community organizations. In this study, a third element, social media ((E) represented in red), has been introduced into the original framework by Savage as an element of previously un-identified space. As illustrated, social media has an impact on all aspects within the radio and non-profit community organizations, and in the view of the primary researcher is critical as an interlinking aspect that can be applied to all areas of radio, business and community organizations. The section marked (E) can be applied to future research which revolves around campus/community, commercial and public radio, and is not necessarily restricted to studies involving social media.
The reminder of this chapter outlines the researchers viewpoint when looking at how social media in campus/community radio in Canada is affected by structuration, ICT4D, the importance of campus/community radio in Canada, as well as the impact that social media has on both broadcaster and station structure and tasks. Figure 2.2 is a graphical representation of how such area are inter-related with each other within the radio framework.
Figure 2.2 – Conceptual framework nested flow-chart.

Structuration in community radio

Anthony Giddens Theory of Structuration (1984) states that individuals or groups create their own structures through dynamic processes in order to match the needs of those individuals or groups. The very methods in which humans create to fulfill their needs are flexible enough to match the desired outcomes, and can be adapted to different situations (Giddens, 1984). The language and methods used are not from a rigid structure, but the broader interaction of language and society which is fluid (Bryant & Jary, 1991). As such, social media and other methods of communication can be adapted and used for multiple purposes, each matching the need of the specific broadcaster to their end goals. Understanding what these goals are helps to facilitate the generation of language through a platform of web 2.0 technologies to assist both a programmer and a station. In addition, structuration stresses the notion that there is no universal mechanism for social change, as the complex world of today restricts the idea of adapting completely to a situation, but using “reflective monitoring” (being flexible to change) in the systems to reach for the intended goals (ibid). By working with an organic and interpretative framework, research can be adjusted according to the findings, and the study will be able to utilize all the data and methods available to it as it is discovered. As a result, the necessity to develop a flexible framework of research that deals with fast-moving web 2.0 trends is necessary, and outlined in detail in Chapter Three.
The concept and practice of “Communication for Development” (C4D) as a social process encapsulates the empowerment of poor and marginalized individuals or groups, allowing them to define their own development objectives through fostering dialogue and participation (AMARC, 2008, p.5). This practice is parallel in theory and scope to that of action research (see Chapter Three) as well as the goals and mandate of campus/community radio in Canada. As Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) increase, C4D processes are exemplified through the convergence of the world of media, computing and telecommunications with the boom of web 2.0 and mobile/Wi-Fi use. As a consequence, new community media channels are emerging that facilitate increased awareness of development issues, allow for indigenous and international knowledge sharing, increase citizen’s participation in development processes and encourage accountability and good governance (ibid., p.5).

In his book Development Communication: Reframing the Role of the Media, Thomas L. McPhail argues that the field of development communication is currently undergoing a paradigm shift; evolving from its roots in modernization theory toward an increasingly bottom-up approach focused on grassroots initiatives and the power of media interventions and education to promote positive social change (Christie, 2011, p.1). The result is that the World Congress on Communications of Development (WCCD) recognizes the importance of using technology to highlight the needs of the listener (AMARC, 2008, p.6). A study by the organization asked if citizens today have greater opportunities to voice their ideas and concerns, and stated that new technologies are increasingly having a positive effect in creating two way communications between listener and broadcaster (AMARC, 2008, p.6; AMARC, 2010 September, p.2).

The importance of social media for development is highlighted with the inclusion of a major training program produced by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research. The goal for the nine week course, entitled Innovative Collaboration for Development (ICfD) is to “empower development professionals to recognize the potential of social media, to make innovative use of these tools to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and reach of their work, and to contribute to the enhancement of the institutional image of their organizations” (UNITAR, 2011, p.2 ). International organizations and non-profit groups use social media as a tool to communicate with stakeholders, so too does campus/community radio, as it act as an important bridge to communicate development information to its listeners around the globe (Solervicens, 2009, p.1). Stations using ICTs favour the interaction between global and local strategies, between local knowledge and international science, and thus increase the effects of the interventions where they are most needed (ibid). The use of ICTS by campus/community radio practitioners around the world has led to the increased awareness of the effects of climate change in local communities around the world, as well as, natural disaster prevention and management and the challenges of food security, health, water and sanitation security (ibid).
Importance of campus/community radio in Canada

Canadian campus/community radio’s impact on the local landscape is much different than that found in more international, developing nations based mostly on the stability of the media industry within Canada itself. The result is an industry that is more about providing opportunity and alternative opinion through broadcast outlets, than one of sweeping social change. The policies within the sector that affect a stations licensing broadcast and mandate, along with the structure of paid staff and board members, results in a less confrontational system that breeds a friendlier environment. Therefore, the Canadian campus/community sector is built around three areas: a training ground for further broadcasting and media; a social justice outreach platform for community news, rights and forums and as a ground for individuals to present music and other topics which they are truly passionate about as a hobby.

Although being phased out by the CRTC as a recognized licensed category, campus/community licensing also encompasses instructional licenses, which designates a station is used as an official teaching and learning ground through a college or university. This license acknowledges the station is used for training of commercial broadcasters, and typically is administered in close relation to the school (as opposed to membership or student levied stations). The CRTC has not licensed any new stations since 2007, and is phasing out this license as “such training could just as easily be provided through closed-circuit, carrier current or Internet-based broadcasting using much of the same studio equipment” (CRTC, 2010). Non-instructional campus/community stations are also training grounds for media and broadcast, but typically do not lead to the field of commercial broadcasting. Those who build skills and knowledge within campus/community radio may move onto other areas such as print, magazine, blogging, podcasting, citizen media, campus newspapers or public radio such as the CBC. The relatively low pay grade found in the industry for staff makes it typically unsustainable for an individual to remain at a station or the industry for a longer period of time without other sources of income. As a result, turnover occurs typically between two and four years for staff, and, based on the transitory nature of campus stations, for many student volunteers as well.

Campus/community radio is also a dedicated outlet for social justice, local community news and cultural development of community as outlined in the 2010 Broadcasting Act (CRTC, 2010). It becomes a platform for local organizations or impassioned individuals to express their desire for social change, acknowledge the imbalance of social justice and broadcast news information that would not reach local commercial news outlets (French Language Services Commissioner, 2011, p.2). Furthermore, local news often comes in short segments of fifteen seconds to three minutes on commercial outlets. Campus/community radio allows for much more in-depth coverage of non-traditional stories for those that are interested in listening. As a result, organizations and individuals have “magazine” style shows, often

---

3 A format that generally looks at a topic with multiple segments devoted to different stories around a theme of the show.
weekly hour long broadcasts that highlight key social justice and news interests such as migrant workers, labour rights, political talk shows, local food systems, queer issues, accessibility matters and other socially-oriented shows (CFRU, 2012).

Finally, campus/community radio becomes an outlet for music or content that can only be broadcast or made available based on the unique properties of the music, the location of the producers and the access to distribution networks that are not financially burdensome on the artist or presenter. These stations often broadcast a diverse range of music and topics that are unavailable on the radio spectrum anywhere else. These include at least sixty-three different languages through ethnic and cultural shows catering to a specific community from stations within the NCRA (NCRA, 2010). These shows support local communities, typically not represented in the mainstream media, by providing relevant news, information and entertainment often not available when an individual or family is living abroad from their home community. Some shows also provide specific programming for a variety of age demographics, including senior, youth and kids focused shows (CFRU, 2012). Music programming allows broadcasters (and listeners) to experience new music not readily available through commercial broadcasting. This includes supporting local artists who would not have the financial means to reach commercial broadcasting outlets due to lack of record label distribution networks. It also embraces niche music genres, such as folk, blues, jazz, classical, death metal, Punjabi hip-hop, electronica, experimental and turntablism which are unavailable on commercial radio station. Jocks and hosts of these shows typically have a deep understanding and passion for the music presented, and are able to gather information direct from a source not accessible by the general public, therefore allowing listeners insight into the musical genre or topic not normally available to them. As Lisa Monk (1997) stated in her master’s thesis, "diversity exists beyond the mix of musical genres. It refers to the verities of people within the Canadian population", which highlights the importance to have not only the music be representative of the population, but the presenters as well. The campus/community sector provides a location for diverse representation of voices on the air, which no other media industry in Canada specifically acknowledges.

**Impact on broadcaster and station**

The implications of a socially connected world though ICTs and social media force the adoption of new media into most organizations in order to remain visible in the industries they serve. Individuals that effectively utilize social media can stimulate other outcomes than traditional marketing, such as idea generation, content collection and network expansion (Fischer & Rueber, 2011, p.16). Campus/community stations fulfill only a small portion of the broadcast listenership in radio, and are increasingly trying to discover or create ways to enhance listeners the station. Providing an alternative and local view alone is not sufficient to retain attention, they need to connect and engage to create a lasting bond between station and listener. The use of innovative web 2.0 platforms also allows the station to attract, retain and inform its volunteer base. However, solely having a profile will not in itself increase
awareness or trigger an influx of participation. Instead careful planning and research will greatly benefit non-profits as they attempt to develop social networking relationships with their stakeholders (Waters et al. 2009, p.101). Stations must provide training and support to their programmers, in order to allow for those individual jocks to be successful in reaching their on and off air goals. The goals of the station parallel those of the individual broadcaster, so the mutual relationship between station and programmer needs to be one of trust, communication and support for the success of both.

As with commercial radio jocks, individual programmers in campus/community radio now identify the need to become more active in social media. Fans or listeners of niche shows have the ability to communicate and enhance their knowledge and entertainment with content provided off-air through social media. Opportunities to reap the benefits of social media are being lost by some programmers who do not feel the need, nor have the insights or motivations to include social media and other web applications in conjunction with their shows.

Richard Waters et al. (2009) argued that social networking sites can be an effective way to reach stakeholder groups if organizations understand how their stakeholders use the sites when properly maintained. Results from their study show that non-profits are beginning to experiment with different Facebook offerings. Because SNSs have become ingrained in daily life, they will increasingly see a diverse audience in terms of age, culture and socio-economic status as individuals log-on and build networks. Then, non-profits will need to use more social networking applications and networking opportunities to meet the growing needs and expectations of their stakeholders (ibid., p.106). This connection with stakeholders provides needed communication opportunities with individuals who may fund or volunteer within the station, thus increasing station capacity.

**SUMMARY**

The related literature on review chapter acknowledges the difference between community media around the and campus/community radio in Canada by introducing the reader to the history of Canadian radio, as well as the chronic struggles around funding and competition with commercial and public radio. The chapter also outlines the unique atmosphere in which stations are structured and how that can affect the way policy is created and social media is used. The growth of mobile use and changes in listening patterns has affected all forms of media, including commercial radio, television, news and print, as social media has become heavily integrated into all of these areas. As a result, social media is being used in campus/community radio in Canada, but how much and by for what purposes is yet to be discovered.

The chapter concludes with an inside look into how the researcher views the environment surrounding this complex problem. The researcher argues that communities create their own systems to meet the
goals and motivations, using social media from a structuration standpoint. The use of technology has a major impact on campus/community programmers, as development of technologies plays a large role in capacity and development within marginalized communities. Campus/community radio in Canada impacts the social fabric of Canadian society in three major ways: as a training ground for further broadcasting and media; as a social justice outreach platform for community news, rights and forums, and as a ground for individuals to present music and other topics which they are truly passionate about as a hobby. As a result, the introduction of new technologies fundamentally changes the way which radio stations and presenters accomplish their goals, and provides additional challenges in achieving success.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION
This chapter will introduce the necessity of using a new methodical approach, why it is important for future research and the actual data collection process (as completed in chronological order) for this study. Due to the lack of published research surrounding campus/community radio in Canada and social media, as well as the fast-paced environment of social media, a new method of research is required to look at the connection of the two areas within academic research. The method acronym “S.M.I.L.E.S.” is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research tools and data designed to use a variety of methods, creating an advanced triangulation platform to collect information and data from multiple areas of research. S.M.I.L.E.S (Split Methodology Inductive-Linking & Enabling System), which uses multiple methods of research, such as semi-structured and probing interviews, closed surveys, literature review, principal investigator reflective journal, internet metrics, content analysis of visual media, listener engagement focus group, participatory workshops, and professional opinion (or other methods based on the needs of the study).

S.M.I.L.E.S
The main method of gathering data for this study was that of a new system which is outlined below. S.M.I.L.E.S was developed in this study to look at communication wants and methods in low-income and not-for-profit organizations when using social media (APPENDIX #3 - S.M.I.L.E.S. POWERPOINT). “Split-Method” refers to the use of both qualitative and quantitative data and methods but is not mixed methods because of the greater focus on the qualitative side. "Inductive-Linking" connects observations of individual incidents to members of a similar situation or community. The “Enabling”, refers to the utilization of data, findings and recommendations in the researched industry through action research and community copyright. The term “System”, adheres closely to the idea of Systems Theory, which concludes that all things are subject to the impact of other systems, and as a result one single topic or result cannot be individually isolated as the wholeness due to the complex relationship at work within a system (Bertalanffy, 1968). S.M.I.L.E.S. methodology is designed to allow for flexibility in both data input and analysis based on the needs of the individual study, so that the interchangeability of methods as well as process and procedure can be adjusted as the study goes on. The result is a system that allows for flexibility when dealing with areas of grey literature, minimal peer-reviewed literature available, changing systems and platforms and when problems arise where planned methods are no longer available for use. The initial plan was to use between eight to twelve different input methods, and permits methods to be dropped from the study after the design phase was completed when complications occur (as long as valid
reasons for the exclusion are included in the methods report). The multiple methods in each phase strengthen the validity of the study.

The S.M.I.L.E.S. methodology connects three main research methods: 1) collaborative inquiry (action research and domain analysis), 2) probing interviews (including surveys), and 3) internet metrics (including content analysis for visual media/visual association & principal investigator reflective journal), supported by the professional opinion of a social media company and commercial radio promotions professionals.

John Creswell (2006) argues that mixed methods research combines both philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry to create a plan for research, data collection and analysis (p.5). Research involving social media can heavily impact individuals being researched and, as a result, it is important for individuals’ identities to remain anonymous (Rooke, APPENDIX # 4 - ROOKE - INTERNET RESEARCH ETHICS). Thus, information gathered directly from individuals specifically for this study will retain the anonymity of both the individual and the associated organization. Like the mixed method approach, the design of S.M.I.L.E.S. focuses around the basic premise that multiple methods of data collection and analysis generate valid results (Creswell, 2006, p.9). Action research also encourages us to ask “what dimensions of an extended epistemology are emphasized in the inquiry and whether this is appropriate?” It encourages researchers to consider the validity claims of the different forms of knowing in themselves and the relationship between different ways of knowing within the researcher (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p.16). As a result, it is critical that the researcher carefully weigh all methods of research and select those which provide a balanced report based on the needs of the community, not the completed results of the researcher.

The use of triangulation to prove validity is of key importance when dealing with mixed methods techniques, as the necessity of verifying findings can be completed even if there is a skewed result from a single test (Mikkelsen, 2005, p. 66). Triangulation allows us to learn from each individual, within a group and reduce the limitations of any one technique by supplements; and/or cross validate findings from a second or more view pointse (ibid., p.67). In this case, triangulation uses multiple methods of scattered data from a variety of sources to create stronger conclusions for one topic or result when the data collected may be grey, non-peer reviewed literature. Non-peer reviewed literature may often be the only literature posted when new emerging trends appear in web 2.0. Published papers in academia have the potential to be outdated within a few months of their completed study when focused on social media platforms, and as a result the S.M.I.L.E.S. approach helps to generate a better understanding of the environment which impacts the organizations, and not necessarily the fads or tends of that specific time frame the research was completed in. As such, focus on literature in social media publications revolves around human intimacies (i.e. the ability to interact with the individual or organization who posted the
content) and courtesies (i.e. time between postings, etc.), and not necessarily the latest application or platform in use. In this study, we continually modify this mixed methods system to gather information as trends and themes arise throughout the data gathering process, and apply these to broader generalized themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lynham, 2000). The result is modification, addition or reduction of methods as data is gathered and analyzed, allowing for flexibility and exploration of new information streams that match social wants and needs (Dooley, 2002, p. 336).

Final conclusions and recommendations have drawn from the methods of research outlined in detail below, with industry recommendations and best practice protocol made available in Chapter 9 of this paper. In the spirit of open source information and growth in action research, the distribution of results and recommendations will be distributed directly to those who request the information during the research, as well as made available through industry channels such as the NCRA, as well as open source publications and creative commons copyright.

**ACTION RESEARCH**

According to Gilmore, Krants and Ramirez (1986), action research “[a]ims to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to further the goals of social science simultaneously (p.161).” Thus, there is a dual commitment in action research to study a system and concurrently to collaborate with members of the system in changing it in what is together regarded as a desirable direction. Accomplishing this twin goal requires the active collaboration of researcher and client, and thus it stresses the importance of co-learning as a primary aspect of the research process (ibid). This is true in the case of campus/community radio and its use of communication tools as this study’s findings will assist the leaders of each radio station (and individual broadcasters) who are involved in reaching out to their communities. The author, as an individual who is actively involved in community radio broadcasting and social media use, is engaging in action research and continues to be both a researcher and a participant in the study (See reflective journal below).

David Selener (1997) emphasizes that while a major goal of participatory research is to solve practical problems in a community (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p.13). “Another goal is the creation of shifts in the balance of power in favour of poor and marginalized groups in society (Selener, 1997, p.166).” Campus/community radio, not only in Canada but around the world, is a chronically underfunded broadcast medium with its main focus being to empower marginalized groups, and therefore is more likely to react to research and change using methods and goals understood by the presenters or stations themselves.

This political form of participation affirms peoples’ right and ability to have a say in decisions which affect them and which claim to generate knowledge about them (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p.12). So while
researchers may be concerned with producing information and action directly useful to a group of people, participation can also empower them at a second and deeper level to see that they are capable of constructing and using their own knowledge (ibid, p.13). This type of research explicitly aims to educate those involved in order to develop their capacity for inquiry, both individually and collectively, as it fosters the communities intimate relationship between knowledge and power and knowledge production (ibid, p.13). Participants within campus/community radio are able to define goals, identify problems and produce solutions with the assistance of capacity researchers, but the discoveries may not be sufficient to meet personal goals. Since the researcher is part of the community in study, he/she must be aware that knowledge making cannot be neutral and disinterested on its own, but is a political process in the service of particular purposes and one which has been institutionalized in favour of the privileged (Hall, Gillette, & Tandon, 1982). As a result, there is a fine balance that must be acknowledged when information and ideas generated by participants is recorded, coded and analyzed by the researcher to reduce the influence of the researcher on the results. Furthermore, the use of multiple methods and sourcing help to reduce further biases.

Participating in any community of practice requires learning to move from being an outsider through participation at the periphery to a more active position (legitimate peripheral participation, according to Lave et al., 1991). Awareness, as a starting point of this process, comes through exposure to ideas of others and lurking⁴ (observing without active participation) to learn about professional language and social norms, before a study is started (MacDonald, Atkin, Daugherity, Fox, MacGillivray, Reeves-Lipscomb & Uthailertaroo, 2004; Efimova, 2004, p.12). As a result, interaction within the community of practice before the start of the study was a key reason why an initial research goal is developed and identified, and an exploratory case study was undertaken.

Action research is best seen as an emergent, evolutionary and educational process of engaging with self, persons and communities, which needs to be sustained for a significant period of time (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p.16). Action research within this study was executed using a variety of methods such as principal investigator reflective journal, semi-structured and probing interviews, group learning engagement panels (domain analysis) and participatory workshops where researcher and jock or staff engaged in information transmission to assist each other’s goals. As a result of its importance within the campus/community radio sector, working through the NCRA was a critical connection point for research in this study. Without the support of the organization, and the network its reaches, research for this study would be inherently gapped and the extension of findings and recommendations would not benefit the entire industry for which the study was completed. Further details are provided later on in this chapter under each individual method.

---

⁴ An individual who reads a topic, but does not contribute to discussion in an online forum, newsgroup or chat room.
CREATIVE COMMONS COPYRIGHT

This thesis uses an Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike Creative Commons license (APPENDIX #11 - CREATIVE COMMONS COPYRIGHT). The use of this specific license encourages the information collected here to be built upon and presented to non-profit or education groups as a means of furthering socially responsible goals. Advantages of using Creative Commons copyright include the ability for information to be embedded into web pages and search engines and to be shared in a peer-to-peer environment, allowing additional organizations to gain the insight into the work (Scholman, 2003). Organizations such as the NCRA or AMARC then have permission to post the study in full on their page, allowing for download, sharing and archival abilities. Minjeonj Kim’s study (2008) on Creative Commons found that “licenses accurately reflect the ways people produce creative works, serve the private interests of creators, and serve the public interests of users” (p.202). Most individuals within non-profit settings view the opportunity for financial gain for one’s work as non-critical, whereas the love of sharing’s one’s personal interests and passions are key reasons why individuals provided a creative commons license for their work (ibid, p. 202, 203).

