Contents

Editorial Details...inside front cover
Mission Statement...inside front cover
Editorial Review Committee...inside back cover

Editorial
By Hagai Gringarten...3

Articles

The Influence of Strategic Learning Practices on Employee Commitment
By Chien-Chi Tseng...5

Knowledge Management Strategy, Enablers, and Process Capability in U.S. Software Companies
By Barbara Beliveau, Eldon H. Bernstein, and Hsin-Jung Hsieh...25

Music Video Use among Egyptian and U.S. Young Adults: A Cross-Cultural Analysis
By Mohamed Reda Soliman, Philip J. Auter, and Erica Ashton...47

Product or Customer centered Organizations and Leadership Styles and Commercial Television Stations
By Jack T. McCann...65

Web Economics: The Added Value of the Web for Daily Newspapers and Commercial Television Stations
By Michelle I. Seelig...81
Student Corner

Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez and the Media: An Analysis through Cultural Studies Theory
By Begoñe Cazalis...97

Reviews

Review of Pete Ward,
By Jonathan Roach, MLIS...113

Review of Seth Godlin,
Poke the Box.
By Hagai Gringarten, A.B.D....117

Instructions to Authors...119
Editorial

Welcome to the Spring edition of the Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (JMR). From the start, we set out to create a world-class journal—accepted and respected by our peers in academia.

Our recent agreements with such great international partners as ProQuest, IBR, IBZ, and EBSCO, solidify our credibility and viability as an academic journal. They improved our brand recognition, increased exposure, created additional Web traffic, and increased the quality of published academic research. As a result, we are experiencing overwhelming growth, and I am proud to announce that we are moving from two issues a year to three.

This current issue of the peer-reviewed Journal of Multidisciplinary Research contains five articles, two book reviews, and one student article in our “student corner.” In essence, these articles are what the journal is all about—while multidisciplinary in nature, they are interesting and current, and they represent significant research from around the globe.

As Malcolm Forbes once said, “Education’s purpose is to replace an empty mind with an open one.” We believe the Journal of Multidisciplinary Research actively contributes to that end.

All the best,

Hagai Gringarten, Editor
Web Economics: The Added Value of the Web for Daily Newspapers and Commercial Television Stations

Michelle I. Seelig

Abstract

While traditional media moved at enormous speeds to present and disseminate news and information online, many have done so without considering details of content and the economics of such a venture. Therefore, this research compares daily newspapers and commercial television stations’ current and future strategic plans for content and Internet operations. Overall, findings show that the online version is not a mutually exclusive product from its traditional counterpart, and much overlap exists in content, structure, and audience. While both media products complement each other, in time, the Internet and social media will function as the prime source of news and information, and traditional media will play a complementary role to sophisticated or technologically driven content for consumption. News managers are shifting structural characteristics within the media organization such as their business model, content, and operations to accommodate this reversal of media consumption.
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Introduction

Today, there are more than 1,100 daily newspaper Websites and 750 commercial television Websites. Yet, while traditional media moved at enormous speeds to present and disseminate news and information online, many have done so without considering details of content and the economics of such a venture (Chan-Olmsted & Kang, 2003; Chyi & Sylvie, 1998; Cohen, 2002; Demers, 1996; 1998; Slocum & Albarran, 2006). Traditional media turned to the Internet as an outlet to reach audiences and to ensure survival with little consideration as to an Internet strategy or business model (Bressers, 2006; Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chyi & Sylvie, 2000; Ketterer, Weir, Smethers, & Back, 2004; Picard, 2000; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000). Mostly, traditional media’s presence on the Internet relies on the
same formulaic content presented in traditional media. Typically, this content has been digital content that is a substitute for the physical product (Chan-Olmsted & Park, 2000; Chyi & Lewis, 2009; Lin & Jeffres, 2001; Pitts, 2003; Seelig, 2007, 2008). The bottom line: There is no clear content or revenue strategy regarding the Internet (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Fahmy, 2008; Ihlström & Palmer, 2002; Picard, 2000).

