APPLYING THE GUIDELINES: A QUANTITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF A STATE AGENCY'S EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

by

JENNIFER RAY

B.S., California Polytechnic State University, 2013

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Communications and Agricultural Education
College of Agriculture

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2015

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Lauri M. Baker

Copyright

JENNIFER LAUREN RAY

2015

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify how K-State Research and Extension (KSRE) has established and maintained its brand through external communication with target audiences. The three research objectives were to determine the extent to which, 1) branding guidelines were followed, 2) calls to action were provided, and 3) key audiences were targeted. A quantitative content analysis was conducted to assess a representative sample of all communication KSRE state employees published within one year, November 1, 2012 to October 31, 2013. The Social Exchange Theory (SET) served as the framework and research objectives were based on the concept of Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC). The study found the correct name of the organization appeared in only 56.6 % (n= 611) of units; appearances of images, graphics, and the official slogan were also minimal. Primarily, the study identified a need for increased specification and clarity in the guidelines in order to promote increased consistency. This study serves as a benchmark for future measurement, a basis for recommended changes, and a call for other state extension agencies to examine communication in similar studies. The researcher recommends the organization makes substantial edits and additions to the branding guidelines, provides employees with training, and implements a regular evaluation of communication efforts to monitor brand representation and communication effectiveness. Additionally, the researcher addresses the need for an IMC model specific to extension, to help communicators implement more strategic and measurable efforts.

Keywords: Extension communication, Land-grant communication, Integrated marketing communication, Brand management, External communication, Brand consistency, Social exchange theory

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. Lauri M. Baker for serving as my committee chair and being a patient, thoughtful, and enthusiastic mentor. She is a tenacious researcher with the grace to motivate me to continually turn purple ink marks into a better quality paper. I also appreciate committee members, Dr. Kristina Boone and Dr. Curtis Matthews for providing advice, encouragement, and constructive criticisms. I am grateful for the guidance of a brilliant and kind committee. Additionally, my time at Kansas State University would not have been as enjoyable without the friendship and teamwork of my fellow graduate students, namely Lana Swendson, Scott Stebner, Jessie Topp, Buddy McKendree, Audrey Holderness, Cassie Wandersee, Katie Rohling, Danielle Holladay, and Steph Coombs. I thank the faculty and staff in the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education for creating a pleasant atmosphere for learning and for helping us along the way.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends, both new and old, near and far. I thank my parents, Bill and Dina Ray, for the love and support they have provided me my whole life. From driving my car across the country to mailing me care packages and flying in for my defense, my parents are awesome. Thank you also to my brother, Andrew Ray for his visits, phone calls, and positive attitude. A special thank you goes to Aaron Bingham for his patience, humor, and reassurance as we both became masters of science.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Advancement in agricultural production and changes to institutional structures have created additional challenges for communicators within land-grant institutions (Kellogg Commission, 1999). These challenges are intensified by the need to communicate with legislators and the general public, who have historically had a vague understanding of the land-grant mission (Miller, 1988; Adkins, 1981) and its funding structure (Blalock, 1964). The tripartite mission of the land-grant institution is to provide teaching, research, and extension to communities (Kellogg Commission, 1999). Communication specialists at land-grant institutions strive to communicate the complex mission, but are often limited by funding available for marketing tactics (Baker, Abrams, Irani, & Meyers, 2011). Communication is essential to the extension aspect in particular because each land-grant institution aims to extend practical knowledge to a wide range of constituents (USDA, 2014). Therefore, all local extension agents communicate with members of the public (Boone, Mesisenbach, & Tucker, 2000), in addition to extension communication specialists, whose roles include marketing and public relations activities (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005).

The land-grant system and the national Cooperative Extension Service (CES) were established over a series of legislative acts, starting with the Federal Land-Grant Act of 1862 (Sanderson, 1988; Boone et al., 2000). The act allotted 30,000 acres to each state to establish colleges "to serve the sons and daughters of farmers and mechanics and specialize in subjects related to those fields" (Boone et al., 2000, p. 11). Kansas State University was the nation's first operational land-grant university, founded in 1863 (Kansas State University Branding Guidelines, 2015). In 1887, the Hatch Act developed the research component by establishing agricultural experiment

stations. The Morrill Act of 1890 required federal oversight of the land-grant institutions, making college records available to the public. The extension aspect of the land-grant mission was officially established with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 (LSU AgCenter, 2014), which funded cooperative extension activities "that had already begun at most agricultural colleges" (Boone et al., 2000, p. 13). Every U.S. state has at least one land-grant institution and a network of regional and local extension offices (USDA, 2013).

The intended purpose of the system is the same today as when it was founded: a tripartite mission of teaching, researching, and extension (Kellogg Commission, 1999; Sanderson, 1988). Historically, the system has focused on the areas of agricultural advancement, youth development, and health and nutrition. Over time, it has become more challenging to maintain relationships with members of the general public, opinion leaders, and legislators; a smaller percentage of these stakeholders are aware of the land-grant institutions' mission and public value (Kellogg Commission, 1999). Considering the long history of the land-grant system, extension agents must be continuously vigilant to circumstances within their area to ensure stakeholders know and understand the value of programs, especially when programs come under close scrutiny (Richardson et al., 2000). The University of Vermont began using the term, "engaged university," stating, "the primary purpose of the 21st century engaged university is to conduct research on problems facing society today, to promote the application of current knowledge…, and to prepare its students to address these problems…" (Kellogg Commission, 1999, p. 41).

A common belief is that the founding mission of the Cooperative Extension Service (extension) was focused on agriculture (Jones, 1992). It can also be argued that the concept was always based on addressing the needs of the people, whatever the needs may be (Jones, 1992). The mission to address the varying and ever-changing needs of unique communities and to communicate the value and impact of services provided poses a great challenge to extension communicators (Jones, 1992). Workman and Scheer's (2012) content analysis of articles published in the *Journal of Extension* revealed a need for more higher-level evidence of extension's impact.

Internal and External Brand Management

Services provided by a university can be studied using the same theoretical principles applied in marketing services (Stewart, 1991; Mazzarol, 1998). Service-focused organizations can benefit even more from branding than product-focused organizations (Krishnan & Hartline, 2001; Brady, Bourdeau, & Heskel, 2005). Therefore, extension should place strong emphasis on ensuring a positive brand that reinforces its mission and values. A brand is a customer experience embodied by images and ideas; brands are often tied to symbols, names, or design (American Marketing Association, 2014).

Internal (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007) and external (Brady et al., 2005) brand management are critical to successful branding of an organization. Brand recognition occurs through accumulating actual experiences with the product or service or through advertisements and media coverage (American Marketing Association, 2014). Target audiences will remember desired brand attributes if the organization communicates them consistently (Ang, 2014; Percy, 2008) and effectively (Erdem & Swait, 1998; Raggio & Leone, 2007). Employee performance

(e.g.: external communication) is enhanced with commitment to the brand (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007).

Brand management requires consideration of internal and external stakeholder's perceptions of the brand. Organizational image refers to how external stakeholders perceive the organization, which is shaped by interactions with internal members (Hatch & Schultz, 1997), among other influences. Organizational identity refers to how internal members (e.g. employees and board members) "perceive, feel, and think about their organizations" (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, p. 357). Organizational identity is impressed upon external audiences when interactions occur (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). Organizational identity reflects the organization's culture, which includes the organization's history, values, and leadership, in addition to material items like buildings and logos (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, 2002).

Issues-Based Communication and IMC

Since the mission of extension is based on societal needs (Jones, 1992), the system has gradually shifted tactics in order to best address ever-evolving community needs. Extension has shifted from primarily working in disciplines-based teams to forming and utilizing issues-based teams, often incorporating specialists from varying disciplines (Bahnl, 1991; Baker & Verma, 1993; Taylor-Powell & Richardson, 1990; Yang et al., 1995). The shift has helped identify new program areas, increase external and internal collaboration, and tailor programs to community needs (Taylor-Powell & Richardson, 1990). However, the shift to working in interdisciplinary, issues-focused teams has also been a challenge to extension agents and communication specialists (Taylor-Powell & Richardson, 1990; Bahnl, 1991; Baker & Verma, 1993). One of the challenges in this new communication approach may be finding a way to ensure a consistent

brand image reaches all audiences, even when communication efforts are focused on diverse issues involving multiple research disciplines and audiences. Another difficulty is communicating the full mission of the Cooporative Extension Service, not just one component (Jones, 1992). These difficulties must be overcome through strategic communication.

The switch to issues-based communication relates to a marketing concept known as Integrated Communication Marketing (IMC), a planning process that helps ensure customers have consistent and relevant experiences with a brand (American Marketing Association, 2014; Ang 2014). The concept of IMC includes models for integrating an organization's advertising and public relation efforts (Kim, 2001; Persuit, 2013; Kelly & Jones, 2005), among other efforts including sales promotions and direct marketing (Persuit, 2013; Kelly & Jones, 2005). Furthermore, IMC involves considering external communication in all aspects of the organization's work (Kelly & Jones, 2005), similar to extension's issues-based planning model. The issues-based planning model is intended to increase internal collaboration among specialists in various disciplines, in order to best plan tactics to strategically communicate to target audiences and ultimately improve community conditions (Taylor-Powell & Richardson, 1990). IMC is a process of planning, interacting with, communicating with, and studying audiences in order to create, strengthen, and maintain relationships with customers and stakeholders (Schultz, Patti, & Kitchen, 2011), and it is recommended for organizations with complex communication objectives (Ang, 2014).

Using the IMC approach can help extension maximize effectiveness of complex communication efforts with limited marketing budgets by identifying effective, low cost options. Public

relations efforts might be more cost-effective in reaching extension communication goals rather than paid advertising, when used strategically (Ang, 2014). Public relations tactics often focus on a much broader audience of "publics" rather than "consumers" (Persuit, 2013, p. 34), which is beneficial to extension because all members of the public are primary stakeholders (Kellogg Commission, 1999; Final Strategic Plan, 2015). Research has found extension users prefer a two-way communication approach and tailored messages (Irani et al., 2006). This is also known as two-way symmetrical communication, a model within the Excellence in Public Relations theory. This model stresses the importance of open communication lines between organizations and consumers (Grunig & Grunig, 1992).

Another aspect of IMC is giving intended audiences a means and motivation to interact with the message and engage with the organization (Schultz et al., 2011), also known as a call to action. The introduction of new media including Facebook and YouTube sites has increased and enriched options for connecting and interacting with audiences (Schultz, et al., 2011). Extension depends on engagement with community members in order to mobilize and sustain program volunteers, leaders, and members. The benefits extension provides cannot be extended to community members without a call to action (Culp, 2013 A; Culp, 2013 B). It is important to provide target audiences with the right call to action (e.g. visit the website or drive to a county office) in order to achieve the desired outcome (Davis & Halligan, 2002). The online *Business Dictionary* (2015) defines a call to action as words that urge the audience to take immediate action, such as "call now." However, this study defines calls to action as any form of contact information provided (e.g. a phone number or email address), which could lead the audience member to another form of communication with the organization. Interacting with the

organization and learning more about its services are critical steps for audiences actively

considering making a purchase (Young, 2014).

Although extension services are generally offered to the public for no cost or for a minimal fee,

consumers are still required to buy in to the idea of using the services and supporting the brand

(Ray, Baker, & Smith, 2014). IMC literature recognizes the need for communication with target

audiences extends beyond the initial purchasing decision (Young, 2014). Young (2014) proposes

there are seven stages in the modern consumer pathway model: awareness, involvement, active

consideration, purchase, consumption, relationship building, and advocacy. Practicing effective

IMC means identifying where audiences fall along the pathway and gaining necessary insight to

present them with tailored messages or other tactics to help move them toward the final

advocacy stage (Young, 2014).

The Role of Extension Communicators

The role of extension communicators is diverse and challenging. Extension communicators have

a responsibility to not only disseminate educational information to extension users, but also

practice public relations and marketing (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005). Duties include

"promoting the image of the organization through consistent signage, logos, T-shirts, and

telephone greetings" as well as "assuming an advocacy role by telling extension's story

effectively" (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005, para. 5).

Furthermore, extension communicators at the state office provide communication resources to

local employees (KSRE News and Media Marketing, 2014) and set an example of

communication for all employees to follow. Extension communicators have also served as

consultants for research staffs working to develop educational materials for target audiences (Miller, 1995). More recently, the shift to issues-based planning has created a need for communicators to also participate in the leadership and support roles of program planning, in order to best promote the mutual goals of extension and the people it serves (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005).

The Extension Brand Name

One way land-grant institutions have responded to the need for accountability is by developing brand identities to create and strengthen relationships with the public (Baker, et al., 2011). For example, Kansas State University branded itself as K-State Research and Extension following a public survey and focus groups in 1996. The new name was established to strengthen the public's perception of the link between the extension component and the university (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). Other universities have developed brand names to differentiate services and be remembered by stakeholders; examples include the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS at the University of Florida), AgriLIFE (Texas A&M University), AgCenter (Louisiana State University), and Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (DSNR at Oklahoma State University).

Accountability

Since extension is funded primarily through taxpayer dollars and private grants, the organization has a responsibility to provide valuable services to the stakeholders investing in its mission. This idea is known as accountability or impact and is reflected in extension research (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005; Richardson, et. al., 2000). The principle that the Cooperative Extension Service needs to communicate its impact is in line with Social Exchange Theory (SET), which

postulates that in order to voluntarily provide something (e.g. financial support), stakeholders must recognize the value of what the other party is offering (e.g. services) (Roloff, 1981). According to SET principles, because legislators and the general public do not clearly understand the extension mission (Miller, 1988; Adkins, 1981), funding (Blalock, 1964), and ultimately, the value of extension, legislators are less likely to give something in exchange (e.g. funding, support to sustain funding).