PRIVACY IN RESEARCH PRACTICES

The proliferation of social media and web 2.0 applications in the previous five years has created a new social research opportunity. As with all research, boundaries must be set out to discover valid and accurate data, keeping ethical practices at the forefront of the data gathering process. The lack of standardized practices requires an in-depth look into the use of such methods, with focus on four major areas: 1) security for the individual, 2) anonymity, 3) safety and 4) use of mined data and information gathered (Rooke, APPENDIX # 4 - ROOKE - INTERNET RESEARCH ETHICS). This study used both passive and active research methods and has been cleaned to remove all characteristics that could identify an individual or organization (ibid.). Research and methods for this study have maintained every effort maintain confidentiality of the individual, association or identifying characteristics, however participants are aware that guaranteed confidentiality is not possible especially when in a group setting as the researcher has no control after the discussion is completed. All participants in the research provided consent in advance of their involvement, had the ability to withdraw from the study at any time, and are aware that data collected via online surveys are subject to privacy laws within the United States of America, due to the server locations of surveygizmo.com. Furthermore, data sets collected are not available for public viewing, and will be destroyed six months after the successful completion of the paper (APPENDIX #5 - RESEARCH ETHICS FORM).
CASE STUDY AND EXPLORATORY RESEARCH

Research began in October of 2010 as exploratory in nature at the University of Guelph’s campus/community radio station CFRU 93.3 FM. As part of an assignment in the researcher’s developmental communications class, individual jocks were asked about their social media use in connection to their shows, specifically if they were using social media to promote the stations membership drive. The results highlighted the necessity for further research into the use of web 2.0 and social media in the industry.

Case study research is defined as “scholarly inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (Yin, 1994, p.33). This allows the researcher to take an isolated look at a radio station, to better determine the unique properties which make up the station’s environment. From this single case observation, the start of a theory formed, and provoked the researcher to study the same phenomenon through other methods of data acquisition (Dooley, 2002, p. 336). As such, the case study of CFRU is a starting point to build theory, and cannot be used as a generalization for all research (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p.219).

CFRU was chosen as an exploratory research case study due to the proximity of location to the researcher’s university, as well as the amount of support within the station the researcher already receives as a long-time volunteer. Most programmers personally knew the researcher from his employment there, and as a result were more likely to respond to the survey. Also, the research received the support of the stations board of directors and staff members, who assisted in the completion of the survey and facilitated additional research opportunities as they acknowledged the importance of the research to the newly started social media campaigns and networks the station was about to implement. Furthermore, CFRU was chosen due to its long standing history within the community, as one of the first campus/community stations licensed in Canada, and its licensing as a long standing radio club (Personal communications, Ian McDirmid, February 21 2011).

The preliminary test survey was administered by paper to programmers at CFRU 93.3 FM in Guelph, Ontario in October 2010 in order to create an exploratory case study of a community/campus radio station’s methods to raise funds. This survey received responses from 26 of a total of 75 active programmers who broadcast through CFRU 93.3 FM. (APPENDIX #7 – SURVEY #1 (CFRU EXPLORATORY SURVEY)). Furthermore, a semi-structured interview with the station’s outreach coordinator was completed. This led to the conclusion of action research activities to engage in support for the station social networking systems, to outline future jock and staff involvement and to create a working support network between researcher and station.
PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOPS

After the research proposal and research ethics board application for this study was approved in late February 2011, CFRU hosted a day long set of workshops presented by staff and other volunteers on a variety of community and programming topics. Participatory workshops use the strengths outlined in participatory research, with the ability for groups to build off of each other’s ideas and perceptions in a collaborative manner (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995, p.1669). As part of the schedule, the researcher hosted a participatory workshop that was attended by approximately twenty programmers, staff, board members and volunteers on March 12th, 2011. The workshop brainstormed ideas as a group about how and why jocks engaged with their listeners. Information was recorded on a whiteboard and later transcribed and coded to digital print. It concluded by providing some basic tips about social media use to those attending, as found by the researcher during early literature reviews. Feedback was solicited by e-mail to those who attended, in order to better understand the success of the workshop, areas of improvement in presentation and data collection, and recommendation for further inquiry.

LISTENER ENGAGEMENT FOCUS GROUPS

Focus groups have become a popular and effective way of conducting research, particularly involving peoples experience and insight (Kitzinger, 1995, p.299; Sim, 1998, p.245). A focus group allows participants to speak between one another, as well as the researcher, about a general topic (Kitzinger, 1995, p.299). The major benefit was that the engagement focus group allowed for various ways of communication to occur in an open forum, which may not have been discussed during an individual interview or survey because feedback and idea generation with others is encouraged (ibid.). When conducting the focus group, it was imperative that the researcher remain as impartial, and try to say as little as possible in order to reduce the research biases on the information gathered (Sim, 1998, p.245). As such, the researcher acted as a moderator, and refrained from generalizing the result of the discussion (Kitzinger, 1995, p.299).

In this study, an exploratory^5 and voluntary listener engagement focus group was conducted with nine members of CFRU on the 31st of March in 2011. The focus group invited programmers, staff, board members and volunteers to an open discussion surrounding the reasons both how and why programmers engaged with their listeners. (APPENDIX #6 - POSTER FOR LISTENER ENGAGEMENT FOCUS GROUP (CFRU)). The hour long discussion hosted in a neutral, off station site, was recorded via audio, transcribed and coded for information.

^5 The focus group was used as a way to gather ideas and trends early in the research process, allowing the researcher to gain insight into future areas of research and generate questions for surveys and interviews.
TRAVELING PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOP

On April 29th of 2011, a voluntary participatory workshop was administered in Ottawa, Ontario, at CKCU (Carleton University), and attended by three programmers from CKCU and CHUO (University of Ottawa). The first thirty minutes of the workshop, the programmers participated in a semi-structured listener engagement focus group about how and why jocks engage with their listeners. The second thirty minutes used a domain analysis method where programmers used post-it-notes and markers to visually connect the reasons why and how the engagement is completed (Figure 3.1). Participants listed the various methods they have tried, or wished to try and connected them to the reasons why they wanted to interact with listeners. From there, the participants ranked how they felt each method worked based on personal satisfaction. Domain analysis allowed the users to choose the words and characteristics that support their thoughts, and as a result transcends across social and cultural boundaries and compared people’s views against experience and problems while learning in the process (Chevalier, 2006, p.1). As a result, the researcher is better able to understand the goals and processes of which participants chose to employ in order to attempt to reach their goals (ibid.p.2). During the domain analysis construction phase, participants talked about individual experiences relating to using web 2.0 and their communication goals with the group. This open discussion was recorded via audio, transcribed and coded for information.

Figure 3.1 – Examples of domain analysis conducted during a traveling participatory workshop.
In June 2011, the researcher presented an adjusted participatory workshop completed under the test pilot program at CFRU, to individuals at the National Campus/Community Radio Conference (NCRC) in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The workshop built upon the information gathered in previous workshops and engagement sessions and asked in further detail the approximately thirty programmers, staff, board members and volunteers who engaged in a group domain analysis project. This group project had participants use post-it-notes and markers to visually connect the reasons why and how they engaged with listeners. Post it notes where then grouped together into like-minded categories in real-time to generate further discussion based on the patterns participants identified (Figure 3.2). This on-the-fly analysis was completed by a volunteer who, previous to the panel, was instructed how to complete the grouping ideas by the researcher. Participants then noted important trends, and expanded upon specific instances that worked or should be avoided. Post-it-notes were then removed, and taken for additional coding and analysis.

Figure 3.2 – Group domain analysis conducted at the NCRC conference in Halifax, NS. (reconstruction after transportation for analysis).

During the domain analysis construction phase, participants talked about individual experiences relating to using web 2.0 and their communication goals with the group. This open discussion was recorded via audio, transcribed and coded for information. Furthermore, while post-it-notes were being added to the board, a survey was also administered in person to the participants of the class, to which fifteen responded (APPENDIX #8 – SURVEY #2 (NCRC SURVEY)).

The workshop also allowed the researcher to make contact with radio station staff within the nation-wide association for the first time. This introduced the study to association members, encouraged stations to think more about their social media use and instructed staff to look for further communications via a nation-wide e-mail survey that was administered in the fall of 2011.
SURVEYS

The surveys executed in this study used a semi-closed design due to time and distance constraints. Question boxes allowed for short answers to be written out, and radio or check boxes used a Likert-type system to gauge a more precise understanding of what the individual had to say about various degrees of perceived success within the research project (Grey & Guppy, 2003, p.103). Both semi-structured or probing interviews and surveys were used to collect information and data because individuals involved easily understood the structure and format, as they are quite commonly used for research purposes. The information gathered via surveys was cleaned and then open coded in conjunction with axial coding for further analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Open and axial coded was also used in the exploratory case study, participatory workshops, listener engagement focus groups and semi-structured or probing interviews (Results posted in Chapter Four).

This method used as part of S.M.I.L.E.S. involved four separate surveys administered over thirteen months (October 2010 – November 2011) to programmers and stations across the spectrum of the NCRA. The surveys asked questions about the use and motivations for social media in communication between broadcaster and listeners. The first survey was submitted to CFRU programmers as part of the exploratory case study (as noted above) (APPENDIX #7 – SURVEY #1 (CFRU EXPLORATORY SURVEY)). The second survey was conducted at the NCRC (as noted above). (APPENDIX #8 – SURVEY #2 (NCRC SURVEY)).

A third survey specifically highlighting the motivation and use of social media from a station’s standpoint was administered via e-mail to participating stations within the NCRA between August 2011 and November 2011. Completed responses from 30 of 82 stations were received via a web based survey link administered on SurveyGizmo.com. Typically completed by paid staff or board of director members, participants accepted a consent form and filled in a seven-page online survey which highlighted the reasons and methods the station uses web 2.0 for distribution of information, marketing or communications, as well as its perceived success and ownership of responsibility at the station (APPENDIX #9- SURVEY #3 (NCRA STAFF)). Responses received from this survey are indicated as “staff” or “station” in future reference, even if the individual who filled out the survey was a member of the board of directors. In this survey, the individual completing the survey is perceived to hold more in-depth knowledge about the inner workings of the station in comparison to a volunteer or programmer.

A final survey was simultaneously distributed by to 54 individual programmers via participating NCRA stations staff members who completed the Survey #3. Station staff forwarded an e-mail request by the researcher to its volunteer base, whose responses were directly sent to the researcher, in confidence, via SurveyGizmo.com. This fourth survey posed questions about personal motivation and social media use for the jocks personal shows, as well as asked participants to discuss the support they received from the
station, any training that was provided and how important social media was to them in completing their goals. Surveys were administered using an on-line link, and the program SurveyGizmo.com was utilized to make administration and data collection simple (APPENDIX #10 - SURVEY #4 (NCRA PROGRAMMERS)).

Participants who provided links or references to website addresses allowed the researcher permission to analyze and data mine information for the blog analysis portion of this study, as outlined in the Research Ethics Form which was signed by all participants in the study (APPENDIX # 4 - ROOKE - INTERNET RESEARCH ETHICS).

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

This study used methods of probing and semi-structured interviews (depending on time and location constraints). Probing interviews included more open-ended and unstructured questions to allow for an opinion based meeting where those involved were encouraged to express their feelings, frustrations and successes without pressure by researcher biases (Sim, 1998, p.245). Probing questions a closer associated with action research, as the researcher's general questions and preamble to the discussion allowed for the interviewee to decide the direction of the discussion in accordance with their goals for interaction through social media. This method allowed those directly involved in the participatory research to express their concerns and address and receive feedback to any unanswered issues which had arisen during the process.

When interviews and surveys were conducted, the interviewer followed suggested statistically proven guidelines in research methods such as “The Step-by-Step of a Good Interview” and “General Problems with the Interview Style of Research” in order to make sure any questions and surveys were easy to understand and asked in a professional manner (Gray & Guppy, 2003).

Interviews and surveys conducted probed inquiry from multiple individuals in each demographic of station, show and/or type of radio in order to understand the requirements of different structures and systems. This included determining the average male-to-female individual broadcaster ratio within campus/community radio and maintaining a minimum female feedback ratio. It also took into account looking at different forms of radio operations (including commercial and public), as well as station broadcasting size and funding levels.

Approximately 15 in-person open-ended interviews took place between the researcher and campus/community radio staff and broadcasters, commercial radio promotions managers, public radio

---

6 Including station size, location, structure and genre.
hosts and non-profit radio centred organizations in Canada and Australia. Additional information was obtained from e-mail correspondence with these respondents. Interviews were recorded as audio recordings, transcribed to text and coded for information.

**DATA MINING**

Data mining involved using internet metrics\(^7\) to gather statistical information, manipulated by SPSS\(^8\) for analysis and trends.

Data minded information was to be gathered by using statistical software and web 2.0 applications to generate data on Facebook and Twitter. This study had hoped to analyze inferential statistics, by comparing findings to other campus/community radio stations with respect to central tendency (i.e., one station used only one format of social media, another used three; which is more likely to gather more interest and feedback from its community), as well as use other statistical tests to determine if any relationships between sectors was present.

However, data mining faces constraints that other methods do not due to the techniques of gathering, availability of tools and lack of academic theory to supports its process and findings (Ackland, 2009, p.481). The result was the inability in this study to find a reliable method of data mining that fell within the ethical guidelines outlined by the University of Guelph’s Research Ethics Board. Any web 2.0 systems which gathered information was outside of the boundaries of this study, potentially caused a risk to those who would have not given permission to be included in the study (Rooke, APPENDIX # 4 - ROOKE - INTERNET RESEARCH ETHICS). The pool of resources to those who did provide permission to investigate any links provided was too small to be viewed as statistically viable for analysis and required extensive time commitments to manage any data that would have been gathered. As a result, this method, which was originally planned to be used at the start of the process, was withdrawn as a feasible source of data collection.

**BLOG ANALYSIS**

Additional data was collected by identifying, reading and analyzing 51 blogs from across the three radio sectors (19 commercial jocks, 12 shows on public radio and 20 shows whose stations are in the NCRA). Focus on blogs in this analysis process was enhanced, as data from surveys, interviews and domain analysis alone offered minimal insight into the use of blogs in radio use. The blogs were analyzed in relation to five criteria: style, content, frequency of update, communication and goals.

---

\(^7\) Raw statistics generated from the internet, such as page hits, content shares, number of posts, etc.

\(^8\) SPSS is a computer program used for survey authoring and deployment, data mining, text analytics, statistical analysis, and collaboration and deployment.
Blogs analyzed in the campus/community sector were identified as those that were referenced or recommended by the survey respondents in Survey #3 and Survey #4, or related to interviews and other research communications with approval from the blog owner or station themselves. Permission to use these sites as a means to gather data was approved under this survey’s research ethics board and consent forms by its participants. Commercial and public sites (CBC Radio) were identified by purposeful selection of stations and shows across the country based on different formats presented by the show/station on-air through a public web portal which catalogued commercial stations from across Canada. The portal will not be identified, as it did not consist of all commercial stations within Canada, and therefore could be used to identify stations that were analyzed. Additionally, four blogs were approved for analysis by commercial radio stations who took part in semi-structured and probing interviews. Permission to use these sites as a means to gather data was approved under this survey’s research ethics board and consent forms by its participants.

TWITTER ANALYSIS

Twitter offers a researcher a plethora of data available to be analyzed when mined from the system, which includes topics of discussion, retweets, trends, geographical location and personal attributes (age, gender, etc.). Analysis of twitter accounts associated with campus/community, as well as public and commercial radio was planned to be undertaken in this study, however the method for gathering data became unavailable, as Twitter placed a cease and desist order on the website “twapperkeeper.com,” which was mining data from Twitter accounts for research purposes. As a result, this method, which was originally planned to be used at the start of the process, was withdrawn as a workable source of data.

FACEBOOK ANALYSIS

Based on the restraints outlined under the section “Data Mining” (both risk of identification and lack of available profiles), Facebook analysis of any form of radio station and individual programmers was not completed.

DATA ANALYSIS

With the help of the statistical programs SPSS, generalizations about trends and the correlation between specific campaigns and methods to promote and connect to the community with the broadcaster was completed for the discussion portion of this study (see Chapter Five). Data gathered from the programmer survey and the domain analysis was used to identify general trends and explore the relationship between specific campaigns and the methods used to promote and connect the community with the broadcaster. As indicated above, Survey #3 was distributed to every NCRC station, receiving
responses from 30 of 82 stations, or 37 percent. Stations also forwarded on Survey #4 to programmers, and received responses from 54 of an estimated 8446 volunteers⁹, or 0.6 percent. Although a low return rate, the responses are a sample of programmers located across the country, with an average of two responses per station who partook in Survey #3.

PROFESSIONAL OPINION

Independent social media companies lead the way with trending, marketing and best practice, as they devote their full time to analysis and utilize the markets to meet their goals. As a result, their professional opinions and recommendations can become an important part of gathering information. For this study, the social media company, InfiniteSM from Toronto, Ontario, Canada, has provided this paper with a “best practices” guide. This guide includes the company’s professional guidance and direction when it comes to leveraging networks associated with radio station or jock use. InfiniteSM, and their co-owners Harris Maxwell and Cory Rosenfield (and staff member Stephen Di Giovanni) have not received compensation for their inclusion into this study.

InfiniteSM is a modern niche agency, specializing in full-service social media integration. We take a company’s objectives and provide customized solutions tailored to fit the right social mediums. We work with small businesses, major brands and agencies in a wide variety of industries. Some recognizable brands we have done work for are: Kinder Surprise, Energizer, Crayola, Loblaw's/Joe Fresh, Shoppers Drug Mart, John Frieda, Dempster's, Huggies, Pampers, Gerber, Sobey's, Nestle and the NFL.

Additionally, semi-structured and probing interviews were conducted with four commercial radio stations located in southern Ontario and Nova Scotia. These interviews were similar in nature to the campus/community and not-for-profit interviews, exploring the interaction and use between social media and commercial radio station. The interviews were recorded via audio recording, transcribed to text and coded for information.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR REFLECTIVE JOURNAL

When the principal investigator is heavily integrated into the industry of research, often the researcher has inside information and access to data through personal experiences. In the outset of this study, it was planned to use a reflective journal to document the use of social media by the principal investigator. However, such documentation was not completed due issue of privacy as outlined under the “Data Mining” and “Privacy in Research Practices” portions of the study. Additionally, the lack of a dedicated process to document activities as they occurred was not identified at the start of the study. This meant

---

⁹ Average number of volunteers per station = 103 * 82 = 8446 volunteers within campus/community radio under NCRA affiliated stations
that the principal investigator’s journal was not maintained in as much detail as necessary to be a viable source of data and information. As a result, this method, which was initially planned to be used at the start of the process, was withdrawn as a source of information. However, it is highly recommended that any future studies using the S.M.I.L.E.S. methodology integrate a reflective journal into the data collection process, as it provides additional insight into the problem which may be relevant to discussion when the researcher is heavily involved in the industry.

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS RUNNING BLOG**

In the spirit of inclusion and feedback, the researcher had maintained a running blog of his work. The blog was updated with relevant postings, findings, announcements and feedback requests in order to maintain a working relationship with those involved in the study. Those interviewed and surveyed were made aware of, and encouraged to view the blog as a source for additional discussion, support and interest into the topic. This blog was used as a life journal, which documented the study in chronological form and provided a timeline of the research with reflection opportunities that helped assess the overall process to which the study was completed.

**SUMMARY**

Chapter Three summarizes the need and implementation of a new system in order to research areas that have low levels of published academic review, as well as sectors of research that involved the rapid change in technology use. S.M.I.L.E.S. is a system designed to create advanced triangulation of results that allows areas of grey literature to be validated by additional methods of research. This study utilized multiple methods of research, including: an exploratory case study, participatory workshops and focus groups, surveys, interviews, visual analysis, professional opinion and literature review, as well as data analysis methods such as domain analysis and computer analysis through the SPSS program. Overall, these methods and systems provide a solid foundation for the findings outlined in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings of the study, highlighting the initial expository research and case study findings as a means to generate theory for the remainder of the study. From there, the study reveals the motivations and methods used by staff and programmers to engage in interaction with listeners. This includes the positives and successes, as well as the negative and frustrations surrounding disclosed by participants of the study. Furthermore, respondents discussed areas where support and policy intersected with social media and campus/community radio. Finally, the chapter finishes with recommendations by a social media company, InfiniteSM, and reviews the findings on how commercial radio is using social media.

