Spring 1998

A Comparison of Two Omaha Radio Talk Shows: Local vs. National Issues

Jodeane F. Brownlee
jbrownlee@unomaha.edu

Michael L. Hilt
The University of Nebraska at Omaha, mhilt@unomaha.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/commfacpub

Part of the Communication Commons

Recommended Citation
http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/commfacpub/52

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Communication at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.
# Table of Contents

Broadcast Educators Assess Public Journalism  
Suzanne Huffman ................................................. 1

A Comparison of Two Omaha Radio Talk Shows:  
Local vs. National Issues  
Jodeane Newcomb Brownlee & Michael L. Hilt ...................... 8

News Directors and VNRs in Expanded Local Newscasts  
J. Sean McCleneghan ............................................. 17

Leased Access: Now and Then  
Edson A. Whipple & Richard Knecht ................................ 24

The Low Ropes Challenge Course as a Means of  
Team Development in Video Production  
William J. Bolduc .................................................. 29

Arkansas Viewers Rate Television Weather  
Raymond W. Barclay Jr ............................................. 38

Freedom of Expression in the Television Newsroom:  
A Key to Creative Management  
Joseph A. Russomanno ............................................ 42

Reviews of Instructional Materials .......................... 50
A Comparison of Two Omaha Radio Talk Shows: Local vs. National Issues

Joodeane Newcomb Brownlee and Michael L. Hilt
University of Nebraska at Omaha

It's 9:06 a.m. in Omaha, Nebraska. A stout, forty-year-old male with sandy blond hair sips a cup of coffee. The "on air" microphone turns red signaling the start of a new morning on talk radio. "Good morning you're on news/talk 1110 KFAB." Tom Becka, a three-year veteran of talk radio, speaks quickly and loudly. Becka describes his show and the audience as the gang in the kitchen. "By that I mean, if you're at a party the best part of the party is in the kitchen," says Becka. "They're arguing, they're fighting, they're laughing, they're discussing, they're disagreeing... that's what we do on my show."

"The Tom Becka Show" airs five times a week on 1110 KFAB. In downtown Omaha, "Talk of the Town with Steve Brown" attracts its own listeners to 1290 KKar. You're on Talk of the Town with Steve Brown, what's on your mind Dorothy?" the 74-year-old Brown says with a deep voice. Brown describes his show as a "public forum for elected officials and their constituents" and for "people with interests and expertise on activities other than politics."

These two radio programs have a common background in that both are caller-driven political talk shows broadcast live from Omaha, Nebraska each weekday morning from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. (Becka is on until Noon). The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of these two Omaha, Nebraska radio talk show hosts during the 1996 presidential campaign, and to see if callers may be influenced by the host's views or if the hosts may be influenced by the caller's views.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The host of a radio talk show is an active participant in influencing the topic and direction of the program. A particular news item may be considered more important by a host just by virtue of the attention it receives from the host. This is an example of the agenda-setting research first conducted in 1972 by McCombs and Shaw. The more coverage, the more important the issue. The less coverage, the less important the issue (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

McCombs and Shaw (1972) coined the phrase "agenda-setting" in their quest to search the role of the media in the 1968 presidential campaign. The 1976 election lowered agenda-setting to expand further into the political arena. Research sought to find out whether the media is reporting in its reporting of candidate characteristics (McCombs & Shaw, 1993). The 1976 election study suggested that issues and most interesting by the press were reported more often than the issues found most interesting by the candidate. It was suggested that "the press is more a kaleidoscope reflecting reality than a mirror reflecting it; that the press is a more active interpreter than a passive transmission belt" (Weaver, 1987, p. 177).

One component of the agenda-setting theory is described as priming. This effect suggests that an audience evaluates election candidates in terms of what issues are included by the news media as opposed to what issues are neglected by the news media. Therefore the news media set the standards by which an audience evaluates candidates. Use of priming in the news media is becoming responsible for selecting the criteria in which the public views an issue, event, or person. Research has found "the news media promote social consensus—not consensus in terms of opinions about whether the press is doing a good or bad job, but consensus about the criteria used in reaching that judgment" (McCombs & Shaw, 1993, p. 64).

Radio talk show hosts provide a unique spin on priming in that they typically spend more time discussing an issue, and immediate feedback can be considered quite unlike typical news reports. Those who call a radio talk show also affect the process of priming by influencing discussion (Iyengar & Kinder, 1987). It is the host, however, who has ultimate control of the direction and details of the conversation (Levin, 1987; Hutchins, 1992; Laufer, 1995).