Nutrition Education Model - Targeted Audiences and Evaluation

Evaluating programs and embracing areas for improvement is key to establishing and maintaining successful extension programs (Farrell & McDonagh, 2012), as is targeting specific audiences (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984). Communicating key messages to target audiences and measuring effectiveness are tenets of IMC planning (Ang, 2014). Gillespie and Yarbrough (1984) created a communication model from practical theories to design and evaluate extension nutrition education programs. The model recognizes the inputs (i.e.: source of information, mode of delivery, receiver preferences, and way of processing) will all effect message interaction and outcomes. Communicator inputs should be tailored to target audiences and evaluated for effectiveness (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984; Brown & Kiernan, 1998). Evaluation is critical in determining communicator inputs (how is the organization communicating with audiences?) and the outcomes (is the communication successful?) (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984). Research indicates extension agents see value in evaluation; the majority of county extension agents in eight states use post-tests to evaluate programs (Lamn, Israel, & Diehl, 2013). However, few measured actual behavior change among participants (Lamn et al., 2013). Furthermore, there is a lack of research showing how extension agents utilize program evaluation data (Lamn et al., 2013).

Extension Communicators' Use of Mass Media

Extension communicators have traditionally used a mix of mass media channels to communicate to external audiences including broadcast and print-based media (Boone et al., 2000). A mix of media is recommended for extension's communication needs (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005; Miller, 1995; Ang 2013); however, some channels are more valuable than others in reaching targeted audiences. According to IMC literature, all channels should be used with an overall strategy in mind (Kelly & Jones, 2005; Ang, 2014). Maddy and Kealy (1998) wrote a commentary article in the *Journal of Extension,* which called use of "integrated communication and integrated thinking," which could make Cooperative Extension "a household brand name associated with quality and accessible education programming" (para. 20-21) by the year 2001. The effectiveness of an organization's communication efforts can be maximized through practicing IMC (Kim, 2000; Schultz et al., 2011). Extension has yet to maximize the potential of its communication efforts.

K-State Research and Extension Branding Guidelines

K-State Research and Extension (to be referred to as KSRE, acronym for internal use only) has the longest history of all land-grant institutions and continually strives to communicate its brand, impact, and public value to stakeholders through various media channels (KSRE Branding Guidelines, 2015; KSRE News and Media Marketing, 2015). All KSRE employees should follow both the Kansas State University and KSRE brand guidelines when communicating both internally and externally (KSRE Branding Guidelines, 2015; University Branding, 2015). The KSRE branding guidelines "introduce K-State Research and Extension's branding strategy and help employees understand the correct ways to represent the brand and strengthen [the] image" (Why Use This Branding Guide section, para. 1). It is critical all internal members are committed

to the brand and communicate it consistently and strategically in every interaction with members of the public (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007). This is reflected in the KSRE branding guidelines (2015), which state:

> All employees contribute to K-State Research and Extension's brand every time we greet a customer, give a program, shake a hand, volunteer, answer the phone, and other routine activities. In other words, every interaction leaves an impression, and K-State Research and Extension's goal is to create and reinforce the impression that we are: science-based, inclusive, objective, practical, community-focused, and friendly. (What is 'Branding?' section, para. 5)

A branding guideline document is the foundation for managing interaction between members of an organization and external audiences, which explains what tactics to use and not use, and can range in length from a few pages to several hundred (Cousins, 2013). The document also expresses the organization's core values (KSRE Branding Guide, 2015).

The internal and external communication needs within the land-grant system have increased over time (Miller, 1995). Extension communication specialists must strive to communicate on behalf of the state agency and provide guidance and resources to local agents (KSRE News & Media Marketing, 2014). Like other state extension agencies (USDA, 2013), KSRE has a presence in every county or designated district within the state of Kansas (KSRE About Us, 2015). Communication specialists are based at the Kansas State University campus in Manhattan, Kansas, within the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education of the College of Agriculture.

Employees in the six units within the communications and agricultural education department communicate with external audiences by sending press releases to various news media; managing YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and Pinterest social media accounts; producing, updating, and publishing print and online publications; creating and distributing video content; producing broadcasts for radio and online publication; and managing five websites (E. Edwards, personal communication, November 20, 2013; P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). The six units consist of a news media services unit and publications unit, which coordinate external communication efforts with employees working in the information technology unit, university printing unit, academic unit, and bookstore and mail center unit (G. Nixon, personal communication, April 18, 2014). Although communication is housed within the Department of Communication and Agricultural Education, employees communicate on behalf of the KSRE organization. The academic unit is not directly involved in communicating efforts, but does provide research and recommendations related to the efforts.

Previous KSRE Communication Research

A national study in 2008 revealed 87% of consumers were unaware of the connection between the state and national extension service (Communications and Agricultural Education Research, 2015), making it imperative for state agencies to assess awareness and perceptions among their respective citizens. KSRE has conducted periodic research through telephone surveys of Kansans and in-depth interviews with legislature (Communications and Agricultural Education Research, 2015). This research (last conducted in 2007) has informed the organization regarding awareness of the name, perceptions of its services, and media use habits. In January and February of 2014, KSRE conducted a qualitative assessment of internal perceptions of the brand from employees and board members across the state, and a quantitative assessment of this audience's media use

and trust (Ray et al., 2014). Prior to this study, KSRE had not conducted an external

communications audit to evaluate its public relations efforts (K. Boone, communication,

October 28, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Societal changes over time have presented land-grant institutions with many challenges in

communicating its tri-partite mission to stakeholders (Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Many of the

nation's more than 100 land-grant institutions (USDA, 2013) have developed name brands to

help make clear and lasting impressions with members of the general public, opinion leaders, and

legislators, but these efforts are often limited by available funding (Baker, et al., 2011). These

factors may explain why members of the general public and legislators often do not fully

understand the mission and funding of extension agencies (Miller, 1988; Adkins, 1981; Blalock,

1964).

According to SET, land-grant institutions have a responsibility to provide valuable resources and

to communicate the value of those resources, in exchange for continued support and funding. In

achieving this, all extension employees must consider the unique and ever changing needs of

their communities (Jones, 1992) and the diversity of interests among stakeholder groups.

Successful extension communication efforts must be tailored to targeted audiences and critically

evaluated (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984).

Extension communicators hold a multi-faceted and challenging responsibility in building

relationships with stakeholders and clearly presenting the organization's mission (Donnellan &

Montgomery, 2005). Coordination and consistency are critical in this effort and can be achieved

through following IMC planning (Maddy & Kealy, 1998). Use of two-way symmetrical communication (Irani, et al., 2006) and evaluation of strategic internal and external brand management are also needed to engage stakeholders and build advocacy for the organization.

In the case of KSRE, communication specialists work in separate units within one department to coordinate all external communication efforts (G. Nixon, personal communication, April 18, 2014). KSRE communication specialists have designed branding guidelines intended to help all employees across units and throughout the state's local offices to maintain a consistent brand image (KSRE Branding Guidelines, 2015). Furthermore, KSRE state communication specialists provide resources, expertise, and examples of effective communication for the local agencies to utilize and follow (KSRE News and Media Marketing, 2015).

Prior to this study, KSRE had not conducted an external communications audit to evaluate its external communication (K. Boone, personal communication, October 28, 2013). This lack of evaluation has left the organization unaware of how its brand, public value, and impact are communicated to the general public, which audiences are targeted, and which calls to action are provided. In order to maximize communication efficiency, KSRE needs to determine the extent to which employees are following brand guidelines, providing audiences with a call to action, targeting key audiences, and communicating impact and public value. Upon gathering this information, KSRE will be able to identify areas where employees can adapt current procedures to better align with IMC, a proven marketing and communication strategy, particularly helpful in communicating multiple key messages to several audiences (Percy, 2008; Ang, 2014). This first step in external communication measurement can inform future research of audience

engagement, allowing for more comprehensive IMC planning. The ultimate goal in IMC planning is to move more stakeholders along the consumer pathway model, from initial awareness and understanding of the brand, through the stages of involvement, consideration, purchase, consumption, relationship building, and advocacy (Young, 2014).

Purpose of Study and Research Objectives

The purpose of this study is to identify how one state extension agency has currently established and maintained its brand and communicated its impact and public value to external audiences. The study objectives are:

- **RO1:** Determine the extent to which branding guidelines were followed in KSRE external communication.

- **RO2:** Assess the extent to which KSRE audience members were provided with a call to action in external communication.

- **RO3:** Determine the extent to which KSRE targeted its key audiences in external communication.

- **RO4:** Assess the extent to which KSRE communicated its impact and public value to target audiences.

This study sought to address its objectives through a quantitative content analysis of all external communication pieces created, updated, presented on the website, distributed, or otherwise made available to the public by KSRE state communication specialists within one year. The year reviewed in this study was November 1, 2012, to October 31, 2013.

Assumptions

Assumptions made during this study were related to the extent of external communication KSRE publishes within one year. The study analyzed Facebook and Twitter posts created, press releases sent, new and revised print and online publications released, videos published to YouTube, radio podcasts created and hosted on the website, and the KSRE website. The researchers assumed this was a fair representation of external communication pieces created, updated, presented on the website, distributed, or otherwise made available throughout the year. The study did not include KSRE content posted to Pinterest because the medium was not in use for the entire time period under review. The website content examined in this study may not have been created or updated within the time period, which means it may not reflect KSRE communication efforts made at the same time as content created using the other media. Since website content was reviewed in live form (to verify link destinations), the content may have also been edited after the time period of review. The study did not include one of the ten radio programs KSRE produces; although the President's Corner program is also produced by KSRE, it was left out of the study because its focus is the entire university and not specifically the extension component. The researchers assumed excluding Pinterest posts and the President's Corner program would provide a fair representation of all state KSRE external communication within the identified time period.

Limitations

Utilizing a quantitative content analysis method offered a few limitations. Since materials analyzed vary in format: written (text found in press releases, publications, websites, social media posts, and videos), visual (photos, graphics, and video content), verbal (audio in radio podcasts and videos), and multiplatform presentations (pieces than contain more than one of the previously mentioned elements), a variety of potential issues existed in coding the meaning of

materials (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005). For example, inflection may have affected the meaning of words used in verbal communication and there may also be meaning portrayed in visual communication such as photos (Riffe et al., 2005). Deriving meaning from inflection and images was not included in the codebook. Therefore, using one instruction codebook to measure brand consistency and communication effectiveness, through various formats (verbal, written, and visual) posed a potential limitation of not including some of the communicated meaning. The researcher and two panels of experts recognized this limitation and tried to minimize it by conducting numerous pretests and by editing the instruction codebook to be more inclusive. The researcher attempted to design the codebook to only gather information that could be consistently interpreted by three coders, to assure reliability. The study focused primarily on whether or not brand elements such as names, graphics, and images were present and how they appeared.

This study is limited in that it did not make comparisons of study findings to reach and engagement data. The author does recommend the comparisons be made in future research. Reach and engagement data (although it was available for some media) was not tracked by KSRE employees during the time period of review. Future measurement of KSRE communication analytics and perceptions can better explain which audiences are seeing and interacting with the content, and why.

The study is focused entirely on the communication of KSRE state communication specialists and should not be generalized to all extension communication in the state of Kansas or to other state extension agencies. It should be kept in mind that, although this study may reveal common

themes of universal challenges in extension communication, each entity of the entire national

system must audit their own efforts in order to identify areas for improvement.

Definition of Key Terms

Multiple terms were used in this research that may not be common knowledge. Definitions of

key terms used throughout this research include:

- **4-H Youth Development -** The national youth organization is a program of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES). 4-H is a multi-faceted program with a mission to "empower youth to reach their full potential, working in partnership with caring adults" (National 4-H Council, 2014).

- **Accountability-** Accountability involves taking responsibility or accounting for one's actions (Merriam-Webster, 2014). In this study, accountability specifically refers to the extension service's responsibility to provide valuable services to the people it serves, because it receives taxpayer funding.

- **Brand-** A brand is the image a customer perceives through first-hand experience with a service or product and it is often tied to a name, logo, slogan, and/or design scheme (American Marketing Association, 2015). Non-customers can also perceive brand images when they encounter the product, service, or organization in the media or through personal communication (Kelly & Jones, 2005). Customers of extension services are people who use materials and/or resources created by the agency, or who participate in an agency-hosted event.

- **Branding-** Branding is the process of strategically communicating in order to build positive brand recognition. Brand recognition is formed through accumulating first-hand experiences with the product or service and through media discussions and advertising reach (American Marketing Association, 2015).

- **Brand image**- A brand image consists of beliefs, thoughts, feelings and expectations individuals hold related to a brand (American Marketing Association, 2015). It is associations made to the brand (Ang, 2014). This is also referred to as organizational image.

- **Brand salience-** Brand salience is the ability of a brand to separate itself from its own environment or history (Guido, 1998).

- **Brand positioning-** Brand positioning refers to the perception of the brand in relation to competing brands (Ang, 2014).

- **Brand equity-** Brand equity is the value a brand adds or detracts to a service or product (Kim, 2000).

- **Call to action-** This study defines the calls to action as any form of contact information provided, which could lead the audience member to another form of communication with the organization. Calls to action can also be defined as messages that motivate audiences to action (Business Dictionary, 2015).

- **Consumer pathway model-** The consumer pathway model of IMC is designed to engage audiences differently depending on their current stage in relationship to purchasing a brand's product or service. The seven stages of the model include awareness, involvement, active consideration, purchase, consumption, relationship building, and advocacy (Young, 2014).

- **Extension Committee on Organization & Policy (ECOP)-** ECOP is the representative leadership and governing body of Cooperative Extension, the nationwide transformational education system operating through land-grant universities in partnership with federal, state, and local governments (ECOP, 2013).