EXPLORATORY RESEARCH AND CASE STUDY

Early research included programmers and staff from CFRU 93.3 FM, probing them for their current motivations for and methods used to create interaction with listeners. This exploratory research identified a disconnect between station and programmer with regards to rules, methods and training for social media use. Within the case study of CFRU 93.3 FM it was discovered that there were no guidelines prepared or communicated to individual programmers about the use of social media. When programmers asked questions of the staff, staff answered on a case by case basis, to the best of their knowledge. Programmers expressed interest in having guidelines for what can and cannot be said or used when interacting with listeners, as well as training in order to learn how to effectively use social media when interacting with. However, staff were unsure of what steps to take to help support their programmers, as the station has not discussed its goals or strategies for using social media, and integrating it into station policy or procedure.

When programmers were asked about the reason why they wished to interact with their listeners, four main areas of responses arose: 1) feedback about the show (what people want to hear, what content should go on the air, requests), 2) promotion of the show (finding new listeners, new communities to engage with), 3) providing additional content (off-air resources, additional discussion options, non-radio media) and 4) communication about the station (volunteering & hiring). Programmers also discussed ideas for better communication methods and practices in a group setting, which included creating a list of on-air tasks to complete such as announcing e-mail and website addresses, providing direct links to archived shows, using podcasts as “important steps to increase our listenership directly,” and creating a
network for promoting similar shows. There were also concerns about what to do when interaction was not created, how to handle low phone-in volume and failed attempts at giveaways.

Results from Survey #1 received responses from 26 of the 75 shows on the air as of October 2010. 21 of those 26 used some form of web 2.0 applications or traditional digital communications in combination with their personal shows (Figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1 – Survey #1 – Types and frequency of social media use by programmers at CFRU 93.3 FM in October 2010.](image)

**MOTIVATIONS**

With four key areas exposed in our case study highlighting the motivations for social media use, additional surveys, interviews and data was collected to gain further insight into the reasons why programmers and stations attempt to interact with their listeners. Additionally, a fifth category, staff/station/community growth has been identified after additional trends were uncovered. The table below highlights the breakdown of motivations, based on the responses of 117 programmers and staff as collected through surveys and domain analysis (Table 4.1).
**Table 4.1** – Motivations of using social media. Survey and domain analysis of station staff and programmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations for using social media</th>
<th>number of replies</th>
<th>percentage of replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback about the show/station</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of the show/station</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing additional content to off-air listeners</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication about the station itself</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Station/Community growth</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents replied with between 0 and 6 motivations 230

**Feedback about the show/station**

More than half of the programmers and staff interviewed were motivated to use social media and interact with their listeners as a way to provide input into their own personal shows or to the general health of the station. Programmers and staff were specifically interested in find out who was listening to the show/station, receiving feedback to find out if they provide content that is interesting and relevant, remaining competitive in the market as a place for listeners to go for new content and information, and as a method to find new content for the show itself.

**Table 4.2** – Quotes from staff or programmers who use social media as a way to gather feedback about the show/station.

"I enjoy hosting a weekly program, but I find it even more exciting when I'm getting feedback, requests and other things to know people are actually listening to me!"

"I can look back at what I've played, see if there's a favourite artist I've been neglecting, or a mediocre one that I've been using as filler too often."

"Develop the show in its genre, Helping artist get information out, knowing there are listeners"

(sic)

**Promotion of the show/station**

Just under half of the participants who took part in domain analysis and answered surveys indicated that social media is a method used to promote individual shows or the station. Those who responded used social media platforms as a way to generate awareness of the show and gather new listeners. Programmers and staff also used social media as a way to promote upcoming events that are associated with the station, the show itself, or content related to the show. Giveaways and contests were also noted as a source for using social media as a promotion tool.
Table 4.3 – Quotes from staff or programmers who use social media as a way to enhance promotion of the show/station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It is a free way of generating more listenership.”</td>
<td>Enhance promotion of the show/station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to remind people when my show is airing”</td>
<td>Enhance promotion of the show/station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It has built our audience and support for the station for our show to be available on the internet for sure”</td>
<td>Enhance promotion of the show/station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not-for-profit groups noted that social media is used as a way to engage younger Canadians, to become aware of the social goals which the organization are looking to promote. However, one organization stated that it has difficult to reach those targeted and therefor has resulted in becoming frustrated with the use of social media.

Providing additional content to the listener off-air

The third identified area for why programmers and staff use social media as an interactive tool had to do with providing additional content to those interested in the show, in an off-air format. This allowed for programmers and staff to engage, post-show, with listeners who may want to look further into the content that was presented on-air. It also allowed for listeners to catch up on content that was missed during a live show, and become involved in the show’s plans and design. Programmers and staff used social media as a way to provide additional coverage of a topic discussed on-air, as a way to link to other locations which are not suited to radio announcements and help drive additional awareness of social justice content, and new or alternative music content.

Table 4.4 – Quotes from staff or programmers who use social media as a way to provide additional content to listeners off-air.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It’s a good way to share information (what we’ve been playing on the show; concerts to come)”</td>
<td>Additional content to listeners off-air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Offering information and other sources to expand on show topics is a good way to build the outreach efforts of the show itself and provides more support to community listeners.”</td>
<td>Additional content to listeners off-air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Social Justice, Education, Covering undercovered topics, space for women for a voice”</td>
<td>Additional content to listeners off-air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By providing additional content on social media platforms, non-profit organizations have the ability to help connect and share content among their followers through a system that allows content to be searched, cataloged and tagged. The result is the ability to provide news and information that matched what the end users want to learn about, and interact with.

Communications about the station itself

The use of social media can also be linked to the station itself, which uses social media as a tool to aid in more “internal” flows of information and communication. Staff would use social media as a way to source and transfer information on a platform that is used by its programmers. Staff also used social media source qualified candidates when hiring for positions within the station. Programmers indicated that they
would often reference back to the station website as a way to promote station information and news that is not directly related to the content of the programmers show, but could be interesting and relevant to the listener. This could include content about but not limited to station events, special programming and volunteering.

Table 4.5 – Quotes from staff or programmers who use social media as a way to communicate about the station itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“To engage with programmers, volunteers, and listeners. To grow … the number of participants in similar/partner organizations.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Helping to improve communication between staff and volunteers”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to keep volunteers and listeners informed regarding station news, upcoming shows, fundraisers etc.”</td>
<td>(sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal/station/community growth**

Finally, more than half of the programmers and staff identified the use of social media as an interactive tool to build community or grow individually. Individuals and organizations identified the importance of a strong community, especially in campus/community radio as the mandate is to provide services and information to very niche or marginalized communities. The result is a motivation to grow the community that interacts with the show/station to educate and entertain the listeners. Individuals both as programmers and staff identified the use of social media as a way to build personal networks and gather the skills to work in other areas that use social media. Station and programmers also used social media as a way to gather financial resources and funding, and make listeners aware of the needs of the station.

Table 4.6 – Quotes from staff or programmers who use social media as a way to enhance personal/station/community growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…[E]nhance my career in the world of sound/media production”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To get people excited about c/c radio.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Listeners know the station, promotion, hiring, building a community with listeners, expand&quot;</td>
<td>(sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social media can also be used as a way to get people more involved in an organization whose personality is more passive in nature. The result is increased awareness about the organization when it showed up in an individual’s “feed”, reminding and encouraging interaction which may not have occurred without the use of social media. This interaction can draw people to a network, and help to grow a community.

**METHODS**

This study, through its use of surveys and domain analysis, has identified that the average station or individual programmer uses almost six different platforms or methods to create interaction with their listeners or stakeholders. A total of 117 programmers and staff members used a total of 659 platforms to entice interaction in the identified motivations (Figure 4.2). Web 2.0 websites and applications accounted
for approximately 48 percent of the total methods used\textsuperscript{10}. Appendix #12 includes percentages of the number of identified platforms and number of programmers/staff/stations who stated they use the method as a communication tool (SEE APPENDIX #12 – METHODS AND PERCENTAGES OF USE BY STAFF AND PROGRAMMERS WHEN COMMUNICATING WITH LISTENERS).

Figure 4.2 – Wordcloud of methods used by staff and programmers to communicate with listeners.
http://www.tagxedo.com Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-ShareAlike License.

\textit{Programmer Methods}

Campus/community radio jocks identified in surveys and domain analysis three areas of communication methods and techniques, with a combination of social media and traditional methods of communication leading the way. Aggregated results show that just fewer than 80 percent of programmers use Facebook (as either a group, FanPage or personal profile) as a means of communication. Programmers also use non-traditional forms of communication such as websites (#2), and e-mail (#3), before moving back to

\textsuperscript{10} Methods include Facebook, Twitter, blogging, forums, RSS feeds, podcast, YouTube/video streaming, etc., and do not include station or standalone websites, e-mail and LISTSERV/mailing lists.
social media (#4 Twitter, #5 blogs) as a means to create interaction. Programmers also indicated that close to half had permission to post their own communication and promotion needs through platforms provided by (or on behalf of) the station. 36 percent of programmers were unsure if they were allowed to or had permission from their staff to post on station run platforms.

**Station Methods**

Exploratory research identified that station staff use social media and other methods of communication in two different situations, as a means for internal communication between staff, membership, volunteers, programmers and board members, as well as external communications between the station and its listeners in general. External communications with listeners included the same motivations as those which the programmers identified. Station external communications also tended to follow similar platforms and use as the programmers it supported, preferring to use Facebook (#1), Website & Twitter (#2), e-mail (#4) and LISTSERVs (#5) as its top means of interactions. Almost 90 percent of station staff also provided their programmers with the opportunity to either directly (48 percent), or thought a staff member (40 percent), use station owned platforms as a means to promote or communicate on behalf of the programmer.

Stations also identified the need to communicate and interact with other staff, programmers, volunteers and members for internal, non-broadcast related information. These platforms were typically more traditional means, with direct e-mail, website, physical billboard postings and LISTSERVs being four of the top five methods (Twitter placed #3). Stations tended to use similar quantity and types of platforms for both internal communication and external promotions.

Furthermore, when asked “who controls the station’s social media”, staff responded by identifying that not one group or individual tended to control or manage a stations social media (Figure 4.3).
As with most stations, structure varies widely based on funding, staffing levels and organizational goals, so no single defined role or position identifies itself as the manager of a station’s social media across the spectrum of stations.

Finally, 44 percent of staff members identified that a single individual, volunteer or outside contractor was used to follow trends and practices in social media. Essentially this individual is viewed as a “guru” of social media, and advice is sought and provided as a guiding tool for the station to follow.

**TWITTER**

Twitter is one of the favoured methods used by programmers and staff for communication internally and externally. Just under half of programmers and close to two-thirds of station staff implemented it into their communication profile. Both programmers and staff reported that Twitter was a good platform to use during live shows as a method for quick feedback, and as a way to acceptably communicate more frequently with listeners and/or fans as compared to posting on Facebook. Programmers and staff who used twitter also were more likely to use other social media platforms.

**FACEBOOK**

The combination of the three types of Facebook use (groups, FanPages and personal profile,) indicated that it was the platform of preference for communicating with listeners. Programmers who used one form of Facebook were equally as likely to communicate with listeners through a second and/or third form of Facebook. Facebook users were very likely to use Twitter accounts as another means of communication,
and also tended to use other platforms, such as e-mail and websites when compared to a programmer who does not use Facebook as a communication tool. Stations tended to combine the use of Facebook with that of traditional communications like e-mail, and with non-electronic forms of communication such as physical billboard posters when looking to facilitate the flow of non-broadcasting information with a station and its programmers.

**BLOGS**

The following section of the paper presents the key findings of a study that specifically focused on the use of blogs. The findings include overall analysis of blogging inside the Canadian radio sector (commercial, community/campus and public radio stations), survey results for different groups of respondents (in all radio sectors) and further supporting literature.

Eleven of the fifty-four campus/community jocks who responded to the programmer’s survey (Survey #3), stated they use external blogs as a method for interaction between listener and jock, with an additional ten stating they would like to learn how to use blogs in campus/community radio. Of the twenty-nine campus/community staff respondents to the station survey (Survey #4), only four stated that an “external blog is used to promote or keep people up to date about station policy and non-broadcast happenings.” The same four stations used blogs to keep listeners informed of on-air content emanating from the station by either staff or volunteers.

Blogs were also identified as a method used by non-profit organizations as a way to congratulate individuals (in a permanent and public setting) on the work they have done with the organization.

**NUMBER OF RADIO BLOGGERS**

Research shows that extrapolation of self-disclosed bloggers within the NCRA estimates that there are between 450 and 650 bloggers in the Canadian campus/community industry\(^\text{11}\). By looking at the stated number of registered stations in the Canadian Radio-Television Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) estimations reveal somewhere between 2800 and 3800 commercial jocks maintain some form of blog-type medium\(^\text{12}\) (excluding Facebook and Twitter), and between 45 and 85 hosts on public radio in Canada also blog\(^\text{13}\). Further research is necessary to determine the number of podcasting broadcasters or off-air broadcasters that maintain a blog of this type within Canada.

\(^\text{11}\) NCRA Campus/Community Blogs: (82 Stations x 103 Volunteers (Average number of volunteers per station) / 4 (an estimated 1/4 of all volunteers are not programmers and do not use social media at all) x [(10/54 + 7/21)/2] = 550 +/- 100 for error = estimated 450 to 650 blogs.

\(^\text{12}\) Commercial Radio Blogs: (716 Stations x 6 Announcers) x (4/5 of all jocks blog) x (3/4 of all stations who blog) = 3231 +/- 500 = estimated 2800 to 3800 blogs.

\(^\text{13}\) Public Radio Blogs: (3 Stations x 25 Announcers) x (4/5 of all jocks blog) = 60 +/- 25 = estimated 45 to 85 blogs.
Commercial radio blogging

A strong distinction between the three major sectors of radio in Canada is apparent with respect to individual blogs and their use. Commercial radio typically uses blogs as supplemental information embedded in the stations’ websites. Announcers pushed traffic from on-air announcements or additional social media platforms back to the station website, driving hits (and therefore potential eyes for advertising revenue) up. Commercial blogs tend to be of a very short in nature, often consisting of only a few sentences of information at maximum. Jocks also re-posted other stories or ‘cannibalized’ (harvested content without permission) from other commercial radio jocks blogs. These blogs tended to fall into two types, blogs that focus on humour, and/or sexual posts that have a shock and/or entertainment value. They appear to be generally focused towards a single sex based on the demographic the station is targeting. Content is mostly centered on relationships, fashion and pop-culture entertainment and posted at the discretion of the jock. Blogs typically did not pre-promote upcoming on-air content or station happenings. Most blogs include only a sentence or two to introduce the content posted on the site, and are not linked to another social media platform such as Facebook or MySpace. Jocks provided very little personality into each post, and rarely encouraged conversation or interaction, even though the blogs themselves are set up for comment and discussion. Not all stations or broadcasters run a traditional blog, but appear to maintain an online presence through additional social media outlets such as Facebook or Twitter. Those commercial stations that do hosted blogs, tended to update them once a show, therefore typically once every working day.

Public radio blogging

Public broadcasters via CBC Radio 1, 2, and 3 tend to use their blogs as a way to highlight upcoming shows and encourage listeners to re-listen or download past shows they may have missed in real-time. Additional supplemental information like extended interviews is also posted on the blogs, though there is some variation between the three CBC channels in the way that format and content is presented by the broadcaster. Blogs tend to be updated once per show, therefore daily or once every seven days depending on the show rotation, and consist of a short to medium length (75-150 words) post.

Campus/community radio blogging

Campus/Community radio uses blogs very differently than commercial radio jocks. Blogs tend to be focused around the content of the show, often allowing listeners to either re-download (via podcasts) past shows or clips, or highlight music and/or talk talks that match the show’s genre. Interaction tends to be encouraged as jocks usually have the capacity to respond to questions. Typically programmers appear to apply some personality into their blogs, using them as a way to engage listeners and provide insight into the programmer on a personal basis, as opposed to commercial broadcasters, of which most posts are re-posts of simple links or content found from other blogs or social media sites. Campus/Community
blogs are usually updated after every show with track lists and additional show content; however, blogs that are not updated as often tend to be used as long-term content (or event promotion or recaps) in a longer format designed to encourage listeners to spend additional time on the blog engaging in the content after the show is off the air. Campus/Community shows also offer the ability to take content or past shows with the listener for later listening, placing material on blogs with direct download or podcast opportunities.

POSITIVES AND WHAT WORKS WELL WITH SOCIAL MEDIA

Participants in the survey conducted at the NCRC were asked to rate their top three successful methods of communication. Participants tended to favour the use of social media (#1 Facebook FanPage, #2 Facebook Profile, #3 Twitter), but were closely followed by more traditional electronic forms of communication such as e-mail (#4), website (#5) and on-air announcements (#6). Participants in domain analysis also suggest that social media was slightly preferred over the use of traditional and non-electronic means of communication.

When asked to staff in Survey #3: “What tends to work when using social media (based on reaching your own personal goals),” staff appeared tentative to respond, offering less responses as opposed to programmers in Survey #4. The more popular responses included targeting specific audiences or groups, running contests and updating listeners about specific events. Programmers on the other hand identified using social media as an effective way to gain immediate feedback and interaction, a good way to promote their show or goals and to create a buzz about a specific show, song or topic. Programmers also acknowledged the importance of using podcasts, knowing how often to post in order to not turn off listeners by making them feel spammed, and to link to other pages of similar content. Social media was also recognized as a method to provoke advanced interest in a specific broadcast, as one programmer stated “posting [information] a few hours before the show and the day after the show. It reminded them we exist and it's also a way to give them more info about the content of our show”. It can also encourage listeners to tune in to a live show, reconnect with the show after it was completed to re-listen or weigh in with the topics and material presented on the show. Social media was also identified as a good way to move information quickly to supporters of a specific organization, bypassing methods that took time to construct and transport (i.e. posters, fliers, etc).

NEGATIVES AND FRUSTRATION WITH SOCIAL MEDIA

When programmers and staff were asked “what has failed to work?” and “what frustrates you when working with social media?” in nationwide surveys and domain analysis responses stressed the frustration and negativity around the overall amount of time it takes to both maintain and create engagement using social media, the inability to get noticed and received feedback on a platform, not
knowing the technical sides of the medium and being unable to measure the results of using social media. Maintenance of a page is also identified as a potential failure in using social media, as too many posts in a short time result in “[p]eople get[ting] frustrated and 'unlike' your page or block it.” However, pages that are left dormant and not updated appear to show a lack of interest from the host/programmer/station and therefore fans and/or listeners view it as pointless to try to establish interactions through the platform. Additional frustrations of programmers and staff members include not having enough followers to view the campaign as being successful, feeling the necessity to use and maintain multiple platforms for communication, and receiving negative comments.

Table 4.7 – Quotes from staff or programmers answering “What tends to work when using social media?”, “what has failed to work?” and ”what frustrates you when working with social media?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positives | -“Linking to other pages or @ing accounts.”  
-“Allowing followers to have a voice on how the show is prepared. Be it discussion topics, or recommending guests.”  
-“One central blog type platform for playlists and posting messages”  
-“posting a link in Facebook as my status or directly targeting online users and posting a listening link to them”  
-“If I have a special guest or event I can post it to Social Media and people are more aware and apt to listen and participate.” |
| Negatives | -“Trying to encourage others to advertise the page.”  
-“Trying to promote days in advance tend not to work. People forget.”  
-“getting people to subscribe as sustaining members via PayPal (eg. $5/mo)”  
-“Simply putting files online.” |
| Frustrations | -“I don't know for sure exactly how well it is working. I don't have access to my show's ratings (I can ask for them, but doing that every week starts to annoy people,) so my efforts could be a complete waste of time for all I know.”  
-“Since I'm a francophone radio show, it's hard for me to get a strong foundation audience here in my hometown. The internet is really the only way I can reach my audience in France, and since I don't live there, it's hard for me to know what the popular websites are for youth over there.”  
-“There are too many possible methods. I prefer to focus my efforts on working with one method that serves as an extension of the show.”  
-“getting the station staff to open up and think outside the box.” |

(sic)

SUPPORT

When the responses of participants in the national surveys and domain analysis methods were coded, training and support were identified as a capacity where programmers and staff both desired to be strengthened in order to better meet their communication goals. Those completing Survey #3 had 40 percent of respondents identify they have received some sort of social media training or support either from other staff, volunteers or an outside agent.
When jocks were asked “If the station provided training or assistance, what form would you like it to be in?” in Survey #4, respondents preferred one-on-one mentoring (#1), course style learning (#2) and hand-outs or written material (#3) as methods to learn thought. (Figure 4.4)

The favoured learning styles of programmers to receive training are similar in percentage to those provided by the stations, although programmers would like more one-on-one mentorship with additional hand-outs or written material to be provided by the station as supplemental support and reference. However, staff may not have the knowledge to create such a course or provide support based on the lack of policy in place. (Figure 4.5)
Staff also indicated that 71 percent of stations provide training opportunities for staff to better facilitate their role within the station, though it is unknown if this response is linked to increased awareness around social media, or general enhancement of job skills and attributes because the survey question may have been viewed as ambiguous when asking about overall training versus social media training.