For the most part, news managers have been cautious in the development of technology-driven content and distribution apart from traditional media (Chyi & Lasorsa, 2002; Greer & Mensing, 2004; Seelig, 2008). It is common for an organization to see what others in their industry are doing before adopting an innovation (Rogers, 1995). What remains unclear for many media organizations is what the competitive edge or consequences are by adopting and implementing the Internet and other emerging media. Many are now taking a step back and scrutinizing the media environment to determine how to proceed in a beneficial way (Boczkowski, 1999; 2004; Cohen, 2002; Zavolina & Reichert, 2000). The purpose of this research, then, is to make known traditional media’s current and future strategic plans for content and Internet operations. Specifically, this study compares the perceptions of news managers at daily newspaper managers with news managers at commercial television stations to determine how media organizations have worked through the structural characteristics of the Internet as an outlet to disseminate news and information.

Background

According to Rogers (1995), the diffusion of innovations in an organization is a two-part process: initiation and implementation. The first part of the process referred to as initiation consists of information gathering, conceptualizing, planning, and ultimately a decision. Implementation is the second part of the process and occurs after an innovation is adopted. Implementation includes redefining/restructuring, clarifying, and routinizing within an organization. Once an innovation loses its separate identity and becomes part of the everyday routines within a social system, it is said that adoption of an innovation is complete. Although good may come out of adopting an innovation, members of a social system rarely take advantage of an innovation-evaluation performance, until it is time to adopt the next innovation or when problems starts to emerge with the current innovation.

Much diffusion of innovations research falls short or stops once an innovation is adopted and rarely examines how the organization responded to the implementation of the innovation (Rogers, 1995). Research that explores technological innovation is typically in the context of basic demographics of adopters, time of adoption, rate of adoption, attributes of the innovation, and predictors of adoption in a social system (Abrahamson & Rosenkopf, 1993; Atkin, Jeffres, & Neuendorf, 1998; Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Patwardhan, 2004). According to Rogers, there are structural characteristics that often hinder the success of implementing an innovation within an organization. Such structural characteristics usually entail a business plan or model that articulates organizational structure, any changes to the operations of the organization, resources, and personnel as well as revenue devoted to implementation of the innovation. What follows is a further examination of the structural characteristics traditional media have been working through to meet the economic viability of the Internet to media organizations.
The Internet and Traditional Media

Research has examined traditional media’s motives for establishing a presence on the Internet (Boczkowski, 1999, 2004; Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chan-Olmsted & Park, 2000; Chyi & Sylvie, 1998, 2000; Demers, 1996, 1998; Kiernan & Levy, 1999; Lowrey, 2003; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000; Picard, 2000; Rosenberry, 2005; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002; Slocum & Albarran, 2006; Sullivan, 2006; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000). Much of this research did not support the theory that competition in traditional media influenced content on corresponding Websites, nor that traditional media would be replaced by a presence on the Internet; instead, the online version would supplement the traditional product (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chyi & Lasorsa, 1999; Kiernan & Levy, 1999; Peng et al., 1999; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002). Others said their purpose for having an online product was a result of parent company influence, without having a real understanding of how to proceed (Saksena & Hollifield, 2002). Research also found that, in addition to the economic pressures for publishing online, the Internet was a solution to reach a wider audience, regardless of location, to foster interactivity with consumers, to provide diverse content and information as well as to change the newsgathering process, generate revenue from advertising, a promotional tool for the traditional product, helpful in reducing production and distribution costs, and an advantage over the competition while staying in front of technology (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chyi & Lasorsa, 1999; Fahmy, 2008; Lowrey, 2003; Peng et al., 1999; Ren & Chan-Olmsted, 2001; Rosenberry, 2005; Russial, 2000; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002; Seelig, 2005; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000).