- **Cooperative Extension Service (CES)-** "The Cooperative Extension Service is a nationwide, non-credit educational network. Each U.S. state and territory has a state office at its land-grant university and a network of local or regional offices. These offices are staffed by one or more experts who provide useful, practical, and research-based information to agricultural producers, small business owners, youth, consumers, and others in rural areas and communities of all sizes" (USDA, 2013, para. 1). The Cooperative Extension Service is also referred to as simply extension.

- **Extension-** Extension is a commonly used, shortened version of Cooperative Extension Service (CES), which refers to an entity of the land-grant system. Extension is also one part of the land-grant system's tripartite mission: teaching, research, and extension or outreach. This component involves reaching out to members of the public to provide information and resources related to teaching and research and working alongside these members to promote the implementation of knowledge in decision making (Kellogg Foundation, 1999).

The KSRE branding guidelines (2015) state, "avoid using extension alone because it does not encompass the scope of the organization in Kansas" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para. 5).

- **Integrated Marketing Communications (IMC)-** IMC is a "research-based, audience-focused, result-driven, communication planning process that aims to execute a brand communication program over time so that there is clarity and consistency in the positioning of the brand. This is achieved by coordinating different communication disciplines and integrating the creative content across different media. The ultimate aim is to achieve short-term financial gain and long-term brand equity" (Ang, 2014, p. 4). IMC efforts must be measured to determine return on investment (Ang, 2014).

- **Public relations-** Public relations is a form of organizational communication that seeks non-paid publicity in order to influence perceptions among consumers, prospective consumers, and stakeholders (American Marketing Association, 2014). All KSRE's communication efforts across the seven media included in this study and its use of Pinterest are considered a form of public relations.

- **KSRE-** KSRE is the acronym for K-State Research and Extension. According to KSRE branding guidelines (2015), the acronym is for internal use only.

- **K-State Research and Extension-** K-State Research and Extension is the shortened name of the Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, the Kansas state entity of the national Cooperative Extension Service (CES). The K-State Research and Extension name was adapted in in 1996, after the organization rebranded itself. The branding guidelines do not specify that the name should always appear in external communication (KSRE Branding Guidelines, 2015).

- **Organizational culture-** Organizational culture involves all members of the organization, is rooted in history, and includes values and material aspects, such as names and logos. Organizational culture is reflected in organizational identity (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, 2002).

- **Organizational identity-** Organizational identity refers to how members think and feel about their organization. These perceptions are impressed on external members whenever they interact, impacting organizational image (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, 2002).

- **Organizational image-** Organizational image refers to how external audiences perceive the organization or brand, and what associations they connect to it. This term is also referred to as brand image (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, 2002).

- **Social Exchange Theory (SET)-** Social Exchange Theory is a framework based in social psychology, which explains that one's actions are "contingent on the rewarding actions of others, which over time provide for mutually rewarding actions, transactions, and relationships" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 890). Exchanges can be economic or social in nature and they have potential to build mutually beneficial relationships.

- **Stakeholders-** Stakeholders are individuals and groups involved with, invested in, or otherwise affected by the actions of an organization (adapted from Merriam-Webster, 2014). Stakeholder groups can impact the organization with their actions and communication. Critical stakeholder groups for extension include members of the general public, opinion leaders, and legislators (Kellogg Commission, 1999).

- **Two-way Symmetrical Communication-** This model is part of the Excellence in Public Relations theory and stresses the importance of open communication lines between organizations and consumers (Grunig & Grunig, 1992). Engagement in two-way communication is not measured in this study, but it is recognized as needed in successful public relations efforts to build relationships with stakeholders.

- **Units-** The word has two meanings in this text: 1) the entities within the Department of Communication and Agricultural Education at Kansas State University responsible for producing external communication (e.g. publications unit and news media services unit), and 2) the units of analysis examined in this study (i.e. weeks of Facebook content, weeks of Twitter content, publications, press releases, the first two minutes of radio podcasts, the first two minutes of YouTube videos, and website pages).

Summary

The chapter began with a brief history and overview of the challenges extension communicators face in building and maintaining relationships with various stakeholders, including members of the general public, opinion leaders, and legislators. Extension communication specialists have a responsibility to disseminate educational information, practice public relations and marketing, and create strategic plans to best serve the needs of their communities into the future (Jones,

1992; Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005). This responsibility has become more challenging over the years and has created a strong need for reaching stakeholder groups and communicating the entire land-grant mission of teaching, research, and extension (Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Members of the general public, opinion leaders, and legislators need to understand the value and impact of extension services (Richardson et al., 2000) in order for extension to establish and maintain a beneficial exchange relationship with stakeholders (Roloff, 1981).

A key component to successfully communicating extension's value is presenting a consistent brand image that resonates with and reaches targeted audiences (Boldt, 1988) through Integrated Marketing Communications (Maddy & Kealy, 1998), with emphasis on two-way symmetrical communication (Irani, et al., 2006), and internal and external brand management. Furthermore, extension communicators must provide audience members with a call to action to engage them and carry out the extension mission (Culp, 2013 A; Culp, 2013 B). KSRE communicators face a challenging task, as they aim to reach and build relationships with a wide range of audiences throughout the state, nation, and world (Final Strategic Plan, 2015).

Evaluation is a critical step in ensuring effective communication (Kelly & Jones, 2005). KSRE needs to evaluate its external communication. The evaluation will provide a measure of how employees in various units are currently utilizing established branding guidelines in all external communication pieces across various media. Furthermore, KSRE needs to measure how it is utilizing established guidelines and resources for consistently communicating the impact and public value of KSRE services (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2015). For these reasons, the study will utilize a quantitative content analysis of external communication to

identify how KSRE has established and maintained consistent representations of its brand, communicated its impact and public value to targeted audiences, and provided calls to action. The metrics created in this study can serve as a benchmark for continual evaluation of external communication efforts. When compared with reach and engagement indicators, this study can inform the development and monitoring of KSRE's future strategic communication objectives to build stronger relationships with the general public and legislature.

Chapter 2 - Review of Literature

The goal of this study is to identify how K-State Research and Extension (KSRE, acronym for internal use only) is currently establishing and maintaining a consistent and clear brand image, reaching out to target audiences with calls to action, and communicating impact and public value through external communication. This research is grounded in Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC), with emphasis on a nutrition education model for extension, two-way symmetrical communication, and internal and external brand management. This chapter will review literature in theory and practice related to the research objectives of determining the extent to which KSRE employees were 1) following brand guidelines, 2) providing audiences with calls to action, 3) targeting key audiences, and 4) communicating impact and value.

SET and Extension Communication

Understanding of organizational relationships can be enhanced by literature in the fields of interpersonal communication and social psychology research (Baldwin, Perry, & Moffitt, 2004). The concept of Social Exchange Theory (SET) provides an explanation for why extension has a responsibility to effectively communicate its impact and public value to stakeholder audiences. Theorists agree the "essence" of the SET framework is that one's actions are "contingent on the rewarding actions of others, which over time provide for mutually rewarding actions, transactions, and relationships" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 890).

SET is a common theory in social psychology, anthropology and, sociology and it has explanatory value in diverse topics such as leadership and organizational justice (Cropanzano &

Mitchell, 2005). Four early authors helped to identify and define the theory: Homans, Thibaut, Kelly, and Blau (Emerson, 1976). Emerson (1976) clarified the concept of SET is "not a theory at all," but rather a "frame of reference from which many theories—some micro and some macro—can speak to one another" (p. 336). Essentially, the framework explains a number of reasons why exchange actions occur in both economic and social circumstances. The actions are "interdependent transactions," which "have the potential to generate high-quality relationships" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 875).

Three basic tenets explain how and why the theory works: rules and norms of exchange, resources exchanged, and relationships formed (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Norms such as reciprocity and negotiation drive the exchange of social and economic resources exchanged, including "love, status, information, money, goods, and services" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 881). The form of exchange (social or economic) is separate from the form of relationship between parties (social or economic) and this pairing can lead to four different situations for organization managers to consider. Relationships exist between parties within (e.g. coworkers and supervisors) and outside the organization (e.g. customers, organizations, and suppliers) (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Norms or rules are responsible for guiding exchange processes (Emerson, 1976). Reciprocity is the norm most studied in organizational management research (Emerson, 1976). Reciprocity can spring from a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges, folk belief and/or moral norms. Interdependent exchanges are based on a combination of actions from both parties. "The process begins when at least one participant makes a 'move,' and if the other reciprocates, new rounds of

exchange initiate. Once the process is in motion, each consequence can create a self-reinforcing cycle" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 876).

Folk beliefs such as the belief that those who are helpful will be helped in the future may also prompt reciprocity, but these have yet to be studied in organizational research (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The moral norm of reciprocity is universally accepted (Gouldner, 1960), but individuals and cultures apply the principle to varying degrees (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Economic transactions are often based on the norm of negotiation, rather than reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Negotiations are more explicit in nature and exchanges are more contingent upon one another, allowing for more commitment and trust; while, reciprocity often creates healthier working relationships within an organization (Molm, Takahashi, & Peterson, 2000). The absence of an economic transaction requires the moral norm of reciprocity in order to elicit a two-way exchange and strengthen relationships between parties (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Molm et al., 2000).

Extension services and resources (such as online and print publications) are often offered for free, which adds complexity to the perception of economic exchange. Swendson and Baker (2014) found external audiences in Kansas associated a potential lack of quality with services offered for "free." The authors recommended extension proceed with caution when using the word "free" to market services (Swendson & Baker, 2014). When examining perceptions of KSRE's internal audiences, Ray et al. (2014) found internal audiences perceived the free or low costs of KSRE's services to be a marketing benefit, but they also required distinguishing the

organization from scams and explaining why services were free. With little public understanding

of the land-grant system and its funding structure (Miller, 1988; Adkins, 1981; Blalock, 1964),

it may be difficult for stakeholders to perceive KSRE's free or low-cost services as valuable.

SET has been previously applied in extension research, in the aspects of survey response rates

(Shooter, 2009; Smith, 1983; Aguilar & Thornsbury, 2005), volunteer motivation (Smith &

Finley, 2004), volunteer training, (Hoover & Connor, 2000), employee reward systems (Linder,

1998), and receptivity to educational materials (Israel, 1991; Galindo-Gonzalez and Israel,

2010). Extension studies have recommended applying SET (Shooter, 2009; Smith, 1983).

Extension research has applied SET (Aguilar & Thornsbury, 2005) through the Total Design

Method (TDM) to increase response rate when conducting surveys. TDM is a method for survey

research established by Dillman (1978), guided by the SET concepts of minimizing costs,

maximizing rewards, and establishing trust (Smith, 1983). According to Dillman (2000), SET

can be applied to explain reasoned action. Survey response can be viewed as an exchange

between respondent and evaluator, where participants consider the benefit-cost ratio before

deciding to participate (Dillman, 2000). Related to another area of extension management,

Lindner (1998) concluded extension should pay attention to the factors of employee pay and

interesting work when designing reward systems.

Extension researchers have applied SET to explain how extension users seek and accept

extension services when they trust the services will be valuable and relevant to them. Without

this trust, stakeholders cannot engage with extension and will not be as willing to provide

support (Israel, 1991). Israel (1991) first connected SET to the "receptivity to extension's

educational materials" because his research showed "clientele seek or accept information when the potential benefits outweigh the costs, and if a trust that the rewards will be delivered is established" (p. 16). Galindo-Gonzalez and Israel (2010) used this same concept to administer a customer satisfaction survey among Florida extension clients. The study found the type of contact significantly affected the quality perceived by the clients and the outcomes of experiences, but not overall satisfaction. "The main factor making a difference across types of contact is the relevance of the information... This perception is based on the fact that most planned programs cover generic information on broad topics to interest a greater number of participants" (Galindo-Gonzalez & Israel, 2010, para 25). Participants said they would prefer to receive materials tailored to their needs and indicated they also preferred programs offered at a useful time. Extension agents should aim to know more about their audiences through engaging in a continuous dialogue to develop relevant programs (Galindo-Gonzalez & Israel, 2010).

Although the framework has been used in extension research, it has not appeared in the numerous studies related to the need for accountability in extension. Outside of extension-specific research, SET has been assumed as a principle in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Stanaland, Lwin, & Murphy, 2011). Balmer, Fukukawa, & Gray (2007) states "ethical identity'' of an organization is formed by "a relationship between parties within a community of business and social exchange" (p. 8) and communication is critical in establishing that relationship. "Perceptions of both CSR and ethical identity depend to some degree on effective firm communication with external audiences" (Stanaland, et al., 2011, p. 48). Stanaland et al. (2011) found perceptions of an organization's CSR are positively affected by the quality of ethical statements produced by the company. Perceptions of CSR positively influence the organization's

reputation, consumer trust, and consumer loyalty. It seems logical SET can also be applied to explain why it is important extension is accountable in utilizing tax dollars to produce services valuable to constituents and in effectively communicating the value of those services.

Research shows SET can be applied to explain a number of extension communication principles: 1) the type of contact or call to action provided to extension stakeholders must be relevant to the particular audience in order to be useful (Israel, 1991; Galindo-Gonzalez and Israel, 2010), 2) extension services must be perceived as valuable to the public in order for the public to engage with extension and voluntarily provide support for its programs (Israel, 1991; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), 3) extension communicators must ensure stakeholders are aware of and understand how extension services are valuable to them (Israel, 1991; Stanaland, et al., 2011), and 4) extension communicators should proceed with caution regarding using the word "free" in marketing services (Swendson & Baker, 2014).