**POLICY**

Being largely a volunteer run sector, campus/community radio in Canada is heavily structured around policy as a guiding principal for both its staff and volunteers (Fairchild, 1993, iv; Monk, 2007, p. 64). Perceptions of policy and rules vary based on the role and function of an individual within a campus/community station. Programmers were widely unaware if any official policy existed (Figure 4.6); however, station staff identified that only 16 percent had official policy in place that dealt with social media use, with additional application of rules being either recommendations on a case by case basis (36 percent), or through unofficial guidelines (12 percent) (Figure 4.6). 44 percent of programmers were also aware of a specific individual whose role it was to support and maintain social media use within the station, with 34 percent unsure who’s roll it is, and 26 percent were unaware.
Figure 4.6 – Awareness and types of policy available (As programmers & staff perceive in comparison).

COMMERCIAL RADIO

Most commercial radio stations in Canada have an individual whose responsibility is to manage and instruct others on the use of social media within the station. This individual is usually either the program manager or promotions manager, or has specialty knowledge of social media. Often recommendations for social media content or policy and procedure are designed by a company-wide “guru,” who provides information and structure in a top-down approach.

Most stations have a social media guideline or policy, either handed down from corporate headquarters, or designed in-house to meet the needs and demographic of the station, though sometimes these are only guidelines and not steadfast rules. Programmers are left to provide content for social media posts on their own. They are generally asked to post once per show, to different social media platforms, though often allowed to twitter more frequently or when not on a shift.

Of key concern to commercial stations is maintaining a strong interactive presence on the platforms it uses, and protecting the station’s brand without alienating listeners or sponsors. Most stations will not use social media as a tool for advertising and monetary gain, but as promotion of their own events, giveaways and not-for-profit social campaigns. Commercial jocks will often use social media platforms as a way to announce upcoming on-air giveaways and encourage non-listeners to tune in for a chance to win or hear specific content coming up shortly. Stations will suggest listeners become fans or followers
on alternate station owned platforms by promoting one page on a secondary platform to encourage growth of the fan base.

Programmers and stations are typically not allowed to “like” companies or other radio stations. They do, however, often “like” or “follow” content, such as musical artists or celebrities, which are presented on the air. Most stations will not use the stations social media pages as a platform to host contests, due to changes in “point of entry” on Facebook and Twitters contesting policy (Twitter, 2012).

Finally, the use of social media is often centred on the demographic of the station. Stations that cater to a younger demographic are more likely to use social media (both in quality and quantity) more often than stations that cater to an older listenership. Some stations advertise using Facebook or Google ads to grown their fan base online, and have moved away from traditional billboard or signpost advertising techniques.

INFINITESM – PROFESSIONAL OPINION

Toronto social media firm InfiniteSM has provided this study with information they recommend as “best practice” for campus/community radio programmers to follow. (SEE APPENDIX #1 – INFINITESM PROFESSIONAL OPINION). This includes using all of twitters features such as re-tweeting, hashtags and replies. infiniteSM recomends programmers us Facebook as a platform for communications, posting 80 characters or less every 18 hours. They also suggest using the new timeline feature, and aditional apps added to FanPages. For the best results, programmers and stations should use both Twitter and Facebook, carefully coordinating content when posting on each of the platforms.

SUMMARY

The findings in this chapter conclude that paid station staff and volunteer jocks used social media for different reasons, even though their motivations were similar in nature. Staff of radio stations used social media and other methods of communication to facilitate the movement of internal, non-broadcast information between programmers and staff. Staff also used these methods to create external connections that benefit the stations broadcasting goals. Jocks used similar methods of interaction with listeners and/or fans of their shows. Findings discovered that stations and programmers wish to interact with target audiences for five common reasons: to gather feedback about the show/station, to promote the show/station, to provide additional content to the listener off-air, to communicate about the station itself, and to achieve personal/station/community growth. Furthermore, programmers were often

---

14 Point of entry refers to the requirement to “like” a FanPage on Facebook in order to gain access to the ability to win something. In spring of 2011, Facebook banned this practice as it inflates the FanPage numbers, and typically attracts individuals who are not true fans of the page while encouraging spamming in order to win a contest.
frustrated over the lack of support received from the station in order to accomplish their goals. Policy surrounding social media also is not consistently employed across the sector, and as a result leaves stations vulnerable to risk. Finally, commercial radio stations use social media much differently than community radio, specifically using it as a way to drive listeners back to the station’s website to create advertising possibilities.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Four identified a wide range of motivations and findings based on research into campus/community social media use. This chapter will discuss these findings, as well as identity management, the significance and correlation of information across Canada, blogging as information utility and credibility, and cost and fundraising in connection to campus/community radio stations in Canada.

THEME 1 – MOTIVATIONS & METHODS

Commercial Radio

The findings indicate different wants and motivations for commercial radio stations and jocks to use social media as a means of communication across the three different radio classifications. Commercial radio jocks are driven by the station to use blogs as a means to increase visibility by connecting listeners to the stations website, usually as a means to increase the monetization of advertising on the stations website. The unoriginal and often shocking material posted on social media platforms with little personality or interaction is in line with the content commercial radio jocks and stations broadcast on the air, a mass media type of broadcast. Commercial jocks also use content found on blogs or social media as a lead to an on-air story which they further add opinion to for entertainment or informational purposes. Content is generic and designed for the largest population possible, in line with the goals of the stations, which is to accumulate the largest cumulative audience of listeners to help drive advertising prices and sales. This is in line with Potter (2002) who stated that only a few (commercial) stations strive for effective audience communication and fruitful relationships by providing interactive content (e.g., guest books, chat rooms, comment function) on their website.

Public Radio

Public radio jocks on the CBC appear to have guided oversight into the content and format which they are allowed to post on their blogs and social network sites. Jocks are expected to know what they can and cannot say on the air when they receive a position within the company, and must follow the guiding principles of the CBC mandate which include production, social media and opinion policies. Online blogs tend to be a midpoint between commercial use and community use, drawing on mass audiences to view their content, but providing a unique format and artistic programming not found on commercial radio. These goals align with the broadcaster’s mandate to “provide radio and television services incorporating a
wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains” from a predominantly distinctive Canadian viewpoint and culture (“CBC Mandate”). Programming must also reflect diversity within the country, and as a result targets non-mass media cultures that are prevalent in commercial radio (ibid). By mandate, programmers must also be responsible and accountable for their material, holding strong to the organizations core values of accuracy, fairness, balance, impartiality and integrity (ibid). Programmers are encouraged to use social media, but must maintain all material within the guidelines for production quality, opinion, fairness and journalistic standards (ibid). Listeners of campus/community and public radio typically appear more critical of broadcasted material that specifically relates to the niche genres provided by these formats due to their interest and in-depth knowledge of the content as their values are similar to the mandated CBC values. As a result, these two sectors are unable to simply provide shallow content posts that contain very little substance but humour or sex appeal which commercial broadcasters can get away with. In-depth knowledge and additional resources are required to stimulate and keep the attention of the listener and/or reader.

News

News stations are now known for their reporting through blogging and Twitter, as well as on-air (Dudek, 2011). Overall use of social media (Twitter and Facebook) in the newsroom more than doubled from 45 percent in 2009 to 96 percent in September of 2011 (Medcalf, 2011). Newsroom programmers view the use of social media as a way to encourage loyalty, help break news, encourage engagement and as another broadcast outlet to reach listeners and/or readers (Ibid.). Users who are geographically local to breaking news report going to local news sources for information about an event (Yardy & boyd, 2010, p. 7). Not only does this allow for additional content details that could be restricted due to the length of the story when presented on-air time, but allows for personal insight from the reporter on the scene, as well as for interaction and discussion of the story. Programmers across the radio spectrum are using their social media platforms as a way to generate discussion about news, entertainment and as a rally point for social change (Cheung & Lee, 2009, p.24).

Interactions

Campus and community radio stations and jocks use blogs as a tool to generate communication between listener and broadcaster, with the overall goal to attain and retain passionate listeners to the specific show and station (Wright, 2006, p. 88). Social media allow both programmers and listeners to gain access to additional links that relate to the topic being presented on a show, as well as access to professionals or experts for further engagement both on and off the air. Interactions via online blogs also match the bloggers motivations to gain feedback about the show in a timely manner and the opportunity to respond to listeners of the show (Wright, 2006 p. 5, 149). Blogs provide interaction, communication, supplemental information and the ability to make content portable via mobile devices. However, such
practices of podcasting and direct download are restricted by copyright law, and are the reason why commercial and public radio stations do not release material on their platforms that can infringe on these rights.

Hagger-Johnson, Egan & Stillwell (2011) argue that individuals who identify “sensational interests”\(^\text{15}\) on the personal Facebook profiles typically support such causes. This means that stations and individual broadcasters can identify and expect to interact with those who post replies to social media about unique topics (p.71). Campus/Community radio in Canada appears to be a leader in communication of information when it comes to sensational interests. With the sector designed as a broadcast outlet for non-traditional information, special interest groups and topics are highly visible in campus/community radio on-air schedules. The addition of social media as a platform for discussion fosters growth of those communities. As programmers promote their own shows, they build a community around the radio show and create network connections between like-minded listeners, which would not normally have been introduced to each other. The ease and frequency of social media use compounds the speed in which a community grows. Good examples such as political, labour and cultural shows in campus/community radio create communities that then organize rallies, live events and group outings that further the goals of its listeners.

**Trending**

Commercial radio and niche market shows also are tasked with keeping up with trends, entertainment and information pertaining to their target audiences. Radio can be a key source of information for listeners, and rely on the station or jock to collect and aggregate information so the listener does not need to do it themselves (Efimova, 2004, p. 8). Programmers or stations who lead in information dissemination and community growth tend to be viewed as a source of expertise and leadership. The result is stations such as Montreal’s CKUT being viewed as a leader in social justice movements, or Kootney Co-op radio being seen as a leader in food issues. Individual programmers whose shows gain notarization may become viewed as leaders or knowledge worker experts in their field, which helps in both personal and community growth.

**Adoption**

Furthermore, findings suggest that station staff and policy makers are not yet sure what types or how much policy needs to be put into place yet, as social media is a relatively new integration into campus/community radio. This has possibly resulted in a more “wait and see” approach to social media by staff, and a lack of support from station shareholders in designing new policy as little pressure by

---

\(^{15}\) Topics that have unique properties or followers not typically associated with mainstream culture. (i.e. a save the beluga whale group or nude sky diving enthusiasts, etc.)
programmers appears to have been asserted. Lack of policy puts a station and individuals who look to use social media at risk, and if the station itself supports the use of social media it is critical that the station provide training and support (Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais. 2010, p.8-9, 52-55).

Historically, radio has been slow in the adoption of new technologies, as indicated in Lind and Medoff’s (1999) study which concluded that that only between 25–40 percent of all U.S. radio stations maintained operational Web sites by 1999, thus the majority of radio stations didn’t quickly enter cyberspace in any comprehensive way. This historically slow adoption process in both updating policy and adapting to new changes in technology retards the growth potential of programmers, as jocks indicate they wish to learn more about social media, but are not provided the training or guidelines to do so. The overall result is stagnation in the early adopter’s phase of Everett Ross’s Technology Adoption Lifecycle (1995) model until stations are willing to make advances in training, education and policy implementation (Fenn, 2008).

**Additional Motivations**

Jock blogs may be written for other generic and non-broadcasting reasons, such as curiosity, for experimentation, an interest in communication and sharing or a need for expressing and publishing ideas (Efimova, 2004, p.5,7,11; Wright, 2006, p.29; Hewitt, 2005, p.105). They may also be written to persuade individuals or groups to follow a specific path, improve knowledge and skills when using technology or to enhance relationships (ibid.). Finally, blogging can increase marketability in order to promote the individuals ideas, and be used professionally as a “living” business-card for future employment opportunities by positioning one as an expert, professional and leader in the industry (ibid.; Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.27). Demonstration of a strong ability to understand and utilize social media is a necessity in the job market for radio jocks, specifically those in commercial radio (Madia, 2011, p.23).

Results also indicate that a company or station may have motivations outside of the study’s findings. These align with the goals of the staff and management at a station or organization. Some managers would like to see the impact or numbers from a specific show or host as "the public nature of a weblog provides a visible trace of [a] knowledge worker[s] activities" (Efimova, 2004, p.2). This allows the station to assess the strength and viability of the show, and the effort put into it by the jock. Social media can also be used as way to keep show hosts up to date with each other, as it is important to have hosts interact with one another to make sure similar content is not re-aired or over-saturated on a station. Jocks can routinely review each other's postings so they can refer to an additional source of information and grow community listeners through consistent messages of information (ibid. p.8). Some stations may see it as a looking glass into the way that radio happens, and encourage jocks to post about what it is like to work in a specific radio station as a way to satisfy curiosity (ibid. p.11). Furthermore, as identified in Chapter Five, stations use social media as an internal communication tool to provide information through
a static location. This allows new programmers to easily access topical information required to assist in new tasks that are being completed, such as how to use a mixing board or interview a band member. These frequently asked questions or “FAQ” pages allow for programmers to refresh their memory of previously learned material, as well as gain insight and tips which may have been forgotten when engaging in personal conversation with a staff member.

**Age**

Our findings conclude that commercial stations or shows whose target demographic is younger (i.e. their listeners uses “social networking sites as a tool for entire lifestyles”, says one commercial promotions coordinator) tend to maintain and use social media more often in their day to day lives. (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.26-29). Stations or shows that serve an older demographic find that listeners use blogs and social media to “keep in touch with family members, keep up to date, share pictures” and do not interact with radio jocks or stations. Stations that have older jocks typically have issues with encouraging jocks to use social media as they don’t feel the necessity to do so, or understand the technology involved in creating and maintaining a social media campaign. However, additional research is required to determine the statistical realities when comparing age demographics and social media use, in commercial, public and campus/community radio.

The use of blogs as a platform is also changing. Preference by younger individuals is moving from a blog-type platform to more interactive and network based formats like Facebook or Twitter (Lenhart Purcell, Smith & Zickuhr, 2010, p.2). The use of blogs for adults, however, slightly increased over the same time (ibid.). Approximately one in ten American adults (and 15 percent of total American internet users) maintains a personal blog online in 2005, which is much lower than the number of estimated bloggers within campus/community radio in Canada, which sits around 30 percent (ibid.). This difference can be attributed to the desire to create interaction, archive information and assist in the overall promotion of individual shows or stations as a broadcaster.

**THEME 2 – IDENTITY MANAGEMENT**

The combination of social media and radio jock requires an individual or station to present themselves through a secondary platform of communication (as opposed to on-air). Paul Longley Arthur (2009) describes the writing of one’s personality in an online fashion as digital biography. As technology affects the speed and magnitude of personal self-expression, online writing has distanced itself from traditional auto/biography writing\(^\text{16}\), changing the fundamental understanding of concepts that help us make sense of our lives, including “self,” “individuality,” “identity,” and “truth” (p.75).

\(^\text{16}\) Auto/biography is a term introduced by Arthur which represents the way individuals use online platforms, such as a blog, to write about their life to a larger public.
Digital biography allows an individual to create an online image or persona based on the matching of broadcast wants and needs of that individual: “a combination of sales pitch, a personal presentation, a business card, a brochure, a personal statement, a list of recommendations, a mini web-site, and a wave from across the room” to convey a desired image that matches the expectation of the listeners or readers in order to create a believable and enjoyable individual to whom they may listen to or engage with online (Arthur, 2009, p.81,84). This form of identity management allows individuals to build upon their on-air personalities in a semi-controlled online environment by picking and choosing further morsels of information to disclose to followers who join them online. Daniel J. Solove (2004), the author of The Digital Person, describes the “aggregation effect” in these terms:

“The digital revolution has enabled information to be easily amassed and combined. Even information that is superficial or incomplete can be quite useful in obtaining more data about individuals. Information breeds information. . . Similar to a Seurat painting, where a multitude of dots juxtaposed together form a picture, bits of information when aggregated paint a portrait of a person” (p.44).

Radio jocks must be able to control this aggregation effect in order to accurately portray the persona they believe is the best fit for their on-air and online character. Findings show that programmers are aware of mistakes that can be made when using social media to construct ones image, and in part are reluctant to attempt to create interaction in areas they are unfamiliar and untrained in.

Podnieks (2004) summarizes the connection between jock and blogger well: “The technological innovations offered by the Internet stimulate, enhance and multiply the means for self-expression, but they do not inherently change the motivations for life writing, which has arguably always been to communicate and connect not only with our own disparate selves but also with those of others” (p.23). It is not simply enough to be a modern day on-air announcer whose only job is to talk on-air; rather, one must communicate with listeners, interact and show compassion, drive and humility in order to maintain a professional persona within the context of the show. By doing so, programmers hope to meet the five main areas of motivation outlined in the findings.

However, digital biography also looks at how others outside of the author help to shape identity, which can include remnants of others’ reports and impressions, together with other out-of-date or misleading information (Arthur, 2009, p.86). Failure to connect the expectations of the listener with that of what the broadcaster provides both on-air and online leaves a gap in identity and communication, driving the listener away from the broadcast. For example, a broadcaster directs traffic on-air to a blog, where the content is either unavailable or ill-addressed to meet the wants of the listener, and has the potential to drive away a long-time listener of the show. Thus, digital makeovers amount to a different “packaging” of what biographers and historians have always known: identities, like language itself, are infinitely changeable and plural, and must be maintained carefully to retain or grow listener bases (ibid. p.82). In
the end, it’s the “growing interrelationship of humans with technologies that augment our abilities” to present ourselves in both an on-air and digital space (ibid. p.72).

THEME 3 – SIGNIFICANCE AND CORRELATION OF INFORMATION ACROSS CANADA

Findings in Chapter 5 included multiple data points, allowing the ability to compare results based on region, station orientation and between programmer and staff members (or any combination thereof). Stations were classified based on the population size, regional location and the number of staff working at each station (Table 5.1). Regions were divided into East Coast, Quebec (and Ottawa), Ontario, Mid-West (Manitoba to Alberta) and Pacific (including Yukon).

Table 5.1 – Station classification based on size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Number of volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100,000 people = Urban</td>
<td>&gt; 75 = Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100,000 people = Rural</td>
<td>&lt; 75 = Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using complete survey and domain analysis data, a range of statistical tests were performed\textsuperscript{17}, indicating that the location and size of the station has no statistical bearing on its use of social media or number of communication platforms (Figure 5.1 & Figure 5.2)

\textsuperscript{17} Although the data are no derived from random samples, test of significance were applied as a precaution
Figure 5.2 – Number of platforms based on geographical location (as reported by staff for internal and external use)
This means that stations that broadcast to a rural listenership and programmers or listeners who reside in a rural setting are not necessarily restricted to accessing social media platforms as early reports on internet use might suggest. The small difference between access by rural and urban populations can be made up by the overall increase in percentage of social media users by station and programmer as opposed to non-broadcast oriented users. Rural communities also had similar levels of social capital (i.e. being involved in community build aspects) in comparison to urban communities, which means that individuals are just as likely to volunteer in a rural setting as opposed to urban settings (Beaudoin, 2004, p.392). Therefore, the null-finding of correlation between station use and size and location is realistic.

Analysis indicated no statistical correlation between stations or programmers who rate the importance of using social media in their stations/show and how well the station/show is utilizing the platforms. Therefore, both programmers and staff tend to find that social media is an important role in their shows (mean=63 percent), but is not related to how well they feel they are using social media to achieve their goals. Then, using geographical markers as a comparison between station and programmer, statistical analysis proved there is no relationship to than use and perceived importance of use between stations based on regional allocations. As a result, programmers or stations located in the east coast of Canada is just as likely to rate the importance of social media in the future as a programmer in Ontario or the west coast (See Figure 5.3 & Figure 5.4).
Figure 5.3 – Importance of social media vs. how well social media is used (as reported by programmers).

Figure 5.4 – Importance of social media vs. how well social media is used (as reported by staff).
THEME 4 - BLOGGING AS INFORMATION UTILITY AND CREDIBILITY

The concept of information utility states that message utility increases as the intensity of the magnitude, likelihood, and immediacy of outcomes conveyed in the message increases, and that increased utility leads to increased selection of the message (Zhang, 2005). Francesca Carpentier (2008) showed that individuals recalled more facts about stories of high repetition, as opposed to low repetition, suggesting that listeners who are exposed to information from multiple sources (such as on-air and then via an online blog) are more likely to remember the story (p. 577). However, this study found that the amount of information an individual remembers does not necessarily inform judgments of the information's personal relevance; thus information presented must be of interest to the listener, or they are less likely to be motivated to express interest in visiting a secondary source (ibid. p. 585). Programmers and stations are very aware of this aspect, acknowledging the issues with regards to frequency of posts and content, as to not alienate their followers.