Revenue

While audiotext and videotext were unsuccessful attempts at reaching audiences beyond the traditional media product, according to Picard (2000), they laid the groundwork for alternative distribution of content. Television followed with something similar called text TV with material prepared for magazines and newspapers such as program listings and marketing of certain content, but this was successful mostly in Europe, not the United States. Similar to the Internet, these vehicles provided the concept of targeting audiences with content they wanted, immediacy of content, and a revenue model whereby users paid for specific content, yet most users want their content free. News managers also considered pushing advertising on users, but this was perceived as an intrusion and too many messages. News managers sought other alternatives to distributing content on the Internet such as portals. Content organized in this way enabled quick and easy access to information to a wide audience and was thought would generate advertising revenue and at the same time control advertising exposure.

Other pay structures have included click-through, flat rates, views, etc., though yet to prove successful (Boczkowski, 1999; Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chyi & Sylvie, 2000; Demers, 1996; Demers, 1998; Ihlström & Palmer, 2002; Picard, 2000; Slocum & Albarran, 2006). Generally, traditional media have financed the online product through their traditional counterpart and some revenue from online advertising (Ihlström & Palmer, 2002). Even though online newspapers are not bound to a local market, they still target audiences in their local market, and this does impact their advertising dollars, particularly when 90% or more of a newspaper’s Website revenue is local advertising (Chyi & Lewis, 2009). Despite declining circulation figures in print, online traffic is on the rise for newspapers (Fahmy, 2008). Although
traditional media reported their online product generates revenue, profits have been low, compared to profits typically generated for the traditional product (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Chyi & Lewis, 2009; Fahmy, 2008; Ihlström & Palmer, 2002).

**Business Models**

In 2000, Chyi and Sylvie's interviews with news managers at newspapers revealed several strategies in play among national, metro, and community online newspapers. National newspapers were more likely to approach their online product from an economic standpoint such as resources, awareness, and quality news. Metro papers were divided by two strategic approaches: One focused on their online product as fulfilling a “niche” and, therefore, sought a business strategy that would appeal to this type of audience; the other online product was “localized” and focused on providing content that appealed to their local audience. Neither model catered to subscriptions and mixed results regarding shovelware. Smaller daily and weekly newspapers also differed in their strategy. Due to restrictions of market size and available resources, these newspapers focused on revenue-generating content such as classified charges, creating sites for clients, and serving as ISP providers for their community. Before, traditional media defined their market as local, metro, regional, national, or global; now, the Internet allows media to self-identify their market along the dimensions of content-oriented, ad-oriented, marketing-oriented, and audience-oriented.

Whereas Chyi and Sylvie (2000) found newspapers define their online product by market, Chan-Olmsted and Ha (2003) discovered commercial television applied one of three business models: revenue-oriented, cost-oriented, and support-oriented. Mostly, television stations applied the support-oriented business model whereby the Internet is a complement to their traditional product. Some practiced the cost-oriented business model that sought to increase the value of the online product by cultivating audience relations and audience intelligence. Lesser still, a revenue-oriented model devoted to the online product such that there is a separate set of operations for this product and views online revenues as more important or relatively important, compared to the traditional product. Chan-Olmsted and Ha (2003) also found the majority of television stations devoted only 1 to 5% of their budget to Internet-related activities.

**Internet Operations**

Traditional media are also struggling with the structure and staff allocated for Internet operations and content for both versions of the news product. Many are haphazardly integrating the Internet into the operational structure of the newsroom as well as struggling to recognize the unique features the Internet offers in presenting content (Bressers, 2006; Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000). News managers have been working through issues relating to news routines, roles and responsibilities of staff as well as the organizational structure between traditional and online operations (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006). Many daily newspaper managers also perceived the Internet to be a disruption to the news process (Saksena & Hollifield, 2002).