IMC and Planning

Extension employees could maximize the effectiveness of their communication efforts by practicing Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) (Maddy & Kealy, 1998). Over the years, state extension agencies have shifted from a disciplines-based program approach to an issues-based program approach (Taylor-Powell & Richardson, 1990; Bahnl, 1991; Baker & Verma, 1993). This model of work is similar to the concept of IMC because it has brought planning for external communication efforts into every aspect of extension work to deliver more strategic programming to audience segments (Kelly & Jones, 2005; Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005), and can convey the relevant value extension offers (Israel, 1991; Stanaland, et al., 2011). Since extension programs are designed to inform and educate the public, all extension efforts are

similar to communication campaigns, which should include planning, launching, and evaluation stages (Ang, 2014).

Gillespie and Yarbrough (1984) created a communication model for extension nutrition education programs. Although this model was published a few years before the 1993 seminal text *Integrated Marketing Communications: Pulling it all Together and Making it Work* by Schultz, Tanenbaum, and Lauterborn (Schultz et al., 2011), it includes many similar elements. Gillespie and Yarbrough's (1984) model included three steps: inputs (from receiver and communicators), intervening process (attention, comprehension, and interaction), and outcomes (acceptance or rejection). The idea was to provide a useful framework for designing communication based on the intended audience's preferences, needs, and habits. Secondly, the model calls for extension agents to interact with the audience throughout the program, in order to best engage audience interests and meet audience needs. The authors recognized programs needed to be evaluated to determine the degree of success and to identify areas for improvement (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984). Brown and Kiernan (1998) applied the framework to an extension health program and considered it to be valuable for program planning.

This model serves as just one example of how extension employees have applied concepts of IMC planning throughout the system's history. Beyond its usefulness to individual extension programs or campaigns, extension can apply the IMC planning process to every aspect of external communication. No model currently exists for fully applying IMC in extension communication.

Today's definition of successful IMC practice has grown to incorporate more than just the basic

concepts of planning, launching, and evaluating campaigns. Ang (2014) studied the tracing of

definitions over the years and adapted the work of various authors to create this definition (p.4):

> IMC is defined as a research-based, audience-focused, result-driven communication
> process that aims to execute a brand communication program over time so that there is
> clarity and consistency in positioning of the brand. This is achieved by coordinating
> different communication disciplines and integrating the creative content across different
> media. The ultimate aim is to achieve short-term financial gain and long-term brand
> equity.

Key terms in Ang's definition are brand equity and brand positioning. Brand equity is defined as

the value a brand adds or detracts to a service or product, as determined by consumer perceptions

(Kim, 2000). Brand positioning refers to the perception of the brand in relation to competing

brands (Ang, 2014). Ang's definition of IMC (2014) has seven key tenets (paraphrased from p.

5):

- Planning involves strategic thinking upfront,
- Communication disciplines (e.g.: public relations and advertising) selected must
  compliment each other to offset strengths and weaknesses,
- Strategy must be supported by research,
- Target audiences must be selected,
- Return on investment must be demonstrated,
- Clarity and consistency in the "look, feel, and voice" of the brand over time must be
  achieved to avoid confusion.
- Content must be shared using the appropriate form of media.

The first step in the IMC process is selecting and coordinating the communication disciplines

(e.g. advertising, public relations, and direct marketing), followed by selecting the forms of

media to be utilized (e.g. websites, social media, and traditional media). "If generating free

publicity is a particular strength (because of the nature of the business [including budget] or

because a brilliant publicist on the team), then a creative strategy revolving around marketing-

oriented public relations should be explored" (Ang, 2014, p. 5). Consumers develop

understanding of messages faster when they encounter the same message in more than one form

of media (Ang, 2014). Cross-media communication strategies are generally more effective than single-media strategies (Ang, 2014), and it is recommended to use a mix of low-cost media in extension communication (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005; Miller, 1995).

"One of the most important, and often most difficult tasks for IMC is ensuring consistency in executions within and across the different types of marketing communication a brand is using, as well as over time" (Percy, 2008, p. 202). Percy (2008) emphasizes consistency must be present in the visual feel of communication because visual memory of imagery (which includes images and graphics) elicits faster recognition of the brand identity than the name itself. The look should not be identical throughout all communication because variation is needed to preserve interest and capture attention (Percy, 2008). However, the more consistent the "unique look or feel to everything" appears, "the more readily brand awareness and communicating the brand benefit will be achieved" (Percy, 2008, p. 202-203). Radio can be challenging to incorporate in IMC because listeners do not receive visual cues (Percy, 2008). Linking radio content to messages shared through other media and repeating "phrases, brands, and any important information" (Ang, 2014, p. 122) can help listeners recognize the brand.

IMC and the Consumer Pathway Model

Young (2014) proposes a consumer pathway model for IMC, which recognizes consumers can make a purchase without being aware of the brand name. This trend has been observed with consumers of extension services, such as families involved in the 4-H Youth Development program (Ray et al., 2014). A KSRE internal audience member made a note in open-ended

survey question that 4-H families are often unaware of the KSRE name (Ray et al., 2014).

Implementing the consumer pathway model into IMC involves identifying audiences along the

stages from brand awareness to brand advocacy, understanding their needs and habits, and

planning and implementing tactics to move them toward becoming supporters who recommend

the brand to others. The seven stages are: awareness, involvement, active consideration,

purchase, consumption, relationship building, and advocacy (Young, 2014). Although the goals

of extension communication may not be in line with driving sales, they still involve driving

audience members to take action by becoming active learners, utilizing the education in their

daily lives, volunteering, and/or recruiting more participants (Culp, 2013 A; Culp, 2013 B).

IMC and Branding: Internal and External

Communicating public value and impact can benefit extension, but only when it accompanies a

consistent representation of a memorable brand. Creating and maintaining brand equity or value

is important and it requires attention to both internal and external brand management. "The

objective of internal branding is to ensure that employees transform espoused brand messages

into brand reality for customers and stakeholders" and involves aligning internal processes and

culture with the brand (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007, p. 60). Internal brand management starts with

coordination of human resources and marketing in order to provide employees with coherent and

consistent messages that reinforce understanding of the brand; this will lead to shared

understanding of the brand, which enables employees to consistently deliver the brand's promise

through external communication (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007). Internal brand management also

requires a set of clear branding guidelines to ensure employees understand how to represent the

brand to external audiences, according to a pre-determined strategy (Cousins, 2013). The impact

of internal brand management is reflected by external communication (Punjaisri, Evanschitzky, & Wilson, 2009).

KSRE conducted a qualitative assessment of internal perceptions of the brand in January and February of 2014 (Ray et al., 2014). The study assessed notes from 39 focus groups composed of local extension agents and board members from across the state and found the audience believed in the established brand values. All five values expressed in the branding guideline's vision statement were reflected in participant responses (science-based, inclusive, unbiased, practical, and community-focused). The slogan (Knowledge for Life) was also a major theme, as the participants believed it was useful in explaining the organization's mission. A major theme found was that internal members believe the free or low cost aspect of KSRE's services is important to mention to new audiences. One participant made a note regarding branding strategy, in that, even though the organization is not trying to sell anything, KSRE "wants [its] brand to be recognized" (Ray et al., p. 10). Three minor themes related to branding were: 1) the KSRE brand is communicated differently to different audiences, 2) KSRE has an unreached potential and would benefit from marketing support, including an "elevator speech" to use in communicating with external audiences, and 3) It is difficult to determine what is the most important aspect of KSRE. Overall, the authors concluded that internal audience perceptions are in line with current branding perceptions, and recommended future research to determine how the brand is actually interacting between internal and external audiences (Ray et al., 2014).

External brand management refers to how the brand is communicated to external audiences. A starting point for implementing IMC is achieving consistency in how the brand is communicated

to audiences (Ang, 2014; Schultz et al., 2011). External brand consistency should be maintained

to avoid confusion and leave a memorable impact on audiences (Ang, 2014; Kelly & Jones,

2005; Schultz et al., 2011). This means all encounters an audience has with a brand should

reflect the same look, feel, and voice conveyed through elements such as images, names, logos,

text, slogans, and tone (Ang, 2014, Percy, 2008). However, brand recognition is useless if

audiences do not know how to connect (are provided with a call to action) or are not motivated to

connect with the organization (Culp, 2013 A; Culp, 2013 B).

KSRE Branding Guidelines

The purpose of an organization's set of branding guidelines is to make sure employees

understand what communication tactics are preferred and which should be avoided (Cousins,

2013). Furthermore, guidelines should ensure all employees are on the same page and have the

information needed to communicate with the appropriate strategy in mind (Cousins, 2013).

KSRE has created a set of branding guidelines to explain the organization's brand strategy and to

help "employees understand the correct ways to represent the brand and strengthen [KSRE's]

image with the world" (What is 'Branding?', para. 4). The guidelines emphasize the importance

of the brand by describing it as "something that separates K-State Research and Extension from

every other organization" (What is 'Branding?' section, para. 1).

KSRE's branding guidelines are available on the organization's website, and include links to 26

sections listed on the right-hand side of the website page. A few of these sections include

acronym (KSRE), cobranding, slogan, photos, and style guide. The style guide section provides a

link to the style guide page and provides an explanation of its purpose:

A style guide is a set of standards intended to clarify written or electronic communication. It helps ensure consistency within organizational communications by providing standards for capitalization, punctuation, spelling, terminology, and usage. (Style Guidelines and Branding section, para. 2)

The KSRE branding guidelines provide various amounts of details and examples within each section. The guidelines include two versions of the KSRE wordmark available for download (one including the university's spirit mark, the Powercat, and a version without the Powercat). Additionally, the guidelines provide a section for downloading templates for business cards, car signs, envelopes, letterhead, newsletter office signs, and PowerPoint presentations. Each section includes contact information for a KSRE employee to answer any branding guideline inquires and for the university's Trademark Licensing department. The branding guidelines do provide some medium-specific information for website, email, mail, social media, telephone, and publication communication, but they do not include strategy for measurement.

"Measurement of your process and results—where you spend your time and money and what you get out of it—provides the data necessary to make sound decisions" (Paine, 2011, p. 5). The branding guidelines do not include instructions or recommendations for continual measurement of reach and engagement achieved through each medium. Furthermore, the guidelines do not include measurable objectives and the general strategy behind each medium's use. For example, the guidelines do not explain who the target audiences are for each of the social media sites, how to monitor and measure engagement for each medium, how to strategically compose 140-character or less tweets, how and where to promote YouTube video views and engagement, and how to track media coverage generated by press releases.

IMC and the Call to Action

Part of IMC planning is choosing the correct call to action or contact information to offer the audience (Ang, 2014). Extension communicators today have many options of calls to action they can offer audiences, including telephone numbers, mailing addresses, email addresses, website links, and links to social media pages. It is important to consider the end goal of what actions the organization would like customers and/or stakeholders to take (Ang, 2014). Since extension aims to serve the current local needs of all community members (Jones, 1992), state extension communicators have a wide range of audience members to reach. KSRE's strategic plan states that the organization aims to be a "provider of Knowledge for Life and educational solutions needed by the people of Kansas, the nation, and the world" (Final Strategic Plan, 2015, para. 1). Website links are commonly provided by organizations so interested audiences already online or engaged in a different form of media can find more information. Social media links are also provided by organizations as a means to share more information and allow audiences to interact with the messages (Persuit, 2013). The KSRE branding guidelines (2015) encourage employees managing websites to "add links to your social media pages, if applicable" (Websites section, para. 3). However, limitations in Internet access and use may still be a barrier to web-based communication with extension audiences (Robideau & Santl, 2011).

Robideau and Santl (2011) researched how Minnesota families already involved with one extension program, 4-H Youth Development, currently receive and prefer to receive communication from their local extension service. U.S. Postal Mail and email are the top ways county extension programs communicate with families already engaged with the organization and the receivers preferred these methods. Two of the eight counties included in the focus group

portion of the study reported a higher rating of interest in communicating via social media and texting (Robideau & Santl, 2011). The survey portion of the study revealed a low percentage of families utilizing email technology in some counties (as low as 15%) and a high percentage of email users in other counties (as high as 88%). This demonstrates a potential limitation to web-based communication including email, web, and social media, but also an opportunity (Robideau & Santl, 2011). The authors concluded that although not all extension users utilize social media, a strategic social media plan could help "strengthen and diversify program communication" (Robideau & Santl, 2011, p. 12) in local extension offices by using social media to engage with target audiences.

Keys to providing the appropriate call to action involve considering the form of media the audience is currently engaged or not engaged with and the interests and preferences of that particular audience (Ang, 2014). The effectiveness of calls to action can be affected by brand recognition (Ray et al., 2014). For example, an internal stakeholder of KSRE mentioned in an open-response survey question that families involved in the 4-H Youth Development program do not always recognize the connection between 4-H and KSRE, citing a case where mail received in a KSRE-branded envelope was thrown away. In this case, the mail communication did not achieve its purpose in motivating the audience member (already involved with KRSE) to action, due to a lack of understanding regarding the brand.

IMC and Targeting Audiences

State extension communicators aim to reach a wide range of audiences that make up the state population. Extension programing throughout the state is intended to meet the needs of urban and rural areas, and younger and older people. "Extension provides practical education you can

38

trust – to help people, businesses, and communities solve problems, develop skills, and build a better future" (Kansas Cooperative Extension Service, 2014, para. 2).

For example, in 2014, KSRE decided to focus on five grand challenges in the state of Kansas: water, global food systems, health, improving community vitality, and growing tomorrow's leaders (KSRE Legislative Report, 2014). KSRE strives to engage all Kansans in its mission and to communicate impact and public value to legislatures (K. Boone, personal communication, October 28, 2013). Furthermore, KSRE has a vision to "be the valued and trusted provider of Knowledge for Life and educational solutions needed by the people of Kansas, the nation, and the world" (Final Strategic Plan, 2015, para. 1). Therefore, KSRE has a very wide range of target audiences it strives to reach, including diverse stakeholder groups within Kanas, in addition to people across the nation and world (Final Strategic Plan, 2015).