Thomas Johnson and Barbara Kaye (2004) investigated how traditional media sources compare to web based blog sources in terms of credibility, in-depth reporting and fairness. They concluded that blogs were highly credible sources of information, in comparison to traditional media that was moderately credible (p. 622). Blogs were found to be more credible because they are independent rather than controlled by corporate interests, and contain stories from around the world that are unavailable or ignored by traditional media (ibid. p. 626). Furthermore, blog readers routinely fact-check traditional media and happily point out errors in their reports, but also reference traditional media sources as a way to confirm facts and figures to gain authority for their own posts (ibid. p. 625-626). This credibility of one’s blog enhances the reliability of a jock’s on-air broadcast and personality, thus helping to retain listeners of the show. Overall, “users view blogs as a new and better form of journalism than the mainstream media, one that is opinionated, analytical, independent, and personal, even when linked back to traditional media for sourcing and referencing (ibid. p. 634).

However, findings indicate the overall low use of blogs in comparison to other forms of social media. Programmers appear to prefer means of communication that support typically shorter, specific information about a single topic whereas blogging tends to provide a long-lasting forum for in-depth reporting. Blogs could be compared to a magazine style show, with other mediums such as Twitter and Facebook, similar to information or news updates. Additional research may be required to determine if the type of show is related to the type of medium used to create interaction, and if such a relationship is critical to the success in meeting station or programmer goals.
THEME 5 – COST AND FUNDING

Reputation can be defined as the perceptions, or mental associations, held by external stakeholders about an organization or individual (Brown et al., 2006; Helm, 2007). It can be one of the most important aspects of a functioning station or show, and inappropriate use of social media campaigns and/or lack of monitoring can destroy one’s reputation. For example, international hamburger restaurant chain McDonalds launched a twitter campaign in 2011 where they encouraged staff, managers and followers of the McDonalds brand to tweet their #McDStories (Bernard, 2012). However, the campaign initially launched to create a softer, positive image became a quick outlet for bad jokes and abusive insults directed at the burger chain, which because of the power of social media and trends, had no way of stopping the hashtag from being used (ibid.). Wendy’s also missed the mark with their “#heresthebeef” campaign, which also quickly became the butt end of raunchy jokes (bid.). The result is the necessity for stations and programmers to be aware of social media, and carefully coordinate any sort of outreach or promotional campaign that could be viewed as contentious before rolling it out to the public.

However, stations that fail to use social media as a tool to effectively recruit volunteers and staff are losing out on additional support at the station. Recruitment drives and targeted volunteering drives that attempt to engage non-existent communities in hope of them joining the station are being lost when stations do not use social media. Researching blogs, niche communities and groups within larger networks can allow for stations or programmers to connect with communities that are often only found online, especially when geographical location is an issue (Madia, 2011, p.20). When a station or show chooses not to engage in social media, they risk becoming less competitive at best and irrelevant or behind the times at worst (McCann, 2010).

Programmers also reported frustration with initial use during the trial phase of Bohlen and Beal’s Stages of Diffusion Theory. Jocks and volunteers who had bad first experiences when using social media tended to become easily frustrated and move away from the use of the platform, and therefore community building (Burke, Marlo & Lento, 2009, p.7). Because engagement is time-consuming and complex, particularly in a social networking environment, it encourages stations to provide support and training when newcomers first try to interact with listeners in hope of alleviating disappointment and, in turn, retention of volunteers (Henderson & Bowley, 2010, p.249). Additional training and support not only forces staff to use their paid hours to correct errors that could have been avoided in the first place, but it also takes attention away from other areas around the station (Ford 2012).

Finally, social media can and is being used as a way to engage both internal and external shareholders and stakeholders to donate money and raise funds for the station. Results indicated a mixed message of success, failure and frustration when using social media as a way to engage in activities to raise awareness of the financial needs of the station. However, failure to attempt to use social media as a
promotional tool isolates the station and removes any type of potential viral marketing\textsuperscript{18}. A catchy, funny and unique idea can be shared amongst fans and non-fans alike, drawing attention to the station which would normally not have garnered (Cesario, 2011). Therefore, a carefully planned and executed online social media campaign has the potential to be a huge benefit for stations that are struggling to remain financially viable.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter discusses the findings in the study, in particulate it was noted that the wants and motivations of programmers and stations vary, based on many personal and professional reasons; however the higher then typical usage of social media is most likely attributed to the desire to be an outlet for information, entertainment and social change, and not tied to geographical regions based on station size or location. Programmers and stations are aware that off-air content and interaction is essential to the success of campus/community programming and therefor look to utilize multiple methods to generate two-way communication and interest. Individual programmers must be aware of how they manage their identities online to be effective in creating a long-lasting community around a show or station. The combination of not knowing how to use social media, not being able to measure its effectiveness and the cost in both financial and time invested into the platforms can be viewed as a key retardant to the use of social media as an interactive tool.

\textsuperscript{18} However, attempts to make content go viral are very rarely successful, as most content needs to be genuine and unplanned to be successful (Barger, 2011).
CHAPTER 6: STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS & RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

As one programmer put it, “what works for some does not work for all,” and that understanding your audience is key to successfully matching platform with listener interaction. Furthermore, social media cannot be viewed as a solution for all of an individual or stations problems; it may only be a tool in process to solve them (Ansaldo, 2012). Also, completing all the strategies for success below would be very time consuming and difficult. These recommendations for best practices are intended to be used as a way to review and adjust current campaigns, or to start in a positive manner when launching new platforms. Topic areas include general strategies, Facebook, Twitter, blog and YouTube use, as well as recommendations directly related to station use, and establishing leadership through social media platforms.

GENERAL STRATEGIES

Success

The term success can be viewed in two different ways: as meeting the motivations and wants of an individual or station, or as achieving industry standards. Although this study did not look at determining the categories of success by individuals or stations who took part or the standards in the industry, it is important for stations and individuals to follow up at the end of the campaign to share metrics indicating the perception of success as a way to build relationships. This will facilitate the diffusion of ideas and information throughout the station, and help gather information to create healthier campaigns in the future.

Determining what platform to use

Radio jocks and staff have to determine if they will maintain a social media platform, and if so, what format will be used and what contents will be included. This decision rests on the type of listeners the broadcaster looks to attract, and on the characteristics of the show itself. It is helpful to go through a series of questions to determine the necessity of using social media. A station or programmer must evaluate their target demographic to see if it would interacting using social media, and if the audience has restricted access to social media use based on the digital divide; if so, any online communications may be a waste of the programmers or stations time (Ansaldo, 2012). The jock or station must also decide if they have the time to maintain the platform, if they are comfortable with using or learning the technology to effectively post, and if they are willing to take the risks associated with open and online communications.
(Hewitt, 2005, p69; Madia, 2011, p.23; Ford, 2011; Gunelius, n.d.; Kuek Hin, n.d.). Furthermore, using a popular platform might not be the correct medium for which to generate interaction with listeners, as this depends on the characteristics of the users, and the platforms structure itself (Madia, 2011, p.23; Ansaldo, 2012). Some communities are more prevalent on specific platforms, and therefore research to determine if using a platform for the target community is necessary to prevent wasted time and resources. For example, most communities in Russia utilize a social media platform called V Kontakte, therefore, if a programmer or station targeted that community using Facebook, the platform itself would lose the opportunity to engage with potential community members (Figure 6.1) (World Map of Social Networks, 2011).

Figure 6.1 – World map of social networks.

Shows that are looking to archive material in a chronological format, such as track lists, best of shows, podcasts or downloads, and significant events or stories that are themed are better suited to a blog than a micro-blogging site such as Twitter, or a social media personal site, such as Facebook. Furthermore, utilizing one specific type of social media platform does not reduce the importance or necessity of also having other social media outlets associated with the show. However, it may not be viable to utilize more than three platforms for interaction, as saturation of listenership occurs (Mac, 2011). Stations and
programmers may also need to look at new platforms as they arise, or at least “squat”\(^\text{19}\) or reserve user names on sites, such as Google+, before they are taken (Mac, 2011).

Station staff also must determine if using new social media outlets for internal communications is worth their time to maintain, as opposed to other forms of traditional digital communication or non-digital formats. If the large majority of programmers and staff do not use a specific platform, it is most likely not efficient to use that platform for internal communication. A survey of staff and programmers can help to determine if maintaining an internal social media platform(s) is viable.

**Preparation**

As with producing good on-air content, preparation is just as important to off-air success (Olsen 2012). Programmers should develop a checklist which includes social media in pre-show preparations. The list should include: posting (between twelve and four hours) in advance of the start of the program, having social media feeds open and operational during the show, reminding listeners on-air how they can participate in interaction with the jocks, announcing e-mail and website addresses and where to go for additional off-air content and/or to hear the show again. It is also good practice to have any guests post on their Facebook wall, blog or tweet that they are going to be on the program to their followers/fans in advance of the show.

**Follow-up**

Attention to promotion and communication practices will allow an individual or station to determine what strategies and platforms are working, and what needs to be adjusted. Stations and programmers can also track what is being said about a show, station or trend by using Twitter hashtags and keywords, as well as Google Alerts. This allows owners of platforms to not only become aware of what is being said about their show, but track overall trends to better reflect the listenership’s preferences in information and entertainment. Sites like Klout.com let users compare and see how much influence they have through social media platforms on the communities they are connected with (Mac, 2011). Using insights and statistics from Facebook pages, Hootsuite.com for Twitter, and YouTube Analytics allow programmers and staff to learn the characteristic traits of those who follow and listen to the show (Mac, 2011).

Additionally, social media comes with a different set of expectations: conversation, timely response, and being respectful are all critical to success (Madia, 2011, p.21). Social media allows for listeners to create an intimate space with the programmer directly, which is important to facilitating interaction and support.

---

\(^{19}\) To “squat” on a site is to obtain the rights and ownership of a name or address, so that no one else may gain control, even if you are not actively using the name or URL.
Profiles that are incomplete and out of date are identified with lack of interest and respect, and therefore destroy the invitation to connect (ibid., p.23).

**Inter-platform communications**

Websites are still one of the major communication and interactive formats used when accessing information about a radio station or show and, as a result, these need to be maintained just as much as social media sites (Ford 2012). However, websites and other platforms that allow for stationary content should use buttons (see Figure 6.2) or links to promote social media networks being utilized by the show or station (Madia, 2011, p.23; Ford 2012).

![Figure 6.2 – Social media buttons. Retrieved from http://www.freedesign4.me/icons/free-social-icons-and-buttons/](image)

For other recommendations to effectively promote across platforms, see Table 6.1:

**Table 6.1 – Recommendations to effectively promote across multiple social media platforms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include links and handles in e-mail signatures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From time to time, mention additional platforms the show or station may be using (i.e “check out the twitter page for more frequent updates”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for help from others to promote the show or station, for advice on topics of discussion and to contribute directly on-air (Ford, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give permission to let others share your content (Ford 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, it is helpful to stagger announcements that have the same content, on different platforms, so that the same post made on a Facebook profile page is not immediately posted on a FanPage, or on Twitter.
Promoting similar content at different times will help to increase message utility, and the number of people who view the content over a period of time (Francesca Carpentier, 2008, p.577).

Website traffic typically comes from three areas: links from other websites (blogs), search engines and traditional marketing efforts. As a result, using link exchanges, optimizing search engines and fliers/posters/word of mouth are still very important to generating hits to a website (Wright, 2006, p.243).

FACEBOOK

With the majority of campus/community radio jocks and stations already utilizing Facebook as a communication tool, Table 6.2 below highlights some recommendations to increase the effectiveness of communication.

Table 6.2 – Recommendations to increase effectiveness of communication on Facebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post in groups or on the wall of those with similar interests to the show;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep content fresh and new, update material two to three times a week (but not more than twice a day);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use multimedia, such as photos and video, as it increases interaction on a post by upwards of 50 percent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always include links in posts (if possible) to external material;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use humour (when appropriate), as it creates entertainment value and enhances recollection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The use of “e-vites” on Facebook can provide additional outlets to get people interested in a topic or aware of an event. It may be beneficial to ask friends or those attending to forward on events onto like-minded individuals, or share the event on their own wall. However, not everyone that says they are attending the event is planning to show-up. Also, sending events to individuals who live outside of the potential attendance area has been identified as an irritant to followers/fans/friends, a may result in the individual blocking or leaving the community.

Posts on Facebook should be short (Ford 2011). Facebook is not a platform designed for posts that are very long by nature, such as a summary or recap of an event, or persuasive argument. If listeners and/or readers need to click the “read more” button in order to understand the idea of the post, it is probably too long of a post and is better suited to be posted as a “note,” or on a blog.
TWITTER

Another very heavily used platform of social media is Twitter, with Table 6.3 providing some recommended best practice procedures to generate additional support and interaction.

Table 6.3 – Recommendations to increase effectiveness of communication on Twitter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When a post asks a question, it invokes a response which creates discussion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A carefully designed background for Twitter page that looks professional and represents the show or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station creates consistency in branding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using hashtags and providing links generate action by the reader to explore more in detail;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting on other posts or retweeting increases exposure, not only by those who the content is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passed on to, but it also can make the original poster of the message aware that you actively engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By using a story in a post, it provides interest, education and a reason to come back to the platform;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the “element of surprise” can grab interest from a reader, but the use of “shock” content could turn people away from an account.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mac, 2011; Grazelle, 2011; Madia, 2011, p.25; Wright, 2006, p.238; (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.151)

Also, when posting about the sector, the hashtag “#communityradio” is the industry tag that denotes those who support and follow campus/community radio.

BLOGS

When blogs focus on the listeners, there are three cardinal rules for replying to comments: respond quickly, be human and follow up to ensure resolution if required (Wright, 2006, p. 153). It is good practice to thank the commenter for their post and acknowledge any issues they have. When required, take ownership of failures or incorrect information posted on the blog. It’s also best to avoid answering a comment or question using a pre-written form letter, as people do not like to feel that their time is less important than the owner of the blogs is (ibid. 183-184). It is important that bloggers remember that posting information on a blog does not create a connection or engagement, that additional steps outlined in Table 6.4 help facilitate interaction. Finally, it is crucial to the success of a blog to provide interaction with those who leave posts, as failure to do so will result in a feeling of neglect (Ford, 2011).

Table 6.4 – Recommendations to increase effectiveness of communication on blogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be cautious of comments left; deletion or failure to respond can alienate or start conflict on a blog;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be generous in praise and attribution, as typically the post will be archived for others to view;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a list to generate discussion works well;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay away from profanity, as it alienates audiences and is unprofessional;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the title of a post short and easy to remember so reference can be made back to that post;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTUBE

YouTube is the second-largest search engine in the world and is a strategic place for companies to showcase their personalities, testimonials or behind-the-scenes looks at the corporate culture (Madia, 2011, p.22). When used correctly, it can foster a strong sense of activism and group identity in practices of cultural resistance, and therefore is an effective outlet for those engaging in social justice programming (Losh, 2011, p.190).

Programmers or stations should remember to brand a channel to match that of the show, keep clips short (under 60 seconds if possible), and cross promote on multiple channels, as it helps to draw attention to other platforms maintained by the show or station (Mac, 2011; Coomans, 2011).

STATION

Without the support of the station, programmers are left to their own to use social media which could become a concern to the station when volunteers become frustrated with the staff’s lack of support, and cause unnecessary complications with improper use that contradicts station policy and hurt a station’s reputation. The overall recommendation is to be sure to address social media at the station in a formal position, and to be prepared to react to complications as they arise (Ford, 2012). Furthermore, the benefits of using social media are outlined, including those for promotion and financial gain in Chapter 6.

Funding

It is important for stations to allow for donations to be made online, through websites like PayPal. This will allow individuals outside of the listening area and those that conduct online financial transactions with a quick and secure way to support the station. It also allows for donation over a longer period of time, where supporters can donate with monthly payments or during non-fundraising periods during the year. Furthermore, it allows the opportunity to donate through the use of credit cards, thus removing the necessity for stations to pay for costly equipment and accounts in order to receive donations in that format.

Information resources

Stations can also use social media as a way to archive and distribute information quickly and easily (Kennedy, 2009). Maintaining an online platform for information, such as a Wiki, forum or website allows programmers the ability to access information without the need to engage staff. This frees up staff from time-consuming e-mails and in-person interactions when dealing with information sourcing and support. The access to information in an archived setting is also beneficial when new programmers or staff join the
station, as it allows them to learn policy and gather resources on their own time, reducing the necessity to be taught about simple operations on an individual basis.

**Providing platforms**

Programmers not only look for support from the station for their own management of social media platforms, but wish to utilize methods of communication provided by the station. Staff should provide their programmers with a centralized method of creating network and communication, allowing programmers to either directly, or through the support of staff, to option to post on a station run platform. By allowing volunteers to interact though platforms managed by the station, they are engaging themselves within the stations already developed community, and developing relationships with new people (Walters et al. 2009, p.105). Stations can also utilize programmers as a means to build and grow community on a stations platform; by spreading news and information about the stations ongoing activities to people they know. As a result, staff should ask programmers to promote on behalf of the station, to potential community members in a professional manner (Westcott, 2007; Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.183).

Stations also do not need to attempt to use all platforms at once, especially when implementing social media use as an official policy. Using a phased approach will help to create smaller disruptions when new policy and processes are being implemented, and provide for learning to take place at a slower pace (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.135).

**Policy**

Creating policy, whether official or recommended guidelines, is critical to the successful use of social media within a station. As such, those who manage a station need to work with stakeholders to generate a policy that is widely accepted by those who will be affected by its implications. Use of a “social media” or “policy” committee is recommended to solicit information from staff, programmers and board member to generate a social media policy or recommended guidelines. Policy will help to reflect and align the stations overall image and mandates, fostering an conflict-free environment when rules are acknowledged and accepted (Madia, 2011, p.22). Using a support website, such as policytool.net is also beneficial in creating policy, ensuring that all aspects of the stations needs are met (Mac, 2011). When policy is completed, it must be distributed and understood by programmers and other staff to be effective when dealing with application and discipline (Ford, 2012). It should also include examples of preferred and inappropriate use, which platforms it applies to, how programmers and staff may or may not relate to it in a personal setting, provide awareness of copyright content issues, and who to go to for help/support. (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.160-161). Failure to do so will result in frustration, disappointment and additional time and resources needed to administer the policy.
The failure to create and identify a process when implementing a platform using social media into a stations repertoire can result in confusion amongst users, and create situations where troubleshooting is required (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.137). A step by step process, as outlined in Table 6.5, as one method that can be use or evaluating a new social media platform.

Table 6.5 – Recommended process to implement a new social media platform.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get intelligence (decide if social media is the correct method to meet the goals of the users).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Clarify objectives (the social media efforts should serve the station/programmers mission and strategic plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Design strategies (Identify who to get involved, what training is needed, where are opportunities to get off to a good star, how to track progress?, and how can to communicate success).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implement the plan (while providing support and resources to those who ask for it).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Measure outcomes (including if the initial plan is in place, if social media is helping to achieve goals, fi changes to be made).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Leverage learning (which allows everyone to pause, reflect, learn and reapply efforts to move forward).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.137-142).

LEADERSHIP

Leaders within each station must realize the importance of a strong blog and/or social media presence, and as a result lead by example (Mitrovic & Tadic, 2009). It is recommended that designated leaders (such as a station manager or program manager) in the station use a blog to facilitate information distribution, idea generation and foster interaction throughout the station. These designated bloggers should be blogging every day; and requiring those they lead read the blog daily (Hewitt, 2005, p.125). This is especially important to create consistence by staff members within a station, as well as syndicated radio shows that go to other stations where they are hosted locally. These station leaders should allow for open dialogue and conversation on their blog. Posts do not always have to be original material, but can be re-posts from outside sources or additional posts from those that read the blog to help grow community. Dedication is also important, as blogs that sit dormant for an extended period of time fail to meet the goals they wish to achieve (ibid., p.132). However, a strong and devoted blog may even gain the attention of other stations and jocks that monitor and re-post your ideas, bringing to light issues of ownership and rights to the content (Jue, Alcalde Marr & Kassotakis, 2010, p.181).
Blogging can also be used as an internal tool to enhance interaction and foster growth within any type of station (See Table 6.6).

**Table 6.6 – Benefits for internal use of blogs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can generate ideas and facilitate in project management functions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance team and project communication with non-broadcasting related station members;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be used as a way to brainstorm ideas in advance of meetings to save time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be utilized to help create dynamic team creation, for example committees who coordinate over blogs or forums to allow the archival of information and ideas to happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wright, 2006, p.125-126).