While staff did attend budget meetings, still not much by way of collaboration between both sets of staff; mostly, they work exclusively for each of their respective product (Bressers, 2006; Russial, 2009; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000). Except for some of the larger newspapers, most
newspapers also did not have a separate staff of photographers for their online product (Zavoina & Reichert, 2000) and no more than two employees devoted to Internet operations (Chan-Olmsted & Ha, 2003). For those where the bulk of personnel was assigned mostly to the print product, online operations employed a smaller staff, yet have been “expected to carry out multiple tasks from assigning and gathering visual content and carrying out all prepost jobs such as scanning and color balancing, to recropping for the online format” (Zavoina & Reichert, 2000, p. 147).

Even though managers have been working to integrate staff of both versions of the product, Bressers (2006) found cultural differences in the newsroom pertaining to status of the particular medium one works. Many newspapers also did not have a converged news desk central to the newsroom to dispense stories, regardless of the version of the news product. This may be due to lack of a structural relationship between traditional and online operations (Fahmy, 2008); or, according to Russial (2009), most converged positions have been primarily for the online product, and this is even more apparent at larger newspapers that hire staff in cross-platform positions with the budget to do so. For example, a newspaper with a circulation of 100,000 typically devotes five staffers to the online operations while the traditional product may include 50 reporters and 10 photographers. Generally, it is photographers expected to have multiple skill sets such as audio and video gathering and editing tasks, shooting stills, and other multimedia work; plus, smaller newspapers have been hiring staffers with multiple skill sets too.

Along with no clear protocol for structure of personnel, how best to handle content for both versions of the media product has been challenging (Bressers, 2006; Chyi & Lewis, 2009; Fahmy, 2008; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002; Zavoina & Reichert, 2000). In 2000, Zavoina and Reichert said the days of shoveling content from traditional media outlets to the Web was over, and newspapers were breaking news. Other changes in content included more photos published in print than online; however, the online product typically updated photos at least once daily. Yet, recent research does not show much by way of original content developed for the online product, nor a lot of effort or resources devoted to the online product (Chyi & Lewis, 2009; Fahmy, 2008; Saksena & Hollifield, 2002). Instead, many newspapers have outsourced the online edition, or the parent company has been involved in the development of the Website, except for breaking news online first (Bressers, 2006). Mostly, media have held back generating content exclusively for online and continue to repurpose content from one version to the other (Bressers, 2006; Chyi & Lewis, 2009; Fahmy, 2008). According to Chyi and Lewis (2009), “At present, most newspapers are ‘shoveling’ or otherwise replicating their print edition (with its traditional sectioning of international, national and regional news, among other sections) on their Web presence, with insufficient thought to the relative value of purely localized news and information” (p. 49).

Convergence

Several media organizations have reported partnering within the same media company (i.e., newspaper and television), with other media, or with other online entities and other news organizations. In most scenarios, convergence has played out in the form of cross-media promotion (Bressers, 2006; Chan-Olmsted & Kang, 2003; Dailey, Demo, & Spillman, 2005, 2009; Dupagne & Garrison, 2006; Ketterer et al., 2004; Kraeplin & Criado, 2006). Ketterer et al.’s (2004) study of convergence cross-media convergence found the Daily Oklahoman and
KWTV still viewed each other as competitors for advertising revenue and news; as such, they fell short of their stated goal of convergence. Instead of both media expanding their resources to provide more coverage through convergence, news coverage was lacking, erratic, and inconsistent. There were coordination problems among staffing, and stories were on both the joint Website and on each medium’s Website. Problems were often the result of both media’s differing organizational styles and newsroom culture, and, therefore, the dynamic for convergence was not strong for these two news organizations.

In 2006, Kraeplin and Criado found television stations were more likely to partner with local newspapers not owned by their station’s parent company, and most collaboration was initiated more so by newspapers than television. Dailey, Demo, and Spillman (2005, 2009) also found a decline in partnerships between television stations and newspapers, and most newspapers gathered their own audio and video. These findings suggest the move toward convergence between television stations and newspapers originally predicted in 2005 did not occur. However, contrary to Kraeplin and Criado (2006), Dailey, Demo, and Spillman (2005, 2009) found newspapers engaged in convergence within their own news organization more so than television stations, particularly sharing content such as planning and discussing how to cover a news story.