IMC involves understanding target audience's media usage habits to plan communication that can best "break through the clutter" (Ang 2014, p. 11). Extension research also recommends tailoring messages to target audiences (Schultz et al., 2011; Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984). Some of the more specific target audiences KSRE aims to reach and engage in its mission are agricultural industry professionals, consumers, gardeners, urban residents, rural residents, youth, young adults, adults, senior citizens, homeowners, and legislators. Beyond these groups, KSRE must consider other potential funding sources and internal members of KSRE and Kansas State University. KSRE must strive to make its communication content interesting (Ang, 2014), relevant, and useful (Galindo-Gonzalez & Israel, 2010) to all of the audiences it wishes to

engage. Communication must reach the target audience members (Ang, 2014; Lohse & Stotts, 2006).

Lohse and Stotts' (2006) case study examined recruitment of members into an extension program intended to educate and motivate audiences already contemplating making behavioral changes to prevent weight gain (in the active consideration stage). The case demonstrated extension efforts did benefit targeted audience members in the intended way, when those members were reached (made aware of the brand and its benefit to them). Recruited participants did increase knowledge of their own body mass index (BMI); however, only 28.6% of participants recruited were members of the intended audience. When target audiences were reached, extension efforts were successful in their goal; however, extension is not always effective in reaching those audience members (Lohse & Stotts, 2006). Extension "must increase [its] ability to target increasingly fragmented audiences with increasingly relevant messages, for increasingly tailored products" (Maddy & Kealy, 1998, para. 20).

IMC and Two-Way Symmetrical Communication

While advertising efforts may be successful in manipulating perceptions of a brand, they may not always motivate audiences to action (Ang, 2014; Kim, 2001); public relations practitioners often view manipulation as a form of one-way communication only to be used in the early stages of publicity and public information (Kim, 2001). Extension communication has traditionally been more focused on public relations efforts, rather than paid advertising. Research has found extension users prefer what Grunig and Grunig defined as the two-way symmetrical communication approach and tailored messages (Irani et al., 2006). Two-way symmetrical communication allows stakeholders to give extension communicators feedback to help shape

their message strategy. One way this can be achieved is by communicating through an interactive website. Irani et al. (2006) found focus group participants (members of the general public) view the Internet as a primary source for information and preferred dynamic content they could interact with. These results emphasize the need for give-and-take relationships between what the public (stakeholders) want and need and what messages the organization (extension communicators) wants to send (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Irani et al., 2006).

YouTube is an example of an interactive, web-based platform KSRE uses as a non-paid medium for communicating with external audiences. The medium allows for interaction by allowing comments and likes, and giving the audience the opportunity to pause and replay messages. The site also allow administrators to monitor analytics including views and watch time. The administrators at YouTube.com use watch time as a metric because it signifies how long viewers are engaged with the content (Creators, 2012). Evaluating online analytics are one way for organizations to gather feedback useful for crafting future strategies to achieve two-way communication.

The concept of two-way symmetrical communication is in line with Young's (2014) consumer pathway model because two-way communication between consumers and the organization is beneficial at each stage (Young, 2014). KSRE internal audiences have found two-way communication is essential in carrying out the organization's mission as, "Participants are lifelong learners that transgress from participant/user to supporter/promoter over time" (Ray et al., p. 9). In particular, the final stages of the pathway involve two-way communication as

gathering feedback from consumers allows to better meet their needs, build relationships, and "help them to help you" by recruiting other potential customers (Young, 2014, p. 56).

IMC and Key Messages

Utilizing IMC planning techniques can help organizations effectively deliver key messages (Kelly & Jones, 2005). Extension strives to deliver key messages to audiences that explain the impact of its services and how they are valuable (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2015). In corporate branding, key messages often are found in the form of positioning statements crafted to develop brand salience (Kelly & Jones, 2005; Ang, 2014). Brand salience is the ability of a brand to separate itself from its competitors, its environment, and its own history (Guido, 1998). Positioning statements are used in IMC to provide targeted audience members with an answer to their question, "What's in it for me?" (Kelly & Jones, 2005), so audiences understand the benefits they receive from supporting the particular brand. In the case of extension, it is important to differentiate the system from others that also require government funding, in order to ensure it is not cut when budgets come under scrutiny (Richardson et al., 2000).

The Extension Committee on Organization & Policy (ECOP) has recognized the need for extension to differentiate itself and communicate the unique value and impact of its services (ECOP, 2013). ECOP has created tools in the past for extension communicators to adapt and utilize when measuring and communicating impact (ECOP, 2013). KSRE communication specialists have adapted these tools to provide internal audiences with the most relevant information needed to strategically communicate its public value and impact (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2015).

The formula for positioning statements is similar to the formula KSRE communication specialists have included in the branding guidelines to help employees write impact and public value statements (Kelly & Jones, 2005; Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2015). There are some similarities and differences among the statements formulas.

Kelly and Jones (2005) provide an example of a positioning statement:

> To (Family Food Shoppers Who Are Concerned About Diet/TARGET CONSUMER), (Mazola/NAME OF BRAND) is the brand of (Margarine/COMPETITIVE FRAME) that (Tastes Better Than All Other Leading Heart Healthy Spreads/BENEFIT).

KSRE communication specialists have provided internal audience members with the following formula for writing public value statements (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2015):

> When you (TARGET CONSUMER) support (PROGRAM NAME/NAME of BRAND) participants will (LEARN/DO WHAT?/COMPETITIVE FRAME) which leads to (OUTCOMES/INITIAL BENEFIT) that will benefit others by (PUBLIC VALUE/ULTIMATE BENEFIT).

Similarly, KSRE communication specialists have provided internal audience members with a document titled How to Develop an Effective Impact Statement. An impact statement is a "brief summary, in ordinary language, of the economic, environmental, or social benefits of our efforts.

It states accomplishments and their payoff to society… Impact is the difference your programs make in people's lives" (How to Develop an Effective Impact Statement section, 2011, p. 1). Impact statements should contain three elements, each defined in the document:

- Issue—Who cares and why?

- What's been done?

- Impact

KSRE's branding guidelines represent an attempt to practice IMC across various media. However, plans to implement IMC strategies are only effective when executed by achieving a consistent representation of names, images, graphics, and key messages. KSRE has not conducted research to determine the extent to which guidelines for communicating impact and public value are being utilized. Furthermore, KSRE needs to communicate a number of diverse impact and public value statements to express the value of each unique KSRE program. Having a number of key messages to communicate is one reason for organizations to use the strategic IMC planning process (Ang, 2014). Encounters with multiple key messages can make it difficult for audiences to remember them (Percy, 2008).

Repeated appearances of names and key messages within media can increase the probability that audiences will process and remember the name (Percy, 2008). Advertisers use a rule of thumb that audience members must encounter a message at least three times within the purchasing cycle (Ang, 2014). For each encounters with the brand to resonate, the audience must at least absorb the brand name and recognize its primary benefit, meaning the audience is paying conscious attention (Percy, 2008). Not all placements

within media have the same effect in capturing attention. Research has shown information at the bottom of online media tends to be ignored (Eyetrack III, 2004). Additionally, repeated appearances of key brand messages and elements are helpful, even when communicating with the same audience on a regular basis. For example, it is recommended that organizations always place their logo at the top of press releases sent to news media because the repeated exposures help build brand recognition (Business Wire, 2015).

IMC and Evaluation

Ultimately, the effects of IMC management are unknown without communication evaluation (Ang, 2014). Measurement is needed to make sound conclusions and how budget and resources can be most effectively allocated to achieved desired results and demonstrate return on investment or accountability (Paine, 2011, Ang 2014). Prior to this study KSRE had not evaluated the extent to which it was actually utilizing IMC (K. Boone, personal communication, October 28, 2013). KSRE needs to evaluate its external communication as a whole to identify strengths and weaknesses, considering brand consistency, calls to action, key messages, and target audiences.

Previous KSRE Research

KSRE has conducted a series of telephone surveys (1996, and 2007), which have helped shape current branding and communication strategies (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). The 2007 telephone survey (representative of all Kansas citizens) found the majority of citizens perceive KSRE's services to be very important (74.4%), while 22% considered the services to be somewhat important, and 2.5% considered the services to be not important (.2% did not respond). However, only 55.5% of respondents had heard of the K-State

Research and Extension name and 51.2 % had heard of the organizations full name (Kansas

Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service). A greater percentage were

aware of the extension name itself (70%). Additionally, the study found 74% of citizens

perceived information from KSRE to be credible, demonstrating strong brand equity

(Communications and Agricultural Education Research, 2015). However, the telephone survey

was not able to determine if Kansans were able to recognized KSRE communication materials

when they encountered them or if these materials could be confused with the work of another

organization.

IMC and KSRE

Extension communicators, and those at KSRE in particular, have a number of complexities they

must consider when coordinating communication efforts (Final Strategic Plan, 2015). Such

complexities provide good reason to practice IMC (Ang, 2014):

- **Brand Consistency-** KSRE has had used different variations of its brand name, logo, graphics, and slogan in the past (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). The organization needs to exert special attention to consistently following its current brand guidelines and ensuring branding guidelines are sufficient and appropriate for achieving communication objectives.

- **Calls to Action-** KSRE utilizes many media channels to connect with audiences (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Website, press releases, YouTube videos, etc.). The organization needs to determine the extent to which it is utilizing these forms of media together and the effectiveness of these media when striving to motivate audiences to action.

- **Target Audiences-** KSRE strives to reach out to all Kansas residents, while also achieving national and global recognition (Final Strategic Plan, 2015). The variation of audience demographics and interests is wide. KSRE must strive to appeal to a variety of interests and needs.

- **Impact and Public Value Statements-** KSRE has a responsibility to communicate the value and impact of its programs. The organization needs to evaluate the extent to which

it is communicating impact and public value across media and identify ways to improve this communication.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to identify strengths and weakness in how one state extension agency communicates its brand, public value, and impact to target audiences, using calls to actions. This chapter began by examining Social Exchange Theory (SET) as an explanation for why extension needs to effectively communicate with stakeholders and then reviewed literature related to Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) and extension communication. Extension research has applied SET in a number of ways; research shows SET can explain the need for tailoring to target audiences' needs, providing audiences with a useful call to action (Israel, 1991; Galindo-Gonzalez and Israel, 2010), and ensuring the public understands the value and impact of extension work (Stanaland et al, 2011).

Extension employees could improve the effectiveness of communication efforts by implementing an integrated approach (Maddy & Kealy, 1998). Extension has shifted toward bringing communication strategies to the discussion table when planning programs (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005), which is a key component of IMC. Extension researchers have created (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984) and implemented (Brown and Kiernan, 1998) a model similar to IMC for program planning. However, IMC planning should encompass all of the organization's efforts to communicate with external audiences, not just a single campaign or program (Kelly & Jones, 2005; Ang, 2014). There is no current model or framework for implementing IMC in extension communication.

Selecting a strategic combination of media to use is a critical first step, but practicing IMC also requires careful, ongoing internal and external brand management and appropriate calls to action (Ang, 2014). Previous research has shown the way KSRE employees perceive the organization is in line with established brand values and slogan (Ray et al., 2014). Providing employees with a clear and consistent representation of the brand will help them to communicate the brand consistently to external audiences (Punjaisri & Winson, 2007). Extension communicators have many options for connecting with audiences, including websites and social media; it critical to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each media type and to utilize them strategically (Robideau & Santl, 2011). Measurement is required to determine if the way employees are actually communicating the brand across media is consistent and in line with objectives.

State extension agencies aim to reach a wide range of audience members, including local constitutes and members of the global community (Final Strategic Plan, 2015) and must continuously strive to reach and engage target audience groups with tailored, relevant messages (Maddy & Kealy, 1998; Lohse & Stotts, 2006). Research has shown extension users prefer to interact with messages and give feedback (Irani et al., 2006), which is in line with the recommended model for two-way symmetrical communication in public relations (Grunig & Grunig, 1992). KSRE communication specialists have made resources available to all internal members in order to help craft important key messages regarding impact and public value (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2014). Ultimately, the extent of success the organization achieves with communication efforts is unknown without some form of evaluation (Ang, 2014). Data is required to guide decisions and improve communication strategies (Paine, 2011).

Extension communicators face a number of challenges (Kellogg Commision, 1999; Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005). Additionally, KSRE has a number of complexities present in its communication goals, which are reasons to use IMC (Ang, 2014). Through the guidance of Integrated Marketing Communication and Social Exchange Theory, this study can evaluate KSRE's external communication. An evaluation of adherence to brand guidelines and utilization of calls to action, targeted messages, and impact and public value statements will help KSRE identify strengths and weaknesses in the extent to which the organization practices effective IMC. This first step in external communication evaluation will help KSRE identify immediate tactics for better communicating its brand image and will serve as a benchmark for future measurement. Ultimately, this research will inform strategies for achieving greater success in the land-grant mission by reaching, engaging, and building stronger relationships with a larger number of stakeholders, who can serve as advocates.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

A review of the literature demonstrated the importance of utilizing clear and consistent brand elements, providing targeted audiences with multiple, appropriate calls to action, and communicating impact and public value of extension. After conducting the review of literature, the following research objectives were developed:

- **RO1:** Determine the extent to which branding guidelines were followed in KSRE external communication.

- **RO2:** Assess the extent to which KSRE audience members were provided with a call to action in external communication.

- **RO3:** Determine the extent to which KSRE targeted its key audiences in external communication.

- **RO4:** Assess the extent to which KSRE communicated its impact and public value to target audiences.