Successful internal blogs typically have common characteristics, such as encouraging anyone to comment or contribute to a posting, allowing for review of ideas by all levels of staff, rewarding staff with praise for good ideas and success, and ensuring equity of ideas and ability (Ford, 2012; Wright, 2006, p.131).

**ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION FOR THE INDUSTRY**

This study finds that there are very minimal adjustments or changes that could be made by the CRTC and Industry Canada to assist campus/community stations in becoming more effective in meeting their goals using social media as a communication tool between listener and broadcaster. Current regulations and codes outlines by the CRTC and Industry Canada are not restrictive in nature surrounding social media use and do not have the ability to influence the policy and protocols imposed by the individual platforms terms of agreements, that do restrict social media use (I.e. Facebook contesting rules, etc.). Further research is required to look at fundraising mechanisms for campus/community radio that could be adjusted by the CRTC and Industry Canada in order to help reduce stresses on a stations financial situation.

Outside of industry regulations, the NCRA (or another campus/community radio association such as AMARC), could complete a study to assess that assess the viability of implementing a nation-wide social media strategy to further unite staff and programmers from across the country. Such a platform might include communication tools to assist in acceleration of industry discussion, as well as create a central location for listeners with unique interests to discover niche programming outside of the local broadcasting range. Furthermore, the organization could provide a platform for on-going discussion about social media goals and achievements, creating a nationwide sounding board for success and failure when stations or programmers attempt to achieve their goals using social media methods. This would facilitate the flow of new information as social media transforms and is applied in the campus/community sector.
SUMMARY

Success using social media can come in many forms, and it is important not to get caught up in the “we have 5000 ‘fans’ we must be doing something right” as social media changes very quickly and platforms live and die in short order (Ford, 2011; Ford, 2012). Chapter Six provided recommendations for both station and programmers to effectively and efficiently use social media as a communication tool. It included best practice techniques when using Facebook, Twitter and blogs, as well as recommendations for policy and procedure. Chapter Six is intended as a reference for programmers and staff to take away from this study, encouraging them to use Social media for social good within campus/community radio in Canada (Mac, 2011)
CHAPTER 7: SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to assist campus/community radio programmers and stations in identifying the wants and motivations of using social media as a method to interact with listeners. The literature review and context revealed a lack of previous academic research pertaining to the Canadian campus/community radio sector. It also identified the expedited pace of change in social media use and preferences, and, as a result, the lack of a system to research issues that have social media as a main focal point. The outcome was the creation and execution of "S.M.I.L.E.S.," developed and tested a methodology utilizing the strengths of many methods to ensure validity of information gathered from non-traditional and sporadic source of information. The use of this methodology has allowed the use of grey literature and multiple sources of information to create a generalized conclusion to an area of research which would otherwise not be accessible to research using standard research practices.

Findings conclude that stations and jocks used social media for different reasons, even though their motivations were similar in nature. Staff of radio stations used social media and other methods of commination to facilitate the movement of internal, non-broadcast information between programmers and staff, and as a result of the increased use of social media, may need to decide what new techniques best suit the goals of staff member to distribute information to its members and what other platforms are currently underused and should be adjusted or discontinued to save time and effort. Staff also used these methods to create external connections that benefit the stations broadcasting goals. Jocks used similar methods of interaction with listeners and/or fans of their shows. Research concludes that stations and programmers wish to interact with target audiences for five common reasons: to gather feedback about the show/station, to promote the show/station, to provide additional content to the listener off-air, to communicate about the station itself, and to achieve personal/station/community growth. As a result, stations must be aware of these areas of interest, and must cater to the needs of both the station and programmers in a proactive manner.

Programmers and jocks used a wide variety of social media, as well digital and traditional methods of communication to achieve their goals. Approximately 80 percent of programmers and stations use Facebook as a means of communication, with Twitter and blogs being other popular forms of social media use. This means that social media is already heavily engrained into the life style and programming preferences in Canadian campus/community radio. Traditional forms of digital communication such as websites, e-mail and LIST-SERV remain very popular as methods of communication, and still need to be addressed as means of communication. Stations and jocks also use non-digital forms of
communications such as in-station billboard postings and word of mouth to meet their interaction motivations, and may still be necessary to facilitate interaction, promotion and success by a show. Programmers and station staff on average use six different methods to facilitate communication, and should continue to use a mix of social media, digital and traditional methods to effectively communicate based on the needs of the specific user, and as a result need support in multiple areas from the station staff.

Discussion of results discovers that campus/community radio members use social media very differently than commercial or public radio, which tends to use it as a method for promotion and entertainment, and not as a way to engage listeners in discussion or interaction. This means that programmers in campus/community radio cannot emulate commercial jocks and hope to achieve success in their own programming. Individual programmers must be aware of how they manage their identities online to be effective in creating a long-lasting community around a show or station. Programmers and stations also adopt the use of social media based on a variety of personal motivations, but as a whole the sector is chronically slow in providing support and policy when facilitating technological change, which has resulted in tentative use and adoption of social media. The use of social media can have a large impact on the station, in terms of opportunities for fundraising, reputation of the programmer/station and the cost of managing the use by staff and programmers. This study also uncovered that there is no statistical relationship based on the use and preference of social media, and the users’ geographical location within Canada. This means that a station in a remote, rural location is just as likely to use social media as one in a large metropolitan area, and may even be encouraged to interact using platforms that build community over larger geographical distances.

Finally, stations that support programmers and staffs use of social media employ best practice when it implements a policy surrounding its use. Programmers also have a tough choice in deciding what platforms of social media to maintain, and what support a station should provide to its stakeholders. As a result, stations need to address social media, or continue the risk of alienating programmers and potential volunteers/listeners who would connect with the station through digital means. Overall, social media use is heavily engrained in North American society, and must be adapted to meet the wants and goals of campus/community radio members in order to facilitate growth of the sector.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The research undertaken in this study leads radio researchers and, specifically, community radio to further areas of inquiry. Additional research is needed to decide what the most effective platforms for conveying information should be used in order to meet the goals and needs of their specific show genres and scope. This can be completed by additional research into two-way communication on social media platforms, as well as access to broadcasting space.
This study also did not look at separation between participant’s perceived view of success, and success as indicated by industry standards. Research is needed to discover the gap between these two results, and what can be done to help educate programmers and stations in the realities of using social media. In this study, the definition of success was not benchmarked for future research when looking at social media and campus/community radio use.

This study was also the preliminary trial for the new methodology S.M.I.L.E.S. and needs further research to determine the reliability and validity of using a system to research topics in social media. Additional studies will assist in refining the process, and facilitate research in academic study. This would include an in-depth look at the use of a principal investigators reflective journal, internet metrics and the principal investigators running blog as sources of information, as well as a review of the other methods used to determine their fit into the system.

Discussion identified a small divide between urban and rural use of social media. Communities in rural settings have many different characteristics than those in metropolitan cities; however, the gap between uses appears to be closing. Additional studies in this area might look at the Adoption of Technology Process (i.e. Bohlen and Beal’s Stages of Diffusion, 1957), Mark Granovetter’s Threshold Model (1982), Everett Ross’s Technology Adoption Lifecycle (1995) and Gartner’s Theory of Hype Lifecycle Model (2008), to determine impact on social media use.

Also identified is a gap in research surrounding radio industries when comparing social media and audience research for the assessment of impact as a new area within public or campus/community radio, or as it affects commercial broadcasting return on investment. Supplementary research is needed to compare internet metrics of social media platforms to traditional forms of methods that calculate listener numbers or cume (thought organizations like BBM Canada, or Stats Canada) and determine if the use of social media can determine a show or stations active listenership.

Finally, additional research into the use of social media and news distribution can provide newsrooms with a better understanding of how to present information to potential consumers. The use of podcasts within campus/community radio is also an area which has yet to be researched in depth. Programmers and staff appear to want to utilize podcasts, but are tentative to adopt their use due to the legal issues around them, in terms of copyright and broadcast licensing. Finally, the use of Wiki’s as a source of information archives was not explored in this study, and could provide beneficial to station staff as a means to archive information and transmit knowledge.
FINAL REFLECTIONS

Social media and campus/community radio in Canada merits more attention than it currently receives from researchers, and station staff. In effect, it comes down to the basics, that if a station or programmer is not using social media, they are not having the opportunity to gain listeners and create interaction, and therefore, meeting the specific goals surround the unique properties of commercial, public or campus/community radio. If the type of information and messaging suits utilizing social media, then there are many platforms which can be used creatively and effectively to meet the goals of listeners, broadcasters and stations. But programmers and station staff are very tentative to break new ground without the support of policy and training. Staff and programmers need to approach social media use with a solid business plan, so that individuals; research, implement, utilize and adjust campaigns, rather than sign-up to a platform and muddle in the murky waters of social media.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Community Radio

Campus/community radio in Canada’s role is outlined in part by the licensing agreements within the Canadian Radio-television Telecommunications Commission Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010-499 as;

13. A campus or community radio station is owned, operated, managed and controlled by a not-for-profit organization that provides for membership, management, operation and programming primarily by members of the community served. In its openness to community involvement, campus and community stations offer ongoing opportunities for training in the operation of their station to volunteers from the community served.

14. Campus and community stations offer programming based on the needs and interests of a community through:

- maximum use of Canadian-produced programming;
- the broadcast of local and regional news and information;
- the broadcast and promotion of local cultural and artistic expression;
- the promotion of Canadian emerging talent with an emphasis on local musical and spoken word talent; and
- the broadcast of local and regional content related to social, economic and community issues.

[Mandate for community stations]

15. Community radio guarantees local broadcasting service through community ownership, which means that community stations cannot be privately purchased by a for-profit organization. Community radio:

- permits and facilitates communication among members of the community by fostering diversity in the broadcasting of opinions, spoken word content and musical programming;
- participates in the stimulation of socio-economic endeavours and in the cultural enrichment of communities; and
- reflects the diversity of the communities served. Local programming is produced, in part, by volunteers.

[Mandate for campus stations]

16. The Commission emphasizes the importance of student involvement in campus community stations as well as the relationships that these stations should maintain with the post-secondary institutions with which they are associated.

17. Campus radio shares the entirety of the mandate of community radio. However, campus radio distinguishes itself as follows:

- local programming is produced in part by volunteers from the student body as well as the broader community;
- the board of directors includes campus representatives, including a balanced representation from the student body and representation from
the administration of the post-secondary institution, station volunteers and the community at large; and
- there is access to funding through student levies.

As well as understanding and respecting the important role campus/community radio plays in the ethno cultural communities the industry serves. (2010)

There are approximately 164 campus/community stations licensed within Canada; of those, 82 are stations that have joined the National Campus/Community Radio Association (NCRA), an organization which lobbies on behalf of the stations that are members under the CRTC. (NCRC, 2010, CRTC, 2012). Membership is voluntary in the NCRC. Many campus/community stations are also members of the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC), or the Association des radio diffuseurs communautaires du Québec (ARCQ) which represents Québécois community stations. Stations are typically supported by a small staff of paid full-time or part-time individuals (usually between two and eight individuals), with volunteers who complete the majority of work to keep the station on the air. This includes creating and executing programming based on the requirements outlined by the CRTC, the needs of the community and the personal preference of the programmer (Monk, 1995, p. 29). A board of directors oversees the station’s long term planning and goals, while volunteers, programmers and staff execute the vision of the board (ibid, p.39 & p.65). Applications to start a campus/community radio station are typically presented to the CRTC by non-profit organizations created for the sole purpose of campus/community broadcasting, and are in competition for free space on the broadcast bandwidth with commercial and public stations (Monk, 1995, p.54).

Commercial Radio

Commercial radio stations are licensed through the CRTC and consist of approximately 716 stations within Canada. These stations have content restrictions based on licensing policy to what can and cannot be aired on the station; however flexibility to meet the needs of their listeners is based on industry demand and the free market. Commercial stations are typically owned privately or are part of a larger media conglomeration, of which 84 percent commercial stations in Canada are owned by five media companies (Khah, 2007). Stations are typically for profit, with staff, managers and jocks looking to maximize earnings by increasing sales via amassing a large listenership.

Public Radio

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is a crown corporation owned by the Canadian government, tasked with providing national Radio and Television stations with a content from a Canadian perspective. Stations are funded by public taxpayers money, advertising revenues, subscription fees, etc., and are
highly restricted based on its licensing agreement with the CRTC and its own mandate (CBC Mandate, 1991).

Radio Jock

Traditional terrestrial radio has changed greatly since the dawn of the internet revolution. Stations’ primary means of communicating with listeners are being supplemented or challenged by internet broadcasting and communications. What was once only one-way transmission of information, entertainment and communications from broadcaster to listener has now become increasingly interactive due to changes based on communication technologies, and therefore easier to apply both feedback and influence from listeners to a broadcast (Howley 2010). Radio announcers are no longer well-spoken individuals reading pre-written scripts into a microphone for a news service; rather, they are multi-tasking presenters performing a variety of tasks both on and off the air. With changes in technology, and communication practices, modern radio broadcasters or “jocks” are required to know much more then on-air presentation: they must be versatile and fluent in technology to retain both on-air and off-air position within the broadcasting spectrum. In this study, the terms programmer, jock and presenter are considered interchangeable.

Social Media:

In 2004, Web 2.0 ushered in the second incarnation of the web. Social Media and Web 2.0 networks, such as Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, etc. are classified by danah boyd and Nicole Ellison (2007) as web-based options that construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system (p. 1). Jeffery Treem and Paul Leonardli’s (2012) alternative description defines social media as a technology allowing individuals to do what was difficult or not possible with previous technologies, with focus on four affordances: Visibility, Persistence, Editability and Associations (p. 7). The combination of the two definitions leaves us with a platform to describe the plethora of forms which social media platforms can be found via social networking sites on the internet. The focus of this study will be on three specific platforms: Facebook, Twitter and blogs. The term “campaign” refers to the use of social media platforms as a communication tool, trying to achieve a specific goal as constructed by the programmer. Other forms of traditional digital media, such as web pages, e-mail and LISTSERV’s can be considered web 1.0 applications.

Blog:

A blog-type medium specifically relates to a website, or section of a website, that allows the author to post text, links, pictures, video or other elements to a static page with time-stamped entries. These pages are
found in mass-blogging websites such as Tumblr, Word Press, Live Journal, etc. and in corporate or private internet pages within a website which often allow for comments and replies to be left for non-instant response by the author. Blogs typically work in chronological form, and are similar in nature to a life journal in structure and use by many individuals. The average active generic blog is typically updated once every fourteen days (Hewitt, 2005, p. 60). Blogs have become a required tool within a radio station in order to keep listeners up to date as information can become dated by the time it reaches traditional news outlet broadcasts, i.e., the evening news (Hewitt, 2005, p. 95).

**Twitter:**

Twitter is a micro blogging site, as described by Alice Marwick and danah boyd (2010) originally as a mobile platform enabling people to “post short, 140-character text updates or ‘tweets’ to a network of others” who subscribe or follow ones postings (p. 116). Each individual post is called a tweet, and can be produced via a mobile device, through SMS or a third party platform written for smartphones, desktop computers or other devices (About Twitter, 2012). Twitter is a real-time information network which allows a subscriber to follow individuals, as well as trends by using hashtags (i.e. #hashtag), reply directly to an individual or post to the public in general (ibid.). Followers frequently “retweet” posts of those they follow, which increases the reach and audience of an individual post (boyd et al., 2010). Twitter identifies trends based on popularity of keywords, hashtags and individual identities based on geographical location, as a source of news and information with the instant ability to provide input into a topic. Due to its portability, over 462 million registered\(^{20}\) users have access to post on-the-ground reports, instant photographs, location updates and quick replies to others users (Bennett, 2012). Its inception in 2006 gained popularity in 2008-09 and has become a mainstay in the Canadian culture as it allows individuals to remain connected to the personal insights of celebrities, as well as close individuals and personal friends.

**Facebook:**

Facebook is a social networking site launched in 2004 which caters to over 820 million users as of January 2012 (Check Facebook, 2012). The site allows for individuals to create profiles with focus on six areas; basic information, contact information, personal information, professional experience, education, and profile picture (Jones & Soltren, 2005, p. 5). Individuals then connect with or “friend” others, become “fans” of various people, places, things, or join groups of like-minded individuals. Communication is achieved by posting status updates on one’s profile, through direct messages or by posting on others “Walls.” Individuals then receive updates via their homepage when others they are connected to update their status, as well as when the pages, groups or events they associate themselves with are updated. The three platforms with in Facebook for use by individuals as a means of communication include

---

\(^{20}\) Of which approximately 120 million are “active users”, individuals who log into twitter at least once per month, expected to rise to 250 million by the end of 2012.
FanPages (open for anyone to join), groups (typically closed and specifically community related) and personal profile pages. In November of 2011, Facebook launched its new “Timeline” feature, transforming an individual’s page into a historical diary of sorts, which includes easier access to older postings and interactions. Individuals control the amount of information made public, as well as limit the visibility of their page to others via privacy settings.

**Podcast:**

A podcast is a full or partial show, interview or collection of songs that are imbedded in either a website, blog or via an RSS feed that allows listeners to download and remotely listen to content on demand. Most are in mp3 format and available through a service such as iTunes that updates individuals when new episodes are available.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX #1 - SUMMARY OF STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS FOR PROGRAMMER PROGRAMMERS

The following recommendations are designed to help facilitate interaction between listener and programmer through social media. These will not solve your problems, but may assist in creating a connection with better efficiency and effectiveness.

**Determining what platform to use**

- Evaluate your target demographic to determine if they would use social media;
- If so, make sure the platforms you use, are the ones that best suit your show and listener type and location;
- One platform is probably not enough, but more than three will result in too much work.

**Preparation**

- Develop a checklist which includes social media in pre-show preparations.

**Follow-up**

- Follow trend by using Twitter hashtags and keywords, as well as Google Alerts, Facebook Insights, YouTube Analytics and/or Klout.com.

**Inter-platform communications**

- Include links and handles in e-mail signatures;
- From time to time, mention additional platforms the show or station may be using (i.e. “check out the twitter page for more frequent updates”);
- Ask for help from others to promote the show or station, for advice on topics of discussion and to contribute directly on-air;
- Give permission to let others share your content;
- Use social media “buttons” on your website;
- Stage announcements that have the same content, on different platforms to increase the number of eyes that may see the post;
- Website traffic typically comes from three areas: links from other websites (blogs), search engines and traditional marketing efforts. As a result, using link exchanges, optimizing search engines and fliers/posters/word or mouth are still very important to generating hits to a website.

**Facebook**

- Post in groups or on the wall of those with similar interests to the show;
- Keep content fresh and new, update material two to three times a week (but not more than twice a day);
- Use multimedia, such as photos and video, as it increases interaction on a post by upwards of 50%;
- Always include links in posts (if possible) to external material;
- Use humour (when appropriate), as it created entertainment value and enhances recollection;
- Use E-vites and ask others to share;
- Keep posts short, use notes or blogs for longer posts.
**Twitter**

- When a post asks a question, it invokes a response which creates discussion;
- A carefully designed background for Twitter page that looks professional and represents the show or station creates consistency in branding;
- Using hashtags and providing links generate action by the reader to explore more in detail;
  - Commenting on other posts or retweeting increases exposure, not only by those who the content is passed on to, but it also can make the original poster of the message aware that you actively engaged with them;
- By using a story in a post, it provides interest, education and a reason to come back to the platform;
  - Using the “element of surprise” can grab interest from a reader, but the use of “shock” content could turn people away from an account;
- The hashtag “#communityradio” is the industry tag that denotes those who support and follow campus/community radio.

**Blogs**

- Be cautious of comments left; deletion or failure to respond can alienate or start conflict on a blog;
- Be generous in praise and attribution, as typically the post will be archived for others to view;
- Using a list to generate discussion works well;
- Stay away from profanity, as it alienates audiences and is unprofessional;
- Keep the title of a post short and easy to remember so reference can be made back to that post;
  - respond quickly, be human and follow up to ensure resolution if required.

**YouTube**

- To brand a channel to match that of the show;
- Keep clips short (under 60 seconds if possible);
- Cross promote on multiple channels.
APPENDIX #2 - SUMMARY OF STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS FOR STATIONS STAFF

The following recommendations are designed to help facilitate interaction between staff and volunteers, as well as provide support for programmers to achieve their social media goals. These will not solve your problems, but may assist in creating a connection with better efficiency and effectiveness.

**Funding**
- Use Paypal.

**Information resources**
- Maintaining an online platform for information, such as a Wiki, forum or website allows programmers the ability to access information without the need to engage staff.

**Providing platforms**
- Provide programmers with a centralized method of creating network and communication, allowing programmers to either directly, or through the support of staff, post on a station run platform.
- Don’t implement all platforms at once, use a phased approach.