Talk radio can be seen as one way the public develops its view of an issue, even person, for it is a "window to the world for millions" and "is the archive of American life" (Levin, 1987, p. 15). Crittenden was the first scholar to research the contributions of talk radio gives to the political process. In his 1967 study of a local Italian call-in show titled "Speak Out," Crittenden found that in a smaller market, callers were motivated to mobilize others into action. He also concluded that the program seemed to stimulate political communication and to formulate political issues as a result (Crittenden, 1971, pp. 209-210). The discussion was never terminated, which allows for alternate views and discussion. Callers to talk radio were predominately lower-middle class or working class people whom otherwise might not have access to community centers. However, with talk radio, they felt they could prompt action (Crittenden, 1971). Those who call have personal motivations, such as expressing an opinion or hoping to get the facts straight (Moore, 1993). By doing so, the callers often feel a sense of belonging (Turow, 1974). Other research has found that the majority of those who call radio talk shows are conservatives and Republican males (Cappella, Turow, Hall Jamieson, 1996), and less mobile and more comfortable with personal communication (Armstrong & Rubin, 1989; Hofstetter, Donovan, Klauber, Cole, Hsu, 1994). Those who listen to talk radio are over 50 years old but listeners who actually call are usually unmarried men, living alone, and between the ages of 18-50 (Bierig & Dimmick, 1979).

Like most of those who listen and call talk radio shows, the majority of the talk hosts are white males (Cappella, Turow, & Hall Jamieson, 1996). The host persuades the caller to reach the outer edges of his or her position in order to incite interaction. Moreover, hosts "frequently and indeed routinely engage in overtly argumentative disputing points with a caller, undermining the rational grounds for a caller's case, up positions contrary to the caller's avowed positions on the issue in question and so forth" (Hutchins, 1992, p. 674). The host may even go so far as abandoning his/her moral convictions or opinions in order to incite a controversy. Controversies keep discussion alive and interesting. This "construction of controversy" (Hutchins, 1992, pp. 674) is perhaps the most important feature of talk on talk radio. The radio talk show is a professional talker and an expert manipulator of both the information and the content. The ideology of the host usually dictates the political persuasion of the shows content (Greatbatch, 1986).
METHODOLOGY

This study examined two Omaha, Nebraska radio talk shows and the hosts, including where they got their information and why they chose to talk about a particular news event on their radio show. This study also attempted to determine whether information disseminated by the hosts influenced callers during the 1996 presidential election, and if callers influenced the hosts with information the callers added to the show. The two talk show hosts were interviewed and studied on four selected dates (two days per each host). The talk shows were selected because of the lively political discussion generated on their shows and because of the competing set of listeners. The two talk show hosts are:

- Steve Brown, who is heard on 1290 KKAR AM each weekday morning between 9 a.m. and noon. Brown is a self-described political conservative who addresses a variety of topics during his radio talk show “Talk of the Town with Steve Brown.” The emphasis is on local, state, and national politics.
- Tom Becka, who is heard on 1110 KFAB AM each weekday morning between 9 a.m. and noon. “The Tom Becka Show” is described by the host as a politically moderate radio talk show with the emphasis on the latest news events of the day.

Both qualitative and quantitative research was conducted to examine the two talk show hosts and their callers.

Qualitative Approach

In-depth interviews allow the researcher to “understand the meanings people hold for their everyday activities” (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 81). In-depth personal interviews with Becka and Brown were conducted after the data on the callers were collected. A pre-determined list of questions was administered to both talk shows hosts, but each host was allowed to expand on the questions to allow for personal anecdotes. The data from the interviews were transcribed and analyzed to find themes among the two talk show hosts.

Two days were spent observing each talk show as a non-participant observer (Babbie, 1995). Also, “The Tom Becka Show” and “Talk of the Town with Steve Brown” were both audio recorded October 21-25, 1996 and October 27- November 1, 1996 in their entirety. Information from the recordings was analyzed for themes and to compare the open-ended interviews of each host with their actual show. The recordings were also used to provide actual dialogue between the hosts and callers.

Quantitative Approach

Babbie (1995) describes a purposive sample as “a type of nonprobability sampling method in which the researcher uses his or her own judgment in the selection of sample members” (p. 227). The purposive sample consisted of those who called the Tom Becka and Steve Brown shows. A survey consisting of twenty questions was administered to callers of “The Tom Becka Show” and “Talk of the Town with Steve Brown”.

Forty-three surveys were administered to callers during the two days on “The Tom Becka Show” and twenty-eight surveys were administered to callers during the two days on “Talk of the Town with Steve Brown.” The survey was necessarily short because of the fear that a longer instrument might hamper the flow of calls to the show. Callers were surveyed while they were on hold prior to talking to the host. This avoided the problem of callers hanging up directly after their conversation was terminated by the host. Every caller who was asked to participate in this study agreed, resulting in 100 percent participation in this study. The callers’ data were collected October 22, 1996 and October 24, 1996 from KFAB and on October 29, 1996 and October 31, 1996 from KKAR. Dates were selected because of the close proximity to the November 5, 1996 general election when political news and advertising is at its highest (Weaver, 1987). This was derived from previous research on talk radio and caller motivations (Cappella & Hall Jamieson, 1996; Crittenden, 1971; Herbst, 1995) as well as research on age setting (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Demographic information was included on the survey as well as questions describing caller motivations (Herbst, 1995).