Design of Study

A quantitative content analysis was utilized to address the research objectives. This method was selected by the researcher in order to systematically analyze all communication pieces KRSE makes available to external audiences within one year. The year reviewed was November 1, 2012, to October 31, 2013. A quantitative content analysis is the "systematic assignment of communication content to categories according to rules and the analysis of relationships involving those categories using statistical methods" (Riffe et al., 2005, p. 3). The researcher chose this method because it is a non-obtrusive, non-reactive approach to objectively measure

media content of various formats (Riffe et al., 2005). The quantitative content analysis method is useful when examining various media; the method has been previously used to analyze websites, blogs, television and radio broadcasts, newspapers, and content posted on YouTube and Facebook (Lin & Jeffers, 2001; Rhoades & Ellis, 2010; Trammell & Keshelashvili, 2005; Rhoades, Thomas, & Davis, 2009). KSRE's external communication can be viewed as the consequence of antecedent KSRE policies, procedures, leadership, and resources (Riffe et al., 2005). Therefore, by examining the external communication pieces, the researchers can make recommendations of how KSRE can adjust the way employees work to produce communication pieces.

Previous Studies - Impact and Public Value

This study's methods were developed in accordance with methods previously used in similar quantitative content analysis research. Workman and Scheer (2012) conducted a content analysis of articles published in the *Journal of Extension* in order to describe the level of extension program effectiveness measured through program evaluation efforts, commonly known as outcome studies. Workman and Sheer (2012) operationalized program effectiveness by utilizing Bennett's Hierarchy of Evidence, a model for documenting evidence of extension impact, and assigning each level with an ordinal value. Similar to Workman and Scheer's research, this study also created a scale to measure the level of effectiveness in two variables: public value statements and impact statements present across KSRE external communication.

Previous Studies - Content Analysis

Rhoades et al. (2009) utilized a content analysis to determine how 4-H Youth Development and extension groups were utilizing social media sites. In order to conduct the analysis, researchers

first gathered a sample of groups or individuals using the sites to be analyzed (MySpace and Facebook). The researchers then analyzed six variables of the sites by assigning observations to numerical categories. Data was analyzed using SPSS software. This study is similar in its methodology, as it applied a set of pre-established coding protocols to create numerical data from social media content, among other media types.

Previous Studies - YouTube Videos

Rhoades and Ellis (2010) examined the "purpose and message of food safety videos posted to YouTube" (p. 166) through a quantitative content analysis. Researchers first gathered the sample of videos to analyze by searching "food safety" on the YouTube home page, which found 81 videos (5 not related to the interest of the study). Two trained coders analyzed a number of elements contained within the 76 video samples over a four-week period of time. One of the elements coded was a credibility ranking, using a five-point scale. The rules for assigning credibility rankings were decided by consulting previous research. The researchers and a graduate student not previously involved in the study also viewed a few samples prior to coding, to reach an agreement on exact coding protocols. Comparable in design, researchers conducting this study also consulted a panel of experts while determining and refining coding protocol.

Determining the Population

Quantitative content analyses commonly involve "drawing a representative sample of content, training coders to use the category rules developed to measure or reflect differences in content, and measuring the reliability (agreement or stability over time) of coders in applying the rules" (Riffe et al., 2005, p. 3). Drawing a sample from the study population is a necessary step in the process (Riffe et al., 2005). However, before a sample could be drawn, the researcher explored

current communication management practices to determine the population and appropriate units of analysis.

The researcher determined the size of units of analysis (also known as study units) to allow for quantifying the study population. The researcher must define units of analysis in order to "reduce and structure the content so it can be selected, analyzed, and recorded" (Riffe et al., 2005, p. 69). External communication pieces examined in the study were: press releases, new and revised publications, Facebook content, Twitter content, website pages, radio podcasts, and YouTube videos produced within the selected time frame. To achieve units similar in length, units of analysis were defined as single press releases, single publications, weeks of Facebook posts, weeks of Twitter tweets, single website pages, the first two minutes of a single radio podcast, and the first two minutes of a single YouTube video.

The researcher decided to code only the first two minutes of YouTube videos because, on average, KSRE's top-ten videos (based on all-time number of views) were watched for 2.0 minutes each. This information was gained by accessing the KSRE's YouTube account log-in information. The researcher calculated the mean minutes watched per video by taking the total watch time for each video and dividing it by its respective number of views. When averaged together, the mean was exactly 2.0 (M= 2.0). YouTube.com uses watch time as a metric because it indicates how long viewers are actually engaged with the content (Creators, 2012). Since watch time statistics were not readily available for radio content, the researcher decided to keep the process consistent and listen to only the first two minutes of radio podcasts as well.

The researcher determined the study population by counting the number of units in each medium created within the selected time period. Lists of units were developed differently for each medium; all lists were stored in one Microsoft Excel 2011 sheet. The researcher made a note of identifying characteristics of the units, so the exact units could be found again (if selected in the study sample). Units were assigned a consistently formatted identifying code (e.g. PR1). After creating the lists, the researcher considered the unique characteristics of each medium to make appropriate exclusions to the study population.

Gathering a complete list of website pages was more challenging than originally anticipated. KSRE's website presence is composed of five websites, which link to one another. Since the fifth site was launched after the time period of review (in December 2013), only the first four sites were included. The researcher obtained electronic PDF documents for each of the four website maps from a KSRE employee. The researcher checked all links, and counted the total number of working and broken links. Broken or missing website pages were excluded, along with pages designed for internal use only (users must log in to view content).

The researcher gathered information from the KSRE website to generate a list of radio programs and information from YouTube.com to generate a list of videos. The radio programs are posted, arranged by date, on the website. The researcher made a list of all podcasts created within the time period, recording the names of the programs, podcast titles, and publication dates to identify individual units. This information was critical because many podcasts (with unique content) had identical titles, but were posted on unique days. The website does not allow for sharing a link directly to each of the archived podcasts. This identifying information was carefully recorded, so

podcasts later selected as part of the study sample could be located. Locating podcasts was still challenging because each of the nine radio programs in this study has its own unique archive, and the only way to access the older posts was by clicking through the page numbers at the bottom of the page and making an assessment of the range of dates found on each page. The list of YouTube units was easier to create. YouTube videos were arranged by date in one continuous, scrolling list on the website. Video titles were stored in the Excel sheet, along with a link directly to the video.

Press releases and publication lists were created by gathering resources from KSRE employees. To count the press release units, the researcher gained access to two electronic files (for years 2012 and 2013), where KSRE employees had stored all press releases distributed within the year (in individual Microsoft Word documents). Press releases were saved in an inconsistent file naming system, so the researcher used titles and dates to identify the units in the Excel sheet. For publication units, the researcher obtained monthly lists of new and revised publications from a KSRE employee. The publication titles and a link to the online versions were recorded in the list. Some publications were revised more than once within the time period, but each individual publication was only counted once.

Facebook and Twitter units were identified by first creating a list of weeks in the year (e.g. May 5- May 11). Then, the researcher examined each of the weeks and made a note of the number of posts or tweets within that week. It is of mention that the researcher accessed older (archived) Twitter content by obtaining the account log-in information and using the Twitter archive feature to access tweets no longer visible to the public. Eight of the Facebook weeks were excluded from

the study population because no content was posted to the KSRE Facebook page within those weeks, leaving only 44 Facebook weeks in the study population.

Sampling

Simple random sampling (SRS) is the "basic sample method assumed in the statistical computations of social research" (p. 211); however, it is not always the most appropriate method to use (Babbie, 2010). Upon determining the wide variation in the number of units per medium and the unique attributes of each category, the researcher decided to take a stratified sample. Stratification is a modification of the simple random sampling method that helps ensure representativeness and decrease the probability of sampling error (Babbie, 2010). The procedure involves breaking the total population into smaller groups and taking a random sample from each of the smaller groups (Riffe et al., 2005). "Rather than selecting a sample from the total population at large, the researcher ensures that appropriate numbers of elements are drawn from homogeneous subsets of that population" (Babbie, 2010, p. 215). The researcher stratified the sample by medium, in order to create a sample of units that best represents the various ways KSRE communicates with audiences. This decision was made by considering the importance of medium and target audience, in accordance with IMC literature (Ang, 2013). The researchers wanted to create a study sample most representative of all seven media.

Table 1 demonstrates how the sample size was determined according to stratified groups of units (by media type). The researchers also decided radio podcasts should be separated into two groups: the Ag Today daily program and all other programs, (which run on a weekly or monthly

basis). Using this procedure, the researchers created a representative sample of 1,080 of the

2,352 unit population to examine in this study.

Table 3.1 Total publication stratified medium groups and the units sample method.

Stratified media	Population	Sample
Agriculture Today radio program	973	276
Other radio programs	518	221
YouTube videos	134	100
New or revised publications	123	93
Press releases	291	166
Weeks of Facebook content	44	39
Weeks of Twitter content	52	46
Website pages	217	139
Total	**2,352**	**1,080**

*Representative samples were drawn using a 95% confidence level and 5% sampling error.

Instrumentation

One codebook was written to gather data from all 1,080 units. "The heart of a content analysis is

the content analysis codebook that explains how the variables in the study are to be measured

and recorded on the coding sheet or other medium" (Riffe et al., 2005, p. 59). Workman and

Scheer (2012) referred to their codebook as a rubric "created to ensure that data were collected

accurately and consistently" (para. 19). Variables were measured and codebook instructions were

developed by consulting the Kansas State University and KSRE branding and style guide

documents (Branding Guideline, 2015; K-State Research and Extension Style Guide, 2010;

Kansas State University Branding Guidelines, 2015; University Style Guide, 2015) and by

interviewing professionals within the KSRE organization (P. Melgares, personal

communication, November 20, 2013; E. Edwards, personal communication, November 20,

2013; K. Boone, communication, October 28, 2013). Due to the nature of the units and the

research objectives, the codebook was carefully crafted, reviewed by a panel of experts,

pretested, and edited to allow for greater ease and consistency. The codebook instrument is found in Appendix A.

The codebook used for the first full pretest and the first 20% of the study sample (n= 244) included six sections: name/affiliations, graphics, calls to action, cobranding, impact/public value, and images/target audiences. After coding the first 20% of the study sample, the impact/public value section was removed from the codebook due to low intercoder reliability scores; data related to those variables were not included in the results. The first question in the codebook asked coders to assign the appropriate code for medium; however, the researcher prefilled in the response to this question when creating the medium-specific coding sheets.

For questions answered with a yes or no response (nominal-level variables), the codebook instructed coders to use 1 to indicate yes responses and a 2 to indicate no responses. For questions that required coders to record the number of times a branding element occurred within that unit (ratio-level variables), coders recorded that particular number. For questions where coders were asked to select from a number of choices (nominal-level variables), each choice was assigned a number for coders to record. All responses were recorded with a numerical value, with the exception of ten open-response questions, when coders recorded other name versions as they appeared within units and any other colors used in official graphics besides the approved colors. The researcher qualitatively analyzed the open response data.

The first section of the codebook (name/affiliation) included 28 questions regarding whether or not the correct name, full name, five versions of incorrect names (including the acronym), the

extension name alone (used as a proper noun), the K-State Radio Network, and three versions of the Kansas State University appeared. If the name appeared, a follow-up question asked coders to record the number of appearances within the unit. Two questions asked if any other version of the KSRE or Kansas State University name occurred, and a follow-up question asked coders to record the other versions. Additionally, two follow-up questions were asked to determine if appearances within the full name appeared in official statements and what the nature of the statement was.

The graphics section contained 41 questions. Nine questions asked if a certain KSRE, K-State Radio Network, or Kansas State University graphic was included within the units and provided an example of the graphic. These nine questions each included one to five follow-up questions to determine the frequency of graphics within units and potential manipulations of the graphic. Three questions regarding use of the slogan in a non-wordmark form were also included in the graphics section (a logical placement at the end of the section, near questions regarding the slogan in wordmark form).

The calls to action section contained 12 questions. Six questions asked coders to determine whether or not the unit contained at least one occurrence of a particular piece of contact information: website link, social media link, phone number, email address, mailing address, and QR code. The follow-up questions for website links included determining whether or not the unit contained a link to Home page, whether or not the unit contained a link to a page on the KSRE website besides the Home page, and whether or not the unit contained a link to a non-KSRE website page. The follow-up question for social media links asked coders to record all types of

social media links included (using specified numerical codes). After initiating the coding pretest, coders decided to interpret this question as all working social media and website links. Links within online media (website pages, Facebook, and Twitter) were checked. Only content within the YouTube videos was coded, to best account for external audience's viewing experiences that occur outside of the YouTube website (embedded in another website or shown at an event.)

The cobranding section included three questions. The first question asked whether or not an organization, company, or program was mentioned (excluding references to KSRE and Kansas State University as a whole, but including program names within KSRE). The follow-up question asked whether or not a graphic for such an organization, company, or program was included within the unit. The follow-up question included a description from the branding guidelines (including graphic examples) and asked whether or not the graphic was properly cobranded with KSRE, according to the guidelines.

Internal documents were used to develop variables in the impact/public value section of the codebook (Communicating Impact and Public Value, 2014). The researcher created two scales to measure the level of effectiveness in impact and public value statements. Similar to Workman and Scheer's (2012) content analysis, the researchers assigned values to the elements contained in an established model. The impact variable was composed of three components defined in the codebook: issue, what has been done, and impact. Examples of how the components might appear were also included. The codebook asked three questions to determine whether or not each of the components was present within the unit (nominal-level variables). A fourth question asked coders to count how many of the previously mentioned components were present (0-3, a ratio-

level variable); this variable served as a measure of effectiveness (none, low, medium, or high). The public value variable was established in the same manner, except it was composed of four components (none, low, medium, high, or very high). This section was removed from the codebook due to low intercoder reliability.