**Policy**
- Some sort of Policy or Recommended Guidelines should be implemented in all stations;
- Use of a “social media” or “policy” committee is recommended to solicit information from staff, programmers and board member to generate a social media policy or recommended guidelines;
- Using a support website, such as policytool.net;
- Include examples of preferred and inappropriate use, which platforms it applies to, how programmers and staff may or may not relate to it in a personal setting, provide awareness of copyright content issues, and who to go to for help/support.

**Process**
1. Get intelligence (decide if social media is the correct method to meet the goals of the users);
2. Clarify objectives (the social media efforts should serve the station/programmers mission and strategic plan);
3. Design strategies (Identify who to get involved, what training is needed, where are opportunities to get off to a good start, how to track progress?, and how can to communicate success);
4. Implement the plan (while providing support and resources to those who ask for it);
5. Measure outcomes (including if the initial plan is in place, if social media is helping to achieve goals, fi changes to be made);
6. Leverage learning (which allows everyone to pause, reflect, learn and reapply efforts to move forward).

**Leadership**
- Designated leaders (such as a station manager or program manager) should use a blog to facilitate information distribution, idea generation and foster interaction throughout the station;
- Blog daily, and requiring those they lead read the blog daily;
- Allow for open dialogue and conversation on their blog;
- Posts do not always have to be original material, but can be re-posts from outside sources or additional posts from those that read the blog to help grow community.
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The proliferation of social media and web 2.0 applications (Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, blogs, etc) in the previous five years has created a new social research opportunity, with over an estimated 400 million people having Facebook accounts by the end of 2011 (Singer, 2009). As with all research, boundaries must be set out to create valid and accurate data, keeping ethical practices at the forefront of the data gathering process. The lack of standardized practices requires an in-depth look into the use of such methods, with focus on four major areas: 1) security for the individual, 2) anonymity, 3) safety and 4) use of mined data and information gathered.

A social networking website is described as a type of website designed to allow for an online profile of oneself or company/organization, with the use of personal information (Location, sex, occupation, hobbies, etc.) as well as photographs and blog type postings. These websites typically allow you to “like” or “follow” other “friends”, sharing information with each other within a network. Often the sites are used to help people keep in touch with others, or to find likeminded individuals (Gold & Huberman, 2007).

Researchers are interested in this new mass form of communication for two reasons: looking at the form itself, and as a unique window of observation on the privacy attitudes and the patterns of information communication among young individuals (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). Online internet research is expected to also provide either some expectation of benefit to the greater public or a specific group, or to the individual for who the research is being carried out (Frankel & Siang, 1999). Online internet research is often believed to be easier to complete as the flexibility and amount of resources are often cheaper and easier to obtain. With new communication tools at hand, like-minded individuals are able to associate or “group” together, allowing access to a larger pool of individuals with technological skills who may or may not be part of an official association. Nobody is forced to join an online social network, and most networks we know about encourage social interaction within their groups (Gross & Acquisti, 2005). Respondents also tend to be more open online when they are unaware of research being completed (Reid, 1996; Childress & Asamen, 1998). However, we must be aware that the available data might not necessarily represent the entire population being studied, fail to go beyond the gathering of
basic surface information as users post minimal or incomplete information, and can often be tainted due
to self-reporting biases and errors (Zimmer, 2010; Frankel & Siang, 1999).

Some strands of internet research have been published, including “Social Networking Theory”
by Lior Strahilevitz. His work has proposed applying formal social network theory as a tool for aiding
interpretation of privacy in legal cases. He suggests basing conclusions regarding privacy “on what the
parties should have expected to follow the initial disclosure of information by someone other than the
defendant” (Gross & Acquisti, 2005). Other research groups, such as the International Journal of
Internet Research Ethics, provide guidelines, recommendations and an open forum in which to discuss
work and methods that are not uniformly agreed upon such as consent within public versus private
domain research ethics for data collection.

There are two major forms of internet research, passive and active. Passive research does not
involve the researched individuals or groups being aware that they are being researched or are
providing information for a research project. This can include data mining of information with the use of
other websites, voyeurism by “following” a blog, Twitter account or Facebook and recording details
about ones postings or by engaging in interaction with an individual on a personal level, without stating
the true intent of the communication (an online chat forum, via ListServ’s or group e-mail, or by a Group
or Fan Page within Facebook). Individuals join groups for the interaction and association, and do not
expect to be test subjects, unless explicitly stated as the reason for the group (Eysenbach & Till, 2001). If
some form of registration is required, subscribers are likely to regard the space as a “Private Place”
(Mayer & Till, 1996). Research in groups will need to address the size of a group as well, as larger groups
create the possibility for less anonymity, as an individual who expresses sensitive or private information
to a group expects confidence to be more realized when a group is smaller (Eysenbach & Till, 2001).

Active research involves the individual knowing they are part of a research project, they have
been made aware or given consent to their involvement. Individuals who are involved in active research
may not be truly aware of their involvement, giving consent via another organization allowing specific
information to be made public (Zimmer, 2010) or by failing to read the fine details of an agreement form
when signing up for a website or group. Whenever possible, active research should inform the subject
that information is being gathered, and provide an “I agree to the following” consent form, outlining the
project in detailed information, providing an opt-out option at a later date, confidentiality, anonymity and any remuneration for their participation (Faden & Beauchamp, 1986).

The first of four major concerns for internet research is providing the individual being researched security of their information. As individual growth of web 2.0 occurs, often many internet websites are joined or linked together. By signing up for one site, you may bilaterally agree to other sites which may use different security protocols. This occurs when individuals sign into a third party site using your primary host account (i.e. Facebook, AOL, Microsoft Live, etc.). As a result, your information is available to be accessed and gathered by that third-person site. Typically, a consent page is required to be accepted, which is a page that outlines the full details of the permissions being requested, but many pages of small, legal text are most often skipped or skimmed by the individual. The newly gathered information can then be sold by a third party, or accessed illegally by hackers who are able to penetrate less secure websites (Schell & Dodge, 2002).

Facebook security settings are also a threat to an individual’s security, as the initial settings are set to “everyone” which allows information to be viewed by everyone, even those who are not logged into Facebook to view its content (facebook, 2011). 30% of Facebook users are unaware that Facebook even grants such privacy setting options (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). Facebook acknowledges that it cannot control the actions of others who use your information and that their security measures are not perfect or impenetrable, so they cannot ensure that information you share on Facebook will not become publicly available (Facebook, 2011) Network settings can restrict viewers of information to those within the “network,” though networks can be much larger than an individual may anticipate and are openly accessed by a non-secure process which often require very little clearance to be accepted (Zimmer, 2010).

Research using web 2.0 content must maintain perceived privacy/anonymity/confidentiality for its subjects, whether passive or active research is undertaken. Information gathered must be cleaned before any information is released in either a report, or as datasets for further use. The cleaning of data means the removal of all information that could result in anonymity being revealed (Rahim & Hai Do, 2000). When dealing with defined groups or organizations, Zimmer points out in a study by Kaufman that even unique characteristics not associated with an individual may be linked to that individual if the subset of data is released and identified (Zimmer, 2010). This requirement would not be as critical when
dealing with a non-defined, unidentifiable group. Identifiable information, such as direct quotes or highly unique markers, allow for internet wide searches to be used, connecting data or information to a specific person, as many web 2.0 sites are indexed into search networks and databases (Zimmer, 2006; Eysenbach & Till, 2001; Frankel & Siang, 1999). Failing to properly clean data creates a position that ignores the broader dignity-based theory of privacy (Bloustein, 1964).

As content and context are linked, the personal safety of an individual, or a group could be jeopardized. When internet research occurs, it often deals with vulnerable individuals or groups, or can create vulnerability with the subject group because of the research. Although respondents are fully aware that providing information can have negative effects, “having fun” and “revealing enough information so that necessary/useful to me and other people to benefit from Facebook” were the two major reasons why individuals posted information to a page (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). However, this leaves individuals vulnerable to new threats both on and offline. Stalking, or hacking of information for telecommunication fraud; unauthorized access to personal accounts for profit, fascination, ego or intellectual challenges; credit card fraud; or other destructive activities like virus or defacing one’s personal profile is increased as unwilling participants are exposed to further risk because of their active or passive involvement in a project (Acquisti & Gross, 2006; Schell & Dodge, 2002).

Finally, information gathered must be stored in a safe, offline facility while research is being completed and destroyed after the findings and results are completed, especially if any databases created link directly back to a specific group or organization which has unique identifying characteristics. The delayed release of statistical supporting databases for further research on a subject group that is to disband (i.e. a co-hort of a university class), is also required if that group is still on-going to provide extra protection (Zimmer, 2010).

As internet research grows, it is critical to remember that web 2.0 research involves people, not technologies (Bassett & O’Roirdan, 2002). When in doubt of your methods or findings, play it safe for the security of your research subjects, especially when they are put in a vulnerable position due to the work being completed.
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CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Barry Rooke, Helen Hambly Odame (Advisor) and Michael Ridley (Committee Member), from the Capacity Development and Extensions Program at the University of Guelph, for the Master’s Thesis of Barry Rooke.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Helen Hambly Odame – hhambly@uoguelph.ca or 1-519-824-4120*53408

DEFINITIONS
Web 2.0 Technologies are defined as social websites allowing interaction amongst online communities, such as Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, YouTube, etc.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to:
1. To create a “best practice” or framework to assist community radio in Canada to better connect to the communities it serves.
2. To better understand the reasons and goals of community broadcasters when interacting with their listeners.
3. To design a methodological framework for social media research within community media and development work.

PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do one or more following things:

1. Participate in a short one-on-one interview discussing your history and involvement in interacting with a community using web 2.0 techniques.
2. Allow for this interview to be taped for research purposes, with the understanding that recordings will not be made public or used except for reference material.
3. Participate in planned seminars
4. Complete a short survey
5. Provide resources for further research.

Interviews shall take no longer then one hour, surveys should be able to be completed within 15 minutes. Seminar lengths vary with scheduled and allotted time. A request may be made for a follow-up sessions or subsequent related study. Please initial if you are willing to be contacted after your initial involvement in the study.

Initial here to authorize contact for follow-up questions or related study: ___

Research findings will be made available at the completion of the study, estimated winter 2012. Please provide your e-mail address if you wish to receive information on the findings.

E-mail: ____________________________

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
There are no risks or discomforts directly associated with the study at this time. Please note that data collected via online surveys are subject to privacy laws within the United States of America, due to server locations.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY
This study will help to provide a framework for community radio to better understand the needs and goals of broadcaster and listener interaction. The study will also help add to the body of knowledge for non-profit organizations to connect with the communities they serve.
PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION
There is no remuneration for your participation in the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study, but confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, especially in a group setting. Information gathered may include names and locations; however, findings and conclusions presented to the public will not include identifying names, characteristics or associations for any individual or company. All data will be destroyed 6 months after the completion of the study. Digital files will remain in a password protected folder for access purposes and encryption. Physical documents will remain in a locked cabinet at the researches home. Video and/or audio recordings may be made during the study to help research, but such recordings will be used for reference and will not be published. These recordings will only be used by the main researcher and only for the research outlined above and will be destroyed within 6 months of the completion of research.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participants involved in group research may withdraw at any time; however, information presented before withdrawal will not be removed. You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so. If you choose to withdraw after information is delivered, an e-mail can be sent to rookeb@uoguelph.ca to have your involvement from the study removed.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca
Fax: (519) 821-5236

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I have read the information provided for the study “Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant (please print)

Signature of Participant ____________________________ Date

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

Name of Witness (please print)

Signature of Witness ____________________________ Date
APPENDIX #6 - POSTER FOR LISTENER ENGAGEMENT FOCUS GROUP (CFRU)

Want to interact with your audience better?

Join us for the first of a few meetings in the “Listener Engagement Focus Group”

Thursday March 31st, 6-7:30pm
NV Lounge – Downtown Guelph

- Workshop open to all
- No on-air experience required
- Bring your questions!

Appetizers will be provided!

CFRU is looking to gather together some bright minds to help discuss the past, current and future ways which programmers communicate with their listeners. This group will be an informal discussion group, looking to gain insight into each other’s techniques to reaching out to their listeners, trying to see what broadcasters would like to receive in the way of interaction and feedback from the listeners and implementing any feedback or involvement in their on-air aspects of their shows. The group will also look at the idea of having a social media policy within the station, drafting some ideas to potentially pass on to the policy committee if interested is warranted. Finally the group will also look at some marketing techniques used to help bolster the listenership and interaction between programmer and viewer, as tips and techniques will be shared.

Agenda:
1. Introductions
2. Group discussion on the goals of interacting with your audience
3. How are people interacting currently
4. Should CFRU have a unified Social Media platform? Or a policy when it comes to interacting with listeners?

Interested in more? Barry Rooke will be working with programmers to help custom build campaigns and marketing techniques as part of his Master’s Thesis. This is a great opportunity to get one on one help to reach out to the listeners you want too.

For more information, e-mail Barry Rooke (rookeb@uoguelph.ca).
APPENDIX #7 – SURVEY #1 (CFRU EXPLORATORY SURVEY)

Social Media Survey:

Please fill out and return in the same cubby as your on-air log sheet is sent.

Name: ____________________________ Show: ____________________________
Do you have a Facebook Account?  Y / N
(If yes, please continue)
Did you join the CFRU group?  Y / N  Did you join the event?  Y / N
Did you invite people to join the group?  Y / N  Did you invite people to join the event?  Y / N
How many people did you invite to the group? ___  To the event? ___

Which of the following do you have, that specifically is used to promote or keep people up to date about your own show (Please Check)?

Facebook Group  ___
Facebook Fan Page  ___
Facebook Profile  ___
Twitter Account  ___
External Blog  ___
Other (Please explain)  ____________________________________

Do you have a Twitter Account?  Y / N

If you were taught how to market your show on Facebook/Twitter/YouTube, would you be interested in promoting your show via these areas? If so, Please write your e-mail below for later reference
APPENDIX #8 – SURVEY #2 (NCRC SURVEY)

About:
The following survey is to help identify the wants and needs of community radio broadcasters and their interaction with listeners.

Confidentiality:
Your name, and any identifying markers that link directly back to yourself will not be used during the writing of the report, nor will they be made public. There will be no reimbursement for your participation in this study. Please fill-out the following as truthful as possible. You may withdraw from this research at any time by e-mailing ronkeb@uoguelph.ca

Consent:
By completing this survey, you agree you have reviewed and signed the associated consent form.

Completed Study:
If you wish to receive a copy of the completed study summary, please provide your e-mail address here.

Station Affiliation: ____________________________
Length of time as a broadcaster: ______________
Gender: M / F
Type of show:
Music
Spoken Word
Multi-Cultural
Other (Please explain) _______________________

Please describe the reasons you wish to communicate with your listeners:

Which of the following technologies do you have, that specifically is used to promote or keep people up to date about your own show (Please check all that apply)?
Facebook Group
Facebook Fan Page
Facebook Profile
Twitter Account
External Blog
E-mails
ListServ
Website
Other (Please explain) _______________________

Page 1 of 2
Have you received training or support to help achieve your communication goals? Y / N
If Yes: What type of training and support, and from who?

What methods do you find work the best to reach your listeners? (Please rank your top 3, 1 being best)

Facebook Group
Facebook Fan Page
Facebook Profile
Twitter Account
External Blog
Website
Station Website
E-mails
ListServ
Posters
On-Air Announcements
Links via other website
Other (Please explain)

Can you describe a time where you were successful in creating reaction from your listeners (example, you hosted an event and put out a poster and listeners attended due to the poster)

Does your station provide you with outreach opportunities (I.e. station newsletter, posters)? Y / N
What do you wish your station did more of to support your communication efforts?
APPENDIX #9- SURVEY #3 (NCRA STAFF)

About the Survey

About:
The following survey is to help identify the wants and needs of community radio stations and their interaction with programmers and listeners. (To be completed by station staff/representatives ONLY!)

Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Barry Rooke, Helen Hambly Odame (Advisor) and Michael Ridley (Committee Member), from the Capacity Development and Extensions Program at the University of Guelph, for the Master’s Thesis of Barry Rooke.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Helen Hambly Odame – hhambly@uoguelph.ca or 1-519-824-4120 *53408

DEFINITIONS
Web 2.0 Technologies are defined as social websites allowing interaction amongst online communities, such as Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, YouTube, etc.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to:
1. To create a "best practice" or framework to assist community radio in Canada to better connect to the communities it serves.
2. To better understand the reasons and goals of community broadcasters when interacting with their listeners.
3. To design a methodological framework for social media research within community media and development work.

PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do one or more following things:

1. Participate in a short one-on-one interview discussing your history and involvement in interacting with a community using web 2.0 techniques.
2. Allow for this interview to be taped for research purposes, with the understanding that recordings will not be made public or used except for reference material.
3. Participate in planned seminars
4. Complete a short survey
5. Provide resources for further research.

Interviews shall take no longer then one hour, surveys should be able to be completed within 15 minutes. Seminar lengths vary with scheduled and allotted time. A request may be made for a follow-up sessions or subsequent related study. Please initial if you are willing to be contacted after your initial involvement in the study.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
There are no risks or discomforts directly associated with the study at this time.
Please note that data collected via online surveys are subject to privacy laws within the United States of America, due to server locations.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY
This study will help to provide a framework for community radio to better understand the needs and goals of broadcaster and listener interaction. The study will also help add to the body of knowledge for non-profit organizations to connect with the communities they serve.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION
There is no remuneration for your participation in the study

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study, but confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, especially in a group setting. Information gathered may include names and locations; however findings and conclusions presented to the public will not include identifying names, characteristics or associations for any individual or company. All data will be destroyed 6 months after the completion of the study. Digital files will remain in a password protected mobile computer, which will include a password protected folder for access purposes and encryption. Physical documents will remain in a locked cabinet at the researcher’s home. Video and/or audio recordings may be made during the study to help research, but such recordings will be used for reference and will not be published. These recordings will only be used by the main researcher and only for the research outlined above and will be destroyed within 6 months of the completion of research.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participants involved in group research may withdraw at any time; however information presented before withdrawal will not be removed. You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so. If you chose to withdraw after information is delivered, an e-mail can be sent to rookeb@uoguelph.ca to have your involvement from the study removed.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator Telephone: (519) 824-4120 , ext. 56606
University of Guelph E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca
437 University Centre Fax: (519) 821-5236
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE
I have read the information provided for the study "Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies" as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form. Please insert your name below.
Click here to authorize contact for follow-up questions or related study

[ ] Allow for follow-up

Research findings will be made available at the completion of the study, estimated winter 2012. Please provide your e-mail address if you wish to receive information on the findings

Basic Station Information

1) Name:

____________________________________________

2) Station Affiliation:

____________________________________________

3) Position:

____________________________________________

4) City/Town:

____________________________________________

5) E-mail Address:

____________________________________________

6) Station Website:

____________________________________________

7) Who looks after the station's Social Media?

[ ] One Staff Member
[ ] All Staff
[ ] Board Of Directors
[ ] Volunteer(s)
[ ] Other
8) Please finish the following statement: Social Media at our station is ...

---

**Internal Social Media Use**

9) Which of the following technologies does your station use to promote or keep people up to date about station policy and non-broadcast happenings (Please check all that apply)?

- [ ] Physical Billboard Postings
- [ ] Physical Newsletters
- [ ] E-mails
- [ ] ListServ
- [ ] Website
- [ ] RSS Feed
- [ ] Facebook Group
- [ ] Facebook Fan Page
- [ ] Facebook Profile
- [ ] Twitter Account
- [ ] External Blog
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Other

10) Please provide the following URLs

Facebook Fan Page URL: _________________________
Facebook Group Page URL: _________________________
Facebook Station Personal Page URL: _________________________
Twitter Page URL: _________________________
Blog Page URL: _________________________
Other: : _________________________

---

**External Promotion and Social Media Use**

11) What methods does the station use to promote on-air content (Shows, upcoming events, etc)?

- [ ] Physical Billboard Postings
- [ ] Physical Newsletters
- [ ] E-mails
- [ ] ListServ
12) Do individual programmers have access to these methods?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Only through staff

---

Policy or Procedure

13) Does your station have any official policy or procedure about social media use for Staff or Programmers/volunteers?

( ) Yes - Staff use only
( ) Yes - Programmer/Volunteer use only
( ) Yes - Both
( ) No - Unofficial guidelines have been suggested
( ) No - Staff make recommendations as they are needed
( ) No - Official policy or procedure

15) Does anyone on staff (or appointed volunteer, or outside hired company) follow social media trends for the station (i.e., keeping up with websites, etc)?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) If yes, what sources?

---

Training

16) Does the station provide training for staff (including one staff training others in an official capacity)?
17) Does the station provide training for Programmers/Volunteers?

[ ] Yes - "Course" style
[ ] Yes - One-on-One mentoring (By staff or other Volunteers)
[ ] Yes - Hand-out or written material
[ ] Yes - Off-site training (Out side company)
[ ] Yes - Website
[ ] Yes - Other
[ ] No

18) Please add specific details if possible.