Dupagne and Garrison’s (2006) case study of media convergence at the Tampa News Center revealed the financial benefits of convergence have been mixed as both media did not completely merge their operations. The Tampa News Center consists of three news units: The Tampa Tribune, WFLA-TV, and Tampa Bay Online (TBO.com)—all housed in one building and owned by one company: Media General. At the time of their research, the Tampa News Center still was addressing issues of staffing and budget. This included the financial integration across all three units such as the coordination of sharing content, editing the product, and employee and other expenses for operating and maintaining the news center. Overall, Dupagne and Garrison (2006) found that while the news center is working toward convergence, it is recognizing slowly the economic advantages of a converged news center. Similar to Kraeplin and Criado (2006), Dupagne and Garrison (2006) assert that by housing both the television and newspaper operations in the same building, television more so than newspapers benefits from convergence because newspapers have a depth of resources and coverage typically unavailable for broadcast television.

Research Questions

In the past, breaking news typically was distributed in traditional media, but now due to the immediacy of the Internet, news organizations are breaking news in whatever outlet the news organization owns that has the greatest potential to reach the audience quickest. Many traditional media outlets have been dual publishing and broadcasting content on the Internet. In some organizations, there has been a separate set of operations for the Internet, versus the traditional media product, while other organizations cross-over personnel. Yet, there is still a fuzzy picture regarding the economic viability of the Internet for traditional media, and many media organizations lack a concrete strategy regarding content and operations of the online product. Accordingly, the following research questions served as a guide for this study:
RQ1: What current strategies are in place for Internet operations in your media organization?
RQ2: Do news managers perceive economic potential for an online presence?
RQ3: How is content produced for traditional and online version of a media’s product?
RQ4: Is there a difference in audience for both versions of media’s product?
RQ5: What is the perception of traditional media’s survival?

Methods

National surveys of both news managers at U.S. print daily newspapers and over-the-air broadcast commercial television stations were conducted in two phases. For all phases of the survey, the highest-ranking news managers listed according to the most recent edition of Editor and Publisher International Yearbook 2006 and commercial television station general managers listed in the 2006 edition of the NATPE Guide to North American Media were included in the recruitment for the questionnaire. The first phase of questionnaires was mailed to newspaper managers (1,068 potential participants) and commercial television station managers (854 potential participants); 225 surveys were completed (133 and 92, respectively). The second phase consisted of an Internet survey distributed in early October 2008; 53 surveys were completed (47 and 6, respectively). This approach, although atypical, was to boost the low response rate received by mail and an effort to maximize responses at a reasonable cost. The overall response rate was 16.9% for newspaper managers and 11.5% for television managers. Survey items were the same for both the mail and Web, with minimal changes to meet the formatting differences from print to Web. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete. All information remained anonymous, and participation in the survey was strictly voluntarily. The survey link was open 24 hours a day.

Items on the questionnaire addressed Internet strategies adopted by daily newspapers and commercial television stations, composition of Internet operations both in staff and structure, current and predicted revenue streams, content for both versions of media’s products and audience composition. Respondents also rank ordered items from a list of emerging technologies they perceive pose the greatest threat to the economic stability to their core product, along with their prediction of both traditional media’s survival as a result from the competition of newer delivery systems. Responses from both questionnaires are compared and analyzed in the next section to determine daily newspapers’ and commercial televisions’ current and future Internet strategy and business model.