The final section of the codebook included two questions related to images (does the unit contain at least one image of a teaching moment?), 12 questions related to content of interest to target audiences, and two questions regarding the words "urban" and "rural." The question regarding teaching moments included a description of how teaching moments are depicted, that is slightly more specific than the description in the KSRE branding guidelines (KSRE Branding Guidelines, 2015) along with two example images. The questions regarding target audiences provided varying degrees of description, as some audience interests are easier to recognize than others.

A variety of challenges existed when crafting a codebook to capture the meaning encoded in various formats: written (all text found in press releases, publications, websites, YouTube videos, Facebook posts, and Twitter tweets), visual (all photos, graphics, and video content in visual media), verbal (audio content in radio podcasts and videos), and multiplatform presentations (pieces than contain more than one of the previously mentioned elements) (Riffe et al., 2005). For this reason, the researcher designed codebook instructions that would only record concrete meaning and information.

Data Recording

Study data were recorded into an electronic coding sheet created with Microsoft Excel 2011. A coding sheet is an electronic or print copy document designed for coders to use when analyzing

data and following coding protocols; coding sheets should be designed to most efficiently produce data that can be statistically analyzed (Riffe et al., 2005). Each of the seven media was recorded in a separate Excel document (per coder), and each individual unit was recorded on its own sheet within its respective document. Individual units were also identified by an assigned code (for tracking and data management purposes).

The researcher set up a file of coding sheets for each coder (using pre-filled responses and formulas when appropriate) to best allow for time efficiency. Some media allowed for pre-filled responses. For example, all questions regarding graphics and images would be skipped in radio units because the medium does not allow for graphics. The researcher pre-filled these cells with 999, the code for not applicable responses. Additionally, the researcher created formulas for all questions that had a follow-up question. When the answer to the first question (e.g. does the correct name appear?) was no (recorded as 2), then, there was no need for coders to answer the follow-up question(s) (e.g. how many times does the name occur?). Formulas were created so that all 2 responses in cells with follow-up questions would trigger a 999 response in the follow-up response cell(s).

Content was reviewed in either an electronic or printed format. Coders reviewed a printed copy of Facebook and Twitter-week content (previously captured via screen shot by the researcher). Press releases and publications were reviewed in printed form (to allow coders to take notes), in addition to electronic form (to allow for keyword searching). Website page units were reviewed live. The first two minutes of radio and YouTube videos were reviewed online.

Initial Pretest

A pretest is recommended to test the reliability of codebook instructions in producing consistently coded data (Riffe et al., 2005). An initial pretest was conducted in December 2013, to help detect issues and further edit the codebook. The pretest codebook and methods were reviewed by a panel of experts, which included Curtis Matthews, Ph.D, faculty in the A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Kansas State University, who teaches research methods classes with an emphasis on strategic communication and Lauri M. Baker, Ph.D., faculty in the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education at Kansas State University, who has a background in extension research and teaches new media technologies. The pretest looked at communication pieces from November 2013, because the pieces were not included in the study, but are similar to those included. To shorten the time needed for initial testing, the pretest was limited to Facebook, Twitter, and press release units. All four weeks of Facebook and Twitter content from November were included in the pretest sample; however, only eight of the 26 press releases created in November were included in the sample. This was considered a large enough pretest sample to initially test the coding process.

The pretest was conducted to identify issues with the codebook and to test intercoder reliability. The lead researcher coded all units in the pretest sample (N=16) and trained a second coder to code one half of the pretest sample (N= 8), to check for reliability. Training is the process of familiarizing coders with the content and the protocols for coding (Riffe et al., 2005). Coders should discuss the protocol and the problems that may occur when applying the protocol to the data. "During these discussions, it should become clear whether the coders are approaching the data from similar or different frames of reference" (Riffe et al., 2005, p. 139).

Researchers can test for reliability among coders through testing intercoder reliability (Riffe et al., 2005). Six of the original 109 variables were selected and checked for intercoder reliability. The researcher and panel of experts selected variables they perceived to be less challenging to code (number of times the KSRE name appeared and whether or not an "other" versions of the name appeared) and variables perceived to be more difficult to achieve agreement upon (measure of public value and impact effectiveness and use of narratives related to or not related to KSRE). The pretest included questions related to the concepts of entertainment education (use of narratives), which were later removed from the study, after the researchers reviewed and clarified study objectives. Variables related to prevalence of the K-State Research and Extension name and prevalence of inaccurate versions of the name produced acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability scores (Lombard, Syder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002) of .843 and 1 respectively. The other variables tested produced extremely low Cohen's kappa scores; effectiveness of impact statement(s) and effectiveness of public value statement(s) generated scores of .04 and -.018 respectively. The pretest served as an initial indicator that public value and impact variables may be challenging for coders to reach agreement. The lead researcher met with the second coder to review coding decisions and make edits to clarify codebook instructions.

Reliability Testing

After making revisions to the codebook and clarifying study objectives, the lead researcher consulted a second panel of experts to evaluate and critique the revised study codebook. The panel of experts for the codebook instrument again included Dr. Curtis Matthews, Ph.D. and Lauri M. Baker, Ph.D. Two new experts were added to the panel. These included: Kristina Boone, Ph.D., department chair in the communications and agricultural education department at

Kansas State University with a background in extension research and strategic marketing, and

Quisto Settle, Ph.D, associate at the Center for Public Issues Education at the University of

Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences with a background in extension research

and internal branding. Upon receiving edits and recommendations for the codebook instrument,

the lead researcher updated the codebook and created a revised electronic coding sheet for

recording study data.

The researchers determined achieving an acceptable intercoder reliability score between two

coders on 20% of the sample (n= 244) would be an appropriate method. One text recommends

testing between 5% and 7% of the total sample for intercoder reliability (Kaid & Wadsworth,

1989); another text recommends testing between 10% and 25% (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003).

Previous studies within the field have coded 10% of the sample (n=9) (Rhoades et al., 2009) and

13% of the sample (n=10) (Rhoades & Ellis, 2010), before dividing the remaining samples

between the coders.

Three coders were used to code the study data, including the lead researcher. The lead researcher

trained two coders to code the study data (both unique coders from the second pretest coder).

The two coders were both graduate students not otherwise involved in the study. The three

coders began by coding another pre-test sample (n= 122), (a stratified sample the same size as

10% of the study units, consisting of units similar to, but outside the range of survey units).

The researcher then ran a test of intercoder reliability on 100 variables (excluding the ten

variables with open responses). The researcher originally used Cohen's kappa as a measurement

for reliability because the index has been adapted for use with more than two coders, several researchers have recommended it is the best method, and it has been proposed the index can account for differences in variable levels (Lombard et al., 2002). Upon receiving an acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability score of .844 (Lombard et al., 2002), the coders began coding the units within the study. Research has shown .70 or greater is often used as a criterion for exploratory research in mass communication, and scores of .80 or greater are acceptable in most situations (Lombard et al., 2002).

Coders then began coding the actual study sample, starting with 10% of the study sample (n= 122), stratified across all media groups. The researcher ran a test of intercoder reliability. Upon receiving an acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability score of .920 (Lombard et al., 2002), the three coders coded an additional 10% of the study sample (n=122) before running another test. This test produced an acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability score of .917 (Lombard et al., 2002).

The researcher became concerned that some of the 100 variables may have much lower intercoder reliability scores, which were not reflected in the overall Cohen's kappa reliability score. The researcher reevaluated literature regarding measurement of intercoder reliability and the variety of variable levels present in the study (nominal and ratio). The researcher determined running a test for each individual variable using the Krippendorf's alpha index would be a more appropriate method because it can test variables of all levels with any number of coders (De Swert, 2012; Hayes & Krippendorf, 2007). After placing the three coders' responses for each the variables into separate Microsoft Excel documents (n= 100), the researcher ran a test of each variable using ReCal 3 (for nominal variables with three or more coders) ReCal OIR (for ordinal,

interval or ratio variables with any number of coders), which are updated versions of ReCal, an online calculator of intercoder reliability (Freelon, 2010; Freelon, 2011; Freelon, 2013).

The individual tests revealed acceptable reliability scores for the majority of variables (n= 80, %= 80) and 21 variables with Krippendorf's alpha scores of less than .70. The 21 variables with scores below .70 were further examined. Two variables produced a Krippendorf's alpha scores of .692 and .697, which the researcher determined to be acceptable. Two variables both with score of -.04 (a response and its follow-up response) were examined closer to reveal the discrepancy in coding was due to a mistake in coding sheet formulas; the reliability score for both variables was 1 after the researcher corrected the formula errors. One ratio-level variable produced a score of .495; the researcher determine the score was affected by the vast majority of responses that were skips (n= 100, %= 98), so when one of the coders responded differently than the two other coders (through accidentally skipping that question as well) the reliability score was greatly affected. The researcher determined this minor discrepancy was not an issue. After a full examination of the scores and response patterns for each variable, the researcher was still concerned about 16 variables with low Krippendorf's alpha scores, ranging from .179 to .65.

Additional Pilot Test

In an effort to improve reliability scores for the 16 variables that produced significantly low reliability scores, the researcher created an additional pilot test. These 16 variables included eight related to public value and impact effectiveness and eight related to content tailored to target audiences. The pilot test contained an additional sample of 122 units (equivalent to 10% of the study sample), from outside the study sample (in the same manner as the pretest sample). This time, the coders only recorded responses for 18 variables, rather than 110. Two variables with

acceptable reliability scores were also included in the pilot test. One variable was included

because it was a component in building the public value score. Another variable related to

cobranding was included because the researcher believed the .697 Krippendorf's alpha score

could be improved. Prior to coding the pilot test, the coders met to review and discuss areas of

confusion with coding these variables; the researcher made additional edits to clarify coding

rules. After conducting the pilot test coding, the researcher ran individual reliability tests for each

variable.

Results from the second pilot test intercoder reliability calculations found scores for variables

related to public value were still too low (α= .582). The overall Krippendorf's alpha score for

public value and impact variables was .582 and the overall Krippendorf's alpha score for target

audience and cobranding variables was .716. Using the criterion of .70, the researcher

determined the variables related to public value and impact to be unacceptable for use in this

study and the other piloted variables to be acceptable.

Removal of Objective Four

Since intercoder reliability scores for public value and impact were unacceptable, the researcher

removed research objective four (RO4: measuring effectiveness of impact and public value

statements) from the study. The nine variables related to research objective four were removed

from the codebook, leaving 101 variables in the study. Then, coders resumed coding the

remaining 80% of study units (n= 836). The remaining 836 units were divided equally (by

medium) among the three coders.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed for descriptive statistics using IMB version 19.0 SPSS Statistics software.

This analysis is similar to Workman and Scheer's (2012) content analysis, which calculated

frequencies and percentages in order to report descriptive information. Cross-tab calculations

were used to analyze the frequency and percentages of results by medium (as medium type was

one of the variables recorded) and in total. The researcher ran the calculations for each of the 101

variables in the study. The analysis unveiled the frequency in which branding elements occurred

within the units: correct, incorrect, and unspecified elements, in relation to the branding

guidelines. The frequency in which content of interest to the audience segments and calls to

action were presented were analyzed. One mean score was calculated using SPSS to determine

the mean number of correct name appearances per unit.

To make comparisons regarding units that did not contain the correct name specifically, all units

with a 2 response to the correct name variable (n= 469) were sorted, placed in a separate Excel

sheet, and ran through SPSS. The researcher ran cross-tab calculations on these units exclusively,

examining the frequency and percentage of graphic and name appearances in relation to medium.

This method of identifying particular units of interest and running exclusive cross-tab

calculations was also used to examine target audiences in relation to calls to action, by medium.

The ten open response variables were qualitatively analyzed using Glazer's Constant

Comparative Method (Glaser, 1965). Since the study found no other colors besides black, white,

and purple were used on any of the official graphics, only two of the open-response variables had

data to be qualitatively analyzed: other versions of the KSRE name and other versions of the

Kansas State University name. The researcher evaluated the date for emergent themes, while

continuously comparing established themes to each of the responses.

Assumptions

The researchers assumed examining content from these seven media would provide a fair

representation of external communication created throughout the year. The researchers did not

include content posted to KSRE's Pinterest account because KSRE had been using Pinterest for

less than the full year reviewed in this study. The study also excluded one of the ten radio

programs KSRE produces. The President's Corner program was left out of the study because its

focus is Kansas State University, not specifically the research and extension components. The

researchers assumed these exclusions would provide a fair representation of all KSRE external

communication created and distributed or otherwise made available to the public by state

employees within the identified time period.

Summary of Methodology

The methodology for this study was developed through considering previous studies and

textbook methodology recommendations. The study utilized a quantitative content analysis

approach because it is a non-obtrusive, objective method for measuring, comparing, and

statistically analyzing media of various formats (Riff et al., 2005). The quantitative content

analysis method has been used in similar studies within the field to analyze media including

extension journal articles (Workman & Scheer, 2012), extension and 4-H social media usage

(Rhoades et al., 2009), and food safety YouTube videos (Rhoades & Ellis, 2010). These

previous studies were considered when designing the methodology of this study.

Following typical structure for content analyses (Riffe et al., 2005), the researchers began by performing a literature review, developing research objectives, and analyzing how KSRE currently makes external communication pieces available to the public. Then, the researchers determined a time period to review, determine the size and scope of the study population, and drew a representative sample of the content. Researchers decided to utilize a stratified sample of the total 2,352 units within the population, in order to make sure the study analyzed a representative group of each media type (Babbie, 2005). The sample size was 1,080 units.