______________________________

Other Questions

20) What are the goals of Social Media use within the station?

21) What tends to "work" when using social media (based on reaching personal goals)

22) What has failed to work?

23) What frustrates you when working with social media?

24) If you could change the way that social media is used within the station, what would you change? (If anything)

______________________________

Final Thoughts

25) Has the station brought in outside support to help with Social Media (Ie. an external company)

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Thinking About It

26) On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being not important at all, ten being essential to the survival of the station), how important is Social Media use to the station's future?

( ) 1
( ) 2
27) If the NCRA or another company was to provide training for staff or programmers in the form of a course, would your station be interested in this?

( ) Yes
( ) Yes - If the cost was appropriate
( ) No
( ) Unsure

28) Any last comments or thoughts about the Study? Survey? Social Media?

Thank You!

Thank you very much for taking the survey. Your response is very important to us!

Please remember to forward on the Programmer Survey to your stations individual programmers!

The full report will be released in Winter of 2012 for your support!

You can follow this study via http://www.barryrooke.wordpress.com

-Barry
rookeb@uoguelph.ca
APPENDIX #10 - SURVEY #4 (NCRA PROGRAMMERS)

Campus/Community Social Media - Programmers Survey

About the Survey

About:
The following survey is to help identify the wants and needs of community radio programmers and their own specific radio station. (To be completed by individual show programmers/volunteers/broadcasters only, not station staff)

Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Barry Rooke, Helen Hambly Odame (Advisor) and Michael Ridley (Committee Member), from the Capacity Development and Extensions Program at the University of Guelph, for the Master's Thesis of Barry Rooke.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Helen Hambly Odame – hhambly@uoguelph.ca or 1-519-824-4120 #53408

DEFINITIONS
Web 2.0 Technologies are defined as social websites allowing interaction amongst online communities, such as Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, YouTube, etc.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to:
1. To create a "best practice" or framework to assist community radio in Canada to better connect to the communities it serves.
2. To better understand the reasons and goals of community broadcasters when interacting with their listeners.
3. To design a methodological framework for social media research within community media and development work.

PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do one or more following things:

1. Participate in a short one-on-one interview discussing your history and involvement in interacting with a community using web 2.0 techniques.
2. Allow for this interview to be taped for research purposes, with the understanding that recordings will not be made public or used except for reference material.
3. Participate in planned seminars
4. Complete a short survey
5. Provide resources for further research.

Interviews shall take no longer then one hour, surveys should be able to be completed within 15
minutes. Seminar lengths vary with scheduled and allotted time. A request may be made for a follow-up sessions or subsequent related study. Please initial if you are willing to be contacted after your initial involvement in the study.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
There are no risks or discomforts directly associated with the study at this time. Please note that data collected via online surveys are subject to privacy laws within the United States of America, due to server locations.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY
This study will help to provide a framework for community radio to better understand the needs and goals of broadcaster and listener interaction. The study will also help add to the body of knowledge for non-profit organizations to connect with the communities they serve.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION
There is no remuneration for your participation in the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study, but confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, especially in a group setting. Information gathered may include names and locations; however findings and conclusions presented to the public will not include identifying names, characteristics or associations for any individual or company. All data will be destroyed 6 months after the completion of the study. Digital files will remain in a password protected folder for access purposes and encryption. Physical documents will remain in a locked cabinet at the researches home. Video and/or audio recordings may be made during the study to help research, but such recordings will be used for reference and will not be published. These recordings will only be used by the main researcher and only for the research outlined above and will be destroyed within 6 months of the completion of research.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participants involved in group research may withdrawal at any time; however information presented before withdrawal will not be removed. You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so. If you chose to withdraw after information is delivered, an e-mail can be sent to rookeb@uoguelph.ca to have your involvement from the study removed.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator Telephone: (519) 824-4120 , ext. 56606
University of Guelph E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca
437 University Centre Fax: (519) 821-5236
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1
SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I have read the information provided for the study "Campus/Community Radio in Canada: linking listeners to broadcasters with Web 2.0 technologies" as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form. Please insert your name below.*

____________________________________________

Click here to authorize contact for follow-up questions or related study

[ ] Allow for follow-up

Research findings will be made available at the completion of the study, estimated winter 2012. Please provide your e-mail address if you wish to receive information on the findings

____________________________________________

Basic Station Information

1) Name:

____________________________________________

2) Station Association:*

____________________________________________

3) City/Town:*

____________________________________________

4) E-mail Address:

____________________________________________

5) Within the station I am a.....*

[ ] On-Air Programmer (Host, or assist in hosting, an on-air show)
[ ] Off-Air Volunteer (Help out around the station but do not have association with an specific on-air show)
[ ] on the Board Of Directors
[ ] New to the station and unsure what I want to do
[ ] Other

6) Do you have any specific "special" roles within the station (I.e. psa producer, etc)
7) Please finish the following statement: Social Media at our station is ...

External Promotion and Social Media Use

8) What methods do you use to promote on-air content (Shows, upcoming events, etc)?

[ ] E-mails
[ ] ListServ
[ ] Website
[ ] RSS Feed
[ ] Facebook Group
[ ] Facebook Fan Page
[ ] Facebook Profile
[ ] Twitter Account
[ ] External Blog
[ ] Physical Billboard Postings / Fliers
[ ] Stickers
[ ] Other
[ ] Other
[ ] Other

9) Please provide the following URLs for your social media pages

Facebook Fan Page URL: _________________________
Facebook Group Page URL: _________________________
Facebook Station Personal Page URL: _________________________
Twitter Page URL: _________________________
Blog Page URL: _________________________
Other:: _________________________

10) Does your station allow you to promote through their channels (ie on station website, twitter account, billboards etc)

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Unsure
Want to Learn

11) Which of the following technologies would I like to learn how to use? (Please check all that apply)

[ ] E-mails
[ ] ListServ
[ ] Station Website
[ ] Personal Website
[ ] RSS Feed
[ ] Facebook Group
[ ] Facebook Fan Page
[ ] Facebook Profile
[ ] Twitter Account
[ ] External Blog
[ ] Physical Billboard Postings / Fliers
[ ] Stickers
[ ] Other
[ ] Other
[ ] Other

Policy or Procedure

12) Is there a specific person that you are aware of in the station who helps or oversee's the stations social media?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Unsure

13) Does your station have any official policy or procedure about social media use for Staff or Programmers/Volunteers?

( ) Yes - Staff use only
( ) Yes - Programmer/Volunteer use only
( ) Yes - Both
( ) No - Unofficial guidelines have been suggested
( ) No - Staff make recommendations as they are needed
( ) No - Official policy or procedure
( ) Unsure
15) Are there any resources (Websites, books etc) that you have used in the past that relate to promotion of your show that you would recommend?

Training

16) Does the station provide training for Programmers/Volunteers?

[ ] Yes - "Course" style
[ ] Yes - One-on-One mentoring (By staff or other Volunteers)
[ ] Yes - Hand-out or written material
[ ] Yes - Off-site training (Out side company)
[ ] Yes - Website
[ ] Yes - Other
[ ] No

17) Please add specific details about training, if possible.

18) If the station provided training or assistance, what form would you like it to be in?

[ ] "Course" style
[ ] One-on-One mentoring (By staff or other Volunteers)
[ ] Hand-out or written material
[ ] Off-site training (Outside company)
[ ] Website
[ ] Other

Other Questions

19) Why do you want to use Social Media in association with your programming/show?

20) What tends to "work" when using social media (based on reaching your own personal goals)

21) What has failed to work?

22) What frustrates you when working with social media?

23) If you could change the way that social media is used within the station, what would you change? (If anything)
Final Thoughts

24) In your opinion, is social media important to your stations' Staff/Board of Directors?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) As a "second thought"
( ) Unsure

25) On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being not important at all, ten being essential to the survival of the show), how important is Social Media use to your programming?

( ) 1
( ) 2
( ) 3
( ) 4
( ) 5
( ) 6
( ) 7
( ) 8
( ) 9
( ) 10

26) On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being no-existent, ten being "on-the-ball"), how well do you believe your station uses Social Media?

( ) 1
( ) 2
( ) 3
( ) 4
( ) 5
( ) 6
( ) 7
( ) 8
( ) 9
( ) 10

27) If you were provided training or resources in social media use, would you be interested in applying it to your show?

( ) Yes - I would pay for it
( ) Yes - If it was free
28) Any last comments or thoughts about the Study? Survey? Social Media?

Thank You!

Thank you very much for taking the survey. Your response is very important to us!

Please remember to forward on the Programmer Survey to your stations individual programmers!

The full report will be released in Winter of 2012 for your support!

You can follow this study via http://www.barryrooke.wordpress.com

-Barry
rookeb@uoguelph.ca
### APPENDIX #11 – METHODS AND PERCENTAGES OF USE BY STAFF AND PROGRAMMERS WHEN COMMUNICATING WITH LISTENERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used to create interaction</th>
<th>number of replies</th>
<th>percentage of replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter*</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Personal Profile*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook FanPage*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Group*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ListServ</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard posting in station</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fliers/Posters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via FM broadcasts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcast*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatroom/Forums*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myspace*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Call-in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross promotion (shows or organizations)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-To-Air</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDs/Shirts/Swag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business cards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video stream/vlogging*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail signature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents replied with between 0 and 11 platforms used 659

* indicates a web 2.0 classification
Engaging Listeners through Facebook and Twitter for Radio Stations and Radio Jocks

Last Revision: April 2012

Facebook and Twitter currently represent the 2 most prolific social networks. These networks are built to spread engagement virally, so remember first and foremost to always focus on providing content that will drive engagement and elicit responses from fans and followers. This builds trust with the audience, and naturally exposes the jock or station to more people.

For jocks, tweets should be more personable even if they are covering similar content to the station. Retweeting should also be encouraged - followers often “re-tweet” things that resonate with them, exposing the jock or station’s tweet to an even wider potential fan base.

Stations should focus on developing a consistent online personality. Taking advantage of the different functionality that Twitter offers (such as re-tweets, replies and hashtags) is key to building a rapport with the audience.

Facebook is most effective when the focus of the page is on building brand loyalty rather than acting as a news outlet. Posts should be made strategically, not just for the sake of posting. According to a study conducted in 2011, it is optimal to make Facebook posts 80 characters or less, every 18 hours or so in order to get maximum engagement.¹

Facebook’s new Timeline for pages (officially launched across the site on March 30, 2012) provides several new tools to improve page moderation, organization and management. Community managers should familiarize themselves with all of the new functionality and insights in order to get the maximum possible benefit from them. Facebook often introduces new features (sometimes with very little advance notice), so it is important to figure them out as quickly as possible.

For stations and jocks, apps can be extremely helpful for replacing the antiquated method of using listener call-ins to enter contests and make song requests while at the same time collecting more useful data about listeners. There is lots of room to get creative with apps – no need to stick to the status quo.

Whether or not jocks’ Twitter and Facebook accounts are directly tied to their station, a policy should be in place outlining what is expected, acceptable and not acceptable with respect to posts made from both jock and station accounts. The policy should be reviewed regularly so it does not become outdated.

The best way to build an online presence is to leverage the best aspects of both Facebook and Twitter by making them work together. The terms of use for both networks differ quite significantly from each other, which can be an advantage to the marketer that fully understands what is and is not allowed on each and where the rules overlap. Many people engage over both, and a strong social strategy recognizes the value of each and approaches them individually but maintains efficiency by connecting them where possible.
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APPENDIX #13 - CREATIVE COMMONS COPYRIGHT

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 Canada (CC BY-NC-SA 2.5)

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
- to make derivative works

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — You must give the original author credit.
- **Non-Commercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- **Share Alike** — If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a licence identical to this one.

With the understanding that:

- **Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.
- **Public Domain** — Where the work or any of its elements is in the public domain under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.
- **Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:
  - Your fair dealing or fair use rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
  - The author's moral rights;
  - Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as publicity or privacy rights.
- **Notice** — For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the licence terms of this work.
APPENDIX #14 - UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH – THESIS COPYRIGHT POLICY

C.3
February 1, 1989

3. COPYRIGHT

I COPYRIGHT POLICY

SCOPE

This copyright policy applies (i) to faculty; (ii) to non-faculty professional and support staff who generate works eligible for copyright under the terms of their employment and (iii) to students who are enrolled in academic programs of the University of Guelph.

Copyright applies to all original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works, including among others, books, writings, musical works, sculptures, paintings, photographs, motion picture films, dictionaries and encyclopedias. Copyright extends to works created on, and contained in, mechanical contrivances, such as records, cassettes and tapes.

Computer software is covered by the Software Creation Policy (Section 13).

POLICY

1. COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP

1.1 The University reaffirms its traditional practice that copyright in works produced by faculty members belong to those faculty members, except in the special cases listed below. The University extends to non-faculty professional and support staff, and to students, these same rights, namely, that ownership of copyright will belong to the author, except in specific cases. It should be noted that the Copyright Act of Canada asserts that the author of a work shall be the first owner of the copyright, except when that person is under a contract of service and the work is made in the course of his/her employment. This automatic transfer of ownership to the employer may be waived if there is a specific agreement by the employer to the contrary. This policy can be considered as such an agreement by the University, whereby the University will re-assign copyright ownership to faculty, non-faculty professional and support staff, and to students, except for the specific instances listed below.

a) When the University specifically asks a faculty member or directs a member of the non-faculty professional staff or support staff to undertake work that is the subject of copyright, the University reserves to itself the ownership of copyright in the work so produced, unless alternative provisions are made in writing.

b) When the University employs non-faculty professional staff and support staff for the express purpose of creating or producing works which may be eligible for copyright, or when there is an explicit requirement in a job description for this responsibility (e.g. editors, film makers, media producers) the University reserves to itself the ownership of copyright in the works so produced, unless alternative provisions are made in writing.

c) When the work is produced by a faculty member with the direct assistance of a member of the University non-faculty professional or support staff who is working under the normal conditions of his/her employment, then the University claims part-ownership of
the copyright to the extent of the contribution of the non-faculty professional or support staff member. If the professional staff member is not working within the normal conditions of his/her employment, then both he/she and the faculty member may claim part-ownership of the copyright.

1.2 For those works eligible for copyright and in which the University claims a part-ownership (Section 1.1(c)) then the University and the author each will assign and transfer to the other the right to acquire and use copies of the work at the cost of reproduction without payment of fee or royalty. Access to the work by third parties shall be the subject of a specific agreement between the University and the author. The agreement entered into by the University and the author will continue after the author's employment with the University is terminated, unless an arrangement is made to the contrary.

1.3 When the student produces a work eligible for copyright based on research or other scholarly activity conducted under the supervision of a faculty member and the supervision of that work is a requirement of his/her academic program, then the University, whilst acknowledging the sole copyright ownership by the student, reserves the right of access to the work.

2. ACCESS TO STUDENT WORKS

2.1 It is a condition of engaging in the undergraduate or graduate programs of the University, that the University receives a non-exclusive, royalty-free licence to:

a) Circulate the work as part of the University library collection;

b) Make copies or representations of the work for academic purposes within the University;

c) Make single copies of a thesis deposited in the University library at the request of other Universities or bona fide institutions;

d) Make available the work to the National Library of Canada for micro-filming;

e) Publish the abstract of any work which is a student thesis.

3. INCOME GENERATED FROM COPYRIGHT WORKS WITH THE UNIVERSITY AS PART-OWNER

3.1 When the University claims part-ownership in any work eligible for copyright (Section 1.1(c)), the author and the University will agree to an income agreement. The income received is to be used first to meet all marketing costs and also to repay any funds specifically advanced for the project by the University. The agreement on distribution of further income will be based on the following guidelines:

a) Until all preparation or development costs incurred by the University are received, the author will receive 25 percent and the University 75 percent of this remaining income;

b) Once all preparation or development costs have been recovered, the author will then receive 75 percent and the University 25 percent of this income;

c) If more than one author is involved, the available income will be distributed amongst the authors in accordance with a pre-arranged and agreed distribution ratio.
4. RECOVERY OF UNIVERSITY COSTS

4.1 When the copyright ownership of a work belongs to the author but where the work was produced with the use of University facilities or services, which in the opinion of the Chair of the Department or Director of the Administrative Department, exceeds those available for normal academic and administrative matters, the University, including the Department, expects to recover its financial interest in the work. Consequently the University and the author will agree to either:

a) Distribution of royalties as indicated in Sections 3.1(a) and 3.1(b) above; or

b) The author will reimburse the University to the extent of the identifiable costs incurred in the preparation and production of the work.

5. ALLOCATION OF UNIVERSITY INCOME RECEIVED FROM COPYRIGHTS

5.1 Royalties or other income from copyright accruing to the University in excess of the amount necessary to meet assignable costs, will normally be made available for the development of other copyright works.

6. INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

6.1 The University community is reminded that the Copyright Act is specific with respect to infringement of copyright. Copyright is deemed infringed by any person who, without the consent of the owner, does anything that only the owner has the right to do. Such infringement occurs in the copying of printed copyrighted material or in the recording and re-use of copyrighted records, tapes and programs. However, copyright has not been considered infringed in "fair dealing with any work for the purpose of private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary" (Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970 c C-30).

The Library has developed guidelines on fair dealing and obtaining clearance for copying from copyright holders. These guidelines, which have been approved by the University, may be obtained from the Library.

II COPYRIGHT PROCEDURES

The procedures described below have been developed to implement the provisions of the preceding Copyright Policy.

1. AUDIO VISUAL MATERIALS

1.1 Work Produced by Central Media Productions.

a) Prior to preparing and producing the work, an agreement must be entered into between the faculty member and the Media Productions group of Teaching Support Services. This agreement will be signed by the faculty member and approved by the Department Chair, the Dean of the College, the Director of Teaching Support Services and the Vice-President Research.

b) At the time the agreement is signed, Media Publications will provide the faculty member with an estimate of the production costs using the current approved rate schedule.

c) Before the work is released as an audio visual document, a Certificate of Release will be signed by the faculty member, the producer of the work, and the Director of Teaching Support Serv-
ices. In those cases where the University of Guelph owns full copyright in the work or when the work is to be issued as a University of Guelph production, then the Department Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Director of the Department of Information will also sign.

d) An accounting of revenues and expenditures resulting from the work will be made available to the faculty member annually. Any royalties will be calculated and distributed by the Department of Financial Services following June 30 and December 31 of each year on monies received during the previous period.

e) Teaching Support Services is responsible for distribution and sales of all audio visual materials, for registering the materials with the National Film Board of Canada under the Berne Convention, and for depositing copies with the National Library of Canada (Canada Acquisitions Section) where appropriate.

Arrangements can be made with the faculty member for alternative arrangements with regard to distribution and sales.

1.2 Work Not Produced by Central Media Productions but Requested by the Department.

a) When audio visual material is produced in a University department at its request, but without the involvement of Central Media Productions, the Department Chair will be responsible for allocating department resources to the project and for keeping records with regard to costs.

Such records will be necessary in determining the distribution of income arising from the sale and distribution of the material.

b) An agreement similar to that covering work produced by Central Media Productions (1.1(a)) will be signed by the faculty member, Department Chair, College Dean, Director of Teaching Support Services and the Vice-President Research.

c) A Certificate of Release will be signed by the appropriate parties (see Section 1.1(c)).

d) An accounting of revenues and expenditures resulting from the work and royalty distribution will be made as described in Section 1.1 (d)).

e) Teaching Support Services will be responsible for the distribution and sales of the materials even when the materials have been produced without the involvement of Central Media Productions (see also Section 1.1(e)).

1.3 Work Not Produced by Central Media Productions and Not Requested by the Department.

a) When materials are produced independently by a faculty member who has not been requested to do so by his/her Department Chair, then the Department Chair will arrange with the faculty member concerned for reimbursement for any use of University facilities which, in the opinion of the Department Chair, are in excess of those normally available for academic and administrative matters.

b) The faculty member is responsible for the distribution and sales of the material.
2. PRINTED MATERIALS

2.1 Work Requested by the Department.

a) When the Department specifically asks a faculty member to undertake preparation of printed material, then the faculty member concerned and the University must enter into an agreement which specifies the nature of the work, the ownership of copyright, and the distribution of any royalties.

2.2 Work Not Requested by the Department.

a) When printed materials are produced independently by a faculty member who has not been requested to do so by his/her Department Chair, then the Department Chair will arrange with the faculty member concerned for reimbursement for any use of University facilities which, in the opinion of the Department Chair, are in excess of those normally available for academic and administrative matters.

3. COMMISSIONED WORK OUTSIDE NORMAL EMPLOYMENT

3.1 When the University enters into a specific arrangement with an individual for work to be done which is outside his/her normal employment, then the University will enter into an agreement with that individual. The agreement will specify the nature of the commissioned work, the time when it is required and any financial considerations.