QUALITATIVE OBSERVATIONS

Data were collected at KFAB in a small, isolated office. About fifty feet away from the on-air studio. Viewers could see Becka from a large glass window. An on-air survey allowed for the show to be heard while gathering data. Surveys were administered ten minutes after the beginning of each show. This allowed for the momentum of the show to build. After the ten minutes, the five lines were usually full. Each caller was asked the short series of questions while they were on hold.

On October 22, 1996 the topic for the full three hours was about a note on a paper given to the Democratic candidate for House of Representatives, James Martin Davis and his wife. A few men who were a few tables away from Davis in a restaurant wrote the handwritten note. The note made a reference to Davis losing the election November. The note also included the epithet R.I.P. (meaning rest in peace). This offended James Martin Davis and his wife because their son was killed in a car accident earlier in the year. The person responsible for the note was a man who worked in the election department for the city of Omaha.

This topic generated calls from both sides of the issue, including an explanation from one of the men at the table. This man said the note was the culmination of a long-standing personal grudge he had against Davis. The note was inappropriate, it shouldn’t cost anybody their job. This was the position taken by Becka. “Was it inappropriate? Yes. Was it tacky? No. Should a man lose his job over this? No.”

Callers on October 24, 1996 were slightly less emotional. The first hour was to the Mayor of Omaha, Hal Daub who was an in-studio guest. Daub answered several questions from callers and while Becka also asked questions and made a few comments, his role was mainly moderator between the callers and the Mayor.

The remaining two hours were devoted to open calls, which allows the caller to talk about any topic on their minds. Again, this was less passionate and even some light-hearted compared to October 22nd. There were fewer calls this day than previous observation.

The KKAR studios face two large glass windows and a glass door that view the street outside. Passers-by can walk by and watch a radio show in progress. The South side...
Callsers calling into KFAB on October 22, 1996 were predominantly white, low-income, middle-class females with little more than a high school degree. These women also declared themselves to be Democrats. On the second day of data collecting, October 26, 1996 the callers were slightly more mixed with the amount of male callers increasing. Those males who called were predominantly white Republican males with some college education. 

Findings from KFAR were quite different than those of KFAB. At KFAR, the majority of callers was male. Over the two day survey period, there were only four female callers. Of the four female callers, two considered themselves Democrats. The rest of the callers were white males who typically earned more than $20,000 a year and had some college education. Most of these callers also considered themselves Republican who few claimed to be Democrats and a few claimed to be Independents.

A total of 71 callers were surveyed from the two Omaha radio talk shows.

### Table 1

Demographics of Omaha Radio Talk Show Callers (N = 71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.0% (49)</td>
<td>31.0% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>7.0% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>23.9% (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>29.6% (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>15.7% (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>19.7% (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>43.7% (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>33.8% (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18.3% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.2% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. School graduate</td>
<td>14.1% (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>40.8% (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>36.6% (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>8.4% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>88.7% (63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5.6% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $15,000</td>
<td>11.3% (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16 - $30,000</td>
<td>8.3% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31 - $45,000</td>
<td>45.1% (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46 - $60,000</td>
<td>7.0% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$61 - $75,000</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000+</td>
<td>7.0% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.5% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed callers to KFAB and KFAR said they typically listened to local talk radio several hours a week with 40.8 percent listening more than six hours a week.
One item all the callers from both radio stations on all four days had in common was their political efficacy. Every single caller was registered to vote in the 1996 general election and every caller said they intended on voting in the election. This supports past research that political talk radio at the two Omaha, Nebraska stations are democratic forums open to anyone who wants to call in. However, unlike the callers in Crittenden’s study, call to Brown and Becka’s show were limited for time, unless their arguments were extreme and compelling. Another change from the 1971 study is that those who call are not predominately lower-middle class people without access to community leaders. Many of the callers and in-studio guests are community leaders who wish to hear directly from their constituents. Those who call-in are typically college educated men and women with high political efficacy. These callers, like those in Crittenden’s study, feel they may prompt action with a phone call. Time and money limited this research. To conduct an actual agenda-setting study, one would have to allow at least a year and gather data on every caller who wants to call in-studio guests are community leaders who wish to hear directly from their constituents. Those who call-in are typically college educated men and women with high political efficacy. These callers, like those in Crittenden’s study, feel they may prompt action with a phone call. Time and money limited this research. To conduct an actual agenda-setting study, one would have to allow at least a year and gather data on every caller who wants to call-in.

A common bond between Becka and Brown was the sense of “you and me against them.” The hosts and callers were unified against the institution, be it the school board, the local, state, and federal legislature. It is this element that motivates the listeners to call and the callers to voice their opinions. Both shows concentrated on important events or issues of the day. The listeners heard more than just facts about these topics; they heard the pulse of a community and were able to listen to more than just two sides of a story. This is the core of political talk radio.
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