Findings

Comparison of the demographic variables for the most part indicated that news managers for both media share similar characteristics. Responses were roughly balanced across groups, with the television news manager’s category slightly underrepresented (35.3%) and daily newspaper managers somewhat overrepresented (64.7%). Newspapers ranged in circulation size: The majority of Web newspapers (89.4%) were small (fewer than 100,000), 8.9% were mid-sized papers (100,000–500,000), and less than 1.1% were large papers (more than 500,000). Market size for both media consisted of: 1 – 25 (16.7%), 26 – 50 (16.7%), 51 – 75 (14.6%), 76 – 100 (19.8%), 101 – 125 (7.3%), 126 – 150 (10.4%), 151 – 175 (8.3%), 176 – 200 (4.2%), and 201+
Respondents geographically defined their markets as: Just over half were local (57.8%), 13.1% defined themselves as metro, 22.5% defined themselves as regional, few defined themselves as national (2.2%), and 4.4% defined themselves as global.

This study initially targeted the highest-ranking news managers at daily newspapers and commercial television station general managers. However, results varied when respondents were asked to select which group they primarily identify: 13.4% said publisher and/or president, 14.9% said managing editor and/or vice president, 3.7% said assistant managing editor, 26.4% said executive editor, 28.6% said general manager, 2.2% said news manager, and 10.7% reported other. Among the survey respondents, a small amount were under 35 years of age (9.1%), just under half were between 36 and 50 years of age (40%), and half were over 51 years of age (50.9%). Less than half of the respondents (15.5%) said they have worked in the news industry 15 years or less, over half responded they have worked in the news industry between 15 to 30 years (51.9%), and 32.6% said they have worked in the news industry over 31 years.

Strategy for Internet Operations

Research question one sought to determine current strategies in place for Internet operations. Data indicated that while daily newspapers (77.2% online 2000 or before) went online earlier than commercial television stations (55.4% online 2000 before), it was commercial television stations (80.4%) more so than daily newspapers (60.0%) that reported a clearly defined strategy for their online presence. Both media were relatively equal in their internal structure for producing the online product and some differences in staffing positions devoted to Internet operations (see Table 1).

Table 1
Internet Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Structure for producing online product</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works in tandem</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works independently</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet employees devoted to Internet operations</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five or less</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions devoted to Internet operations</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content manager</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News editor</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia editor</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound editor</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web designer</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copywriter</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revenue

Research question two looked at how both media generate and allocate revenue for Internet operations. News managers were asked how much their organization is dependent on revenue from online ventures, and both media said their organization considers roughly 10% of their organization's budget devoted to Internet operations. Findings also revealed revenue sorted along three streams: ad sales, content subscription, and customer relations (see Table 2). News managers also were asked what they deemed important for generating revenue for their online product now and in five years. Although both media showed an increase in the importance of these three revenue streams in five years, daily newspapers more so than television perceived these revenue streams important to Internet operations. Both media perceived ad sales as the most important revenue stream now and in five years, and anticipate that in five years revenue for online ad sales will increase.

Table 2
Revenue Streams for Internet Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of:</th>
<th>Newspapers Now</th>
<th>Newspapers Five Years</th>
<th>Television Now</th>
<th>Television Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Sales</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content subscription</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer relations online</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desired % of revenue contribution from online ad sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of revenue</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 21%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only important responses are reported and percentages have been rounded.

Content

Research question three examined differences in content produced for both versions of a media’s product. While content may come from traditional product, wire services, or parent company, commercial television stations more so than daily newspapers reported producing
original content for their Websites, and have even started to present content first on their Website more so than in their traditional counterpart (see Table 3). The majority of both media reported breaking stories online (81.0% newspapers, 80.4% television stations); however, commercial television more so than daily newspapers updated content throughout the day. This finding is not surprising given that commercial television provides news updates and full news reports throughout the day in their traditional product, whereas daily newspapers meet a deadline for publication once a day. Both media also self-identified the orientation of their online product as content-oriented more than other dimensions.