Researchers developed a codebook instrument to explain how variables were to be measured and recorded (Riffe et al., 2005). The lead researcher developed the codebook by reviewing Kansas State University and KSRE branding guidelines, interviewing KSRE employees, and consulting a panel of experts. An initial pretest of six variables was conducted to test the reliability of the codebook and to better clarify its instructions (Riffe et al., 2005). Prior to conducting the initial pretest, the researcher trained a second coder to make sure both coders were familiar with the content and the coding protocols established in the codebook. The initial pretest revealed some of the codebook instructions were not clear enough to produce consistent results between the two coders. The two coders reviewed and discussed coding decisions and then the researchers made edits to the coding instrument. Upon edits to the codebook and clarification of study objections, the lead researcher trained two additional coders (both unique from the initial pretest coder). The three coders began to code the full pretest and study content.

The researcher initially used Cohen's kappa as an index for intercoder reliability. The coders began by conducting a pretest of units similar to, but outside of the study sample (n= 122) and achieved an acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability. Next, the coders coded 20% of the study data (n= 244), checking for reliability after each 10% (n=122) and achieving acceptable Cohen's kappa reliability scores. This technique of testing a small percentage of study data was adapted from textbook recommendations (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003; Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989) and previous studies (Rhoades et. al., 2009; Rhoades and Ellis, 2010). The researcher determined using Cohen's kappa to test reliability for all variables may not have been the most appropriate method. The researcher ran individual intercoder reliability tests for each variable, using an online calculation tool to determine the Krippendorf's alpha index, taking into account the ratio and nominal variable levels. From these results, the researcher determined 18 variables that needed testing again in an additional pilot test (using the same method as the pretest, n= 122). The pilot test indicated the variables related to impact and public value produced unacceptably low, so research objective four was removed from the study.

Data were recorded into electronic coding sheets utilizing Microsoft Excel 2011 software and analyzed using IMB SPSS Statistics version 19.0. The researchers ran mean values, frequencies, percentages, and cross-tab calculations. Some units of particular interest were identified, sorted, and ran through SPSS separately. Open-response variables were qualitatively analyzed to reveil themes using Glazer's Constant Comparative Method (Glaser, 1965). This quantitative content analysis method was utilized in order to measure external communication efforts (the consequence) and make recommendations for KSRE employee external communication procedures and internal brand management (the antecedent) (Riffe et. al., 2005).

Chapter 4 - Results

Considering the growing challenges in communicating the land-grant mission to intended target audiences, this study set out to examine K-State Research and Extension (KSRE)'s external communication. Using Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) as a guide, the study aims to identify how the state extension agency has established and maintained its brand, communicated to external audiences, and provided calls to action. The coders of this study recorded responses to 101 codebook questions for 1,080 units across seven media channels. The findings from this research will be presented in this chapter in order of the following research objectives:

- RO1: Determine the extent to which branding guidelines are followed in KSRE external communication.

- RO2: Assess the extent to which KSRE audience members are provided with a call to action in external communication.

- RO3: Determine the extent to which KSRE targets its key audiences in external communication.

RO1: Extent of Branding Guidelines Applied in External Communication

To gather information needed for RO1, "determine the extent to which branding guidelines are followed in KSRE external communication," the coders recorded the use of the KSRE and Kansas State University name and graphics, use of the KSRE slogan, cobranding of the organization, and use of images. The following text and tables offer a detailed description of how these brand elements appeared. Coders recorded appearances of correct, incorrect, and other versions of the elements.

Correct K-State Research and Extension Name Use.

Overall, the correct name appeared either in writing or verbally at least one time in 56.6% (n= 611) of units. All media types included some correct name appearances. All Facebook (n= 39, %= 100) and publication (n= 93, %= 100) units and 99% of press release (n= 164) units contained the correct name. In contrast, some media types contained much lower percentages of correct name usage. Only 13% (n= 13) of YouTube units contained the correct name. The frequency and percentage of correct name appearances is shown for each media type in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Percentages and frequency of correct name (K-State Research and Extension) appearances by media type.

Medium	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	164	99
Facebook (N= 39)	39	100
Twitter (N= 46)	24	52.2
Publication (N= 93)	93	100
YouTube (N= 100)	13	13
Radio (N= 497)	185	37
Website Page (N= 139)	93	67
Total (N= 1,080)	**611**	**56.6**

Researchers coded the number of times the correct name was used within each specific unit. The number of times the correct name occurred within units varied. Less than half of the units (n=469, %= 43.4) did not contain the name at all, and a similar percentage (n= 467, % 43.2) contained one to two appearances. A small percentage of units (n= 144, %= 13.3) contained more than two appearances. Full results are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Correct name appearances per unit (N= 1,080).

Number of Name Appearances	n	%
0	**469**	**43.4**
1	339	31.4
2	128	11.9
3	47	4.4
4	40	3.7
5	21	1.9
6	11	1.0
7	7	.65
8	5	.46
10	2	.19
11	2	.19
12	2	.19
13	4	.37
14	2	.19
47	1	.09
1 to 2	**467**	**43.2**
More than 2	**144**	**13.3**

Table 4.3 demonstrates the average number of correct name appearances by medium. Press

release, publication, and website units, on average, contained two to three appearances of the

name. Facebook was the medium with the greatest average number of correct name appearances

(M= 3.1, ST= 1.68), and YouTube was the medium with the lowest average number of correct

name appearances (M= .17, ST= .53).

Table 4.3 Mean correct name appearances per unit.

Medium	Mean	Std. Dev.
Press Release (N= 166)	2.55	2.69
Facebook (N= 39)	3.1	1.68
Twitter (N= 46)	.98	1.2
Publication (N= 93)	2.25	5.07
YouTube (N= 100)	.17	.53
Radio (N= 497)	.45	.65
Website Page (N= 139)	2.22	2.37
Total Mean (N= 1,080)	**1.25**	**2.32**

Incorrect K-State Research and Extension Name Use

To determine if guidelines were followed, coders checked each unit for appearances of five

specific incorrect versions of the name:

- KSRE,
- K-State Research & Extension,
- K-State Extension,
- Kansas State Research and Extension,
- and Kansas State Research & Extension.

The KSRE acronym was included in this list of incorrect versions because the branding

guidelines indicate the acronym is for internal use only and the study included only external

communication pieces. Incorrect versions of the name occurred in six of the seven media types.

However, these occurrences represent only a small percentage of the units (n = 63, %= 5.9,

combined). Detailed results are found in Table 4.4. Four of the five incorrect versions appeared

in at least one of the units. "Kansas State Research & Extension" did not appear in any of the

units, so this version is not included in Table 4.4. The KSRE acronym was the incorrect version

of the name that occurred most (n= 53, %= 4.9). The KSRE acronym occurred most frequently in website units (n= 49, %= 35.3 of website units). Other incorrect versions specifically examined by coders appeared in low percentages: K-State Research & Extension (n= 5, %= .5), K-State Extension (n= 4, % = .4), and Kansas State Research and Extension (n= 1, %= .1). The Kansas State Research & Extension version did not appear (n= 0, %= 0).

Table 4.4 Frequency and percentage of incorrect name appearances by media type.

	KSRE		K-State Research & Extension		K-State Extension		Kansas State Research and Extension	
Medium	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	0	0	3	1.8	1	.6	0	0
Facebook (N=39)	0	0	1	2.6	0	0	0	0
Twitter (N= 46)	2	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Publication (N= 93)	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
YouTube (N=100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radio (N= 497)	0	0	0	0	2	.4	0	0
Website (N= 139)	49	35.3	1	.7	1	.7	1	.7
Total (N=1,080)	**53**	**4.9**	**5**	**.5**	**4**	**.4**	**1**	**.1**

The KSRE acronym appeared one time in 49 units (n= 49, %= 92.5), two times in two units (n= 2, %= 3.8), and three times in two units (n= 2, %= 3.8). The other incorrect names (K-State Research & Extension, Kansas State Research and Extension, and K-State Research Extension) did not appear multiple times within any unit.

K-State Radio Network Name Use

The name was found in all media types except publication units, as shown in Table 5. The K-State Radio Network name appeared most frequently in radio units (n= 135, %= 27.2), followed

by YouTube units (n=14, %= 14). Overall, the K-State Radio Network appeared in 15.6% (n= 169) of all units, much lower than the percentage of correct name appearances (n= 611, %= 56.6), but higher than the percentages of incorrect names (n= 63, %= 5.9).

Table 4.5 Frequency and percentage of radio name (K-State Radio Network) appearances by media type.

Medium	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	2	1.2
Facebook (N=39)	2	5.1
Twitter (N= 46)	5	10.9
Publication (N= 93)	0	0
YouTube (N=100)	14	14
Radio (N= 497)	135	27.2
Website (N= 139)	11	7.9
Total (N=1,080)	**169**	**15.6**

Not all radio programs used the network name within the first two minutes of the podcast. Table 4.6 demonstrates that programs, Outbound Kansas (n=14, %= 100), Milk Lines (n= 27, %= 96.4), Tree Tales (n= 20, %= 95.2), and Perspective (n= 25, %= 92.6) contained the network name in more than 90% of units. The Agriculture Today (n= 48, %= 17.4) and Sound Living (n= 1, %= 4.8) programs contained the name in less than 20% of units, while Kansas Profile, Weather Wonders, and Wheat Scoop did not contain the name at all (n= 0, %= 0).

Table 4.6 Frequency and percentage of radio name (K-State Radio Network) name appearances by media type.

Radio Program	n	%
Outbound Kansas (N= 14)	14	100
Milk Lines (N=28)	27	96.4
Tree Tales (N= 21)	20	95.2
Perspective (N= 27)	25	92.6
Agriculture Today (N= 276)	48	17.4
Sound Living (N=21)	1	4.8
Kansas Profile (N= 14)	0	0
Weather Wonders (N= 71)	0	0
Wheat Scoop (N= 25)	0	0
Total (N=497)	**135**	**27.2**

Full K-State Research and Extension Name Use

Coders recorded appearances of the full name, "Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service" to see if the name's use was in accordance with brand guidelines. As shown in Table 4.7, the full name only appeared in press release, publication, and website units. The full name appeared in 163 of the 166 press releases (98.2%) and all 93 (100%) of the publications.

When press release units contained the full name (n= 116, %= 98.2), at least one appearance of that full name was within this official statement. For purposes of this research, the statement is classified as Statement A:

K-State Research and Extension is a short name for the Kansas State University

Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, a program designed

to generate and distribute useful knowledge for the well-being of Kansans. Supported by

county, state, federal and private funds, the program has county Extension offices,

experiment fields, area Extension offices and regional research centers statewide. Its

headquarters is on the K-State campus, Manhattan.

When the full name appeared within a statement on the website (n=5, %= 3.6), 80% (n=4) of the

time, the webpage contained a press release and the full name was found within the same

previously stated official statement. However, one of the five appearances (n= 1, %=20) was

within a different statement. The About Us page of the website included the following statement,

Statement B:

> K-State Research and Extension is a short name for the Kansas Agricultural Experiment
>
> Station and Cooperative Extension Service. We are a partnership between Kansas State
>
> University and federal, state, and county government, with offices in every Kansas
>
> county. We conduct research through Kansas that is then shared by Extension agents and
>
> others on our Web sites and through numerous conferences, workshops, field days,
>
> publications, newsletters and more.

All but one of the publication units (n= 92, %= 99) contained at least one appearance of the full

name within a nondiscrimination statement. In the case of the exception, the full name appeared

unattached to a statement of any kind. Full results are shown in Table 7. The following

nondiscrimination statement (Statement C) appeared in 99% of the publication units:

> K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
>
> Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work, Acts of May 8 and June 30,

1914, as amended. Kansas State University, County Extension Councils, Extension

Districts, and United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating, John D. Floros,

Director.

Table 4.7 Frequency and percentage of full name (Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Service) appearances by media type.

	Full name		Full name within a statement		Full name within a nondiscrimination statement	
Medium	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	163	98.2	163	98.2	0	0
Facebook (N=39)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twitter (N= 46)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Publication (N= 93)	93	100	92	99	92	99
YouTube (N=100)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radio (N= 497)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Website (N= 139)	7	5	5	3.6	0	0
Total (N=1,080)	**263**	**24.4**	**260**	**24.1**	**92**	**8.5**

Extension Name Use

As instructed by the codebook, coders recorded all appearances of the name "Extension" within

the unit "as an official, capitalized title, referring to KSRE." Coders recorded appearances of the

Extension name in all media. Extension appeared most frequently in press release (n= 164, %=

99) and publication units (n= 91, %= 99) because Extension appeared within the official

statement and nondiscrimination statements (included in most units, as shown in Table 7).

Excluding press release and publication units, the Extension name appeared in relatively low

percentages, ranging from 5.2% (n= 26) for radio to 22% (n= 30) for website units. This is

shown is Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Frequency and percentage of extension name (Extension) by media type.

Medium	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	164	99
Facebook (N=39)	5	12.8
Twitter (N= 46)	8	17.4
Publication (N= 93)	91	99
YouTube (N=100)	15	15
Radio (N= 497)	26	5.2
Website (N= 139)	30	22
Total (N=1,080)	**339**	**31**

Other Versions of the K-State Research and Extension Name Use

Coders also made note of other versions of the K-State Research and Extension name. These

findings are shown below in Tables 4.9 and 4.12. The "K-StateRes&Extension" and

"KStateResExt" names occurred in all Twitter units (n= 46, %= 4.3). The K-State Research and

Extension News name (n= 63m %= 5.8) was the most common other version and it occurred in

website (n= 15, %= 34.5) and press release units (n= 15, %= 9). The most common other name

versions are shown below in Table 4.9. Three major themes of "other" versions of the name

occurred. These are communications or marketing references, version of the entire KSRE name,

and entities of KSRE. It is of note that use of other names share common characteristics, such as

author and specific radio