Table 3
Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original content produced for Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 40%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 41%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content first published/broadcast in traditional media product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 40%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 41%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content from wire services (i.e., AP, Reuters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 40%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 41%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content from parent company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 40%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 41%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update content on Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five hours</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice daily</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Daily</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-oriented</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-oriented</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing-oriented</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience-oriented</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages have been rounded.
Audience

Research question four looked at audience composition for both versions of a media’s product (see Table 4). Findings revealed that the majority of both media did not perceive direct competition with their online product (78.4% newspapers, 85.7% television), yet reported overlap with audience for both versions of product. Newspapers more so than commercial television anticipate that in five years more than half of their audience will be online, while commercial television perceived that the majority of their audience will still attend to their traditional product. More than half of both media reported tracking Web users (68.1% newspapers, 66.7% television); however, methods varied (i.e., internal metrics solution, Sitemeter, to Google Analytics, HitBox, Omniture Site Catalyst as well as National standard measures).

Table 4  
Audience Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience overlap</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutually exclusive</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap of both</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Audience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly traditional</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly online</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same for both</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages have been rounded and may not add to 100%.

Future of Media

Research question five sought to determine the future of traditional media’s survival (see Table 6). Overall, both media appeared cautiously optimistic they will have a place in the future. However, commercial television stations more so than daily newspapers perceived their medium would never be obsolete (58.8% newspapers, 81.6% television). Commercial television stations were more optimistic they would survive competition from newer delivery systems (74.9% newspapers, 91.8% television), and they were slightly more likely to benefit from competition of newer delivery systems (52.2% newspapers, 68.4% television). When news managers were asked which medium they perceived posed the greatest threat to the economic stability of their news organization, responses varied. Newspaper managers perceived print news magazines (28.8%), text messaging (21.6%), and online newspapers (17.4%) to be their greatest threat to the economic stability of their news organization, while television news managers perceived the greatest threat to be their peers (17.3%), mobile phones (16.7%), and RSS feeds (15.3%).
Conclusion

When the Internet exploded for mass consumption in the early 1990s, newspapers were eager to maintain their position as a dominant content provider, while commercial television stations were slow to establish a presence on the Web. In the time that followed, it is clear both daily newspapers and commercial television stations have made great strides establishing a presence on the Internet. In spite of this, the success of these ventures has yet to be determined. By investigating the structural characteristics, media organizations have navigated to implement the Internet for the presentation and dissemination of news; this research provides some understanding as to current and future strategic plans for both content and Internet operations. Overall, the findings presented here suggest the online version is not a mutually exclusive product from its traditional counterpart, and much overlap exists in content, structure, and audience.

These findings also are supported by the Online News Association (ONA) and Pew’s (2009) survey of online journalists. Their research found cautious optimism for those journalists working online more so than in traditional media than in years past. This research, along with ONA and Pew, also found that while news organizations are working toward full integration of the structure of operations and staffing for both products, there is a slight shift for resources and staffing devoted to Internet operations. Although both studies reported confidence in journalism’s survival and found much is riding on advertising as a source of revenue from Websites, their study indicated that journalists are encouraged that some other self-sustaining revenue model will matriculate, but no definitive answers as to what that future model will be. Both studies support that original content is first online when compared to prior years that found original content first in traditional media.

Yet, while this research provides insight as to how both media are strategizing content and operations to meet audiences in the 21st century, findings must be interpreted cautiously. This study is limited by its lower than ideal response rate, especially among commercial television broadcasters. Though Kraeplin and Criado (2006) experienced a similar response rate in their 2004 survey of news managers, there is no answer for this. Might this have occurred because only those television managers with a clear strategy responded? In contrast, did more newspaper managers participate because they are more willing to admit they remain fuzzy as to their Internet strategy and look to their peers for guidance? It is conceivable, then, that a more representative sample of commercial television managers will alter the results of this study.

The missed opportunity to include items regarding convergence or partnerships with other media in the questionnaire is also a limitation of this study. Although Seelig (2008) did not find much by way of partnerships or sponsorships on media Websites, ONA and Pew (2009) did find that online journalists pursue partnerships as a viable profit model. However, only a third have some type of revenue-sharing partnership with other news entities, distributors, or advertisers, and most said they do not rely on this partnership for economic stability. Therefore, research regarding plans to carry out partnerships with others will be insightful.

This research also did not consider Deuze’s (2003) typology of journalism—orientating, instrumental, monitorial, and dialogical journalism. Instead, news managers were asked to classify traditional media sites along Chyi and Sylvie’s (2000) orientation typology—audience-oriented, content-oriented, market-oriented, and ad-oriented. Future research might consider Deuze’s (2003) typology in an effort to understand the specific purpose of these Websites. Chyi and
Sylvie’s (2000) typology is more concerned with identifying sites along market structure than journalists interacting with citizens, “This suggests that the unique differences between new kinds of journalism developing on the Internet and journalism existing within other media modalities reveal much wider developments, and thus consequences for contemporary journalism and media production as a whole” (Deuze, 2003, p. 219).

Sullivan (2006) also contends that newspapers today have lost site of their audience and look at journalism as a commodity. He attributes these changes to technology and the diversity of the community the newspaper is said to represent. As newspapers struggle to stay competitive, they have largely ignored how technology may be harnessed to deliver information and fail to see that newspapers no longer follow a one-size-fits-all model of journalism. Instead, most newspapers have been consumed with “selling audiences and advertisers” (p. 68), than what value this news is to the community. Chyi and Sylvie (2000) assert this is partly due to newspapers’ poorly defined market structure and inability to define a clear business strategy for both their traditional product and Internet presence, and, changes in competition. Newspapers no longer compete against other newspapers; they are competing with all media. Thus, uncertainty regarding how to characterize properly the purpose of Websites leads to instability as to the economic viability of the online product.

Another issue is the lack of agreement of what a newspaper should be in the 21st century. By changing the way the newspaper caters to their audience, Sullivan (2006) believes this will ultimately win back the audience it is said to represent. A change in thinking about what journalism is requires the media organization to be reflexive when implementing new strategies for doing things. What works for one media organization might not work for another; therefore, connecting with the community to understand better the function of journalism is a prudent next step to success. These limitations suggest opportunities to research for definitive answers regarding economic pressures balanced with providing a quality product to audiences. More specifically, is there a current business model that is successful, and how may it be applied to the media organizations surveyed in this study?

In sum, this research shows a reversal of roles so to speak, or as Rogers (1995) articulated in his diffusion of innovation theory, an innovation forces an organization to redefine or restructure what it does. Based on the data presented here, news managers have recognized this and have started to shift structural characteristics within the media organization such as their business model, content, and operations to accommodate this reversal of media consumption. Even though Lewis’ (2008) survey of Internet users indicated that as young people mature they will seek out traditional media more so than social media and the Internet, the findings presented here supports Stempel and Hargrove’s (2008) analysis that a decline in use of traditional media will continue as audiences go online for news and information. According to Chyi and Lewis (2009), while the print product reaches more local readers than the online version, non-newspapers sites lead in use and market penetration (i.e., Yahoo! News, MSNBC, AOL News, etc.), and the top national newspaper sites have been USA Today.com and NYTimes.com; but, when it comes to local news, readers still sought out their local newspaper for content.

As Dutta-Bergman (2004) suggested, news provided by traditional media and news provided via the Internet serve a complementary function to each other. The expectation here is that both media will complement each other, but that in time the Internet and social media will function as the prime source of news and information, and traditional media will play a complementary role to sophisticated or technologically driven content for consumption. With
continued development of social media and an increase in the availability of broadband access, the Internet will continue to permeate audiences’ everyday lives. In view of this, traditional media will survive—albeit smaller and not necessarily at a critical mass—as a niche role, yet still part of the consumers’ media mix. Just as other media have moved away from providing content for masses audiences, traditional media will evolve into a more individualized medium. There will be several smaller outlets for journalism content, and in return, smaller dispersed revenue streams. Media formats are changing and, like traditional media, are adapting to new methods of creating, designing, and delivering content to their audiences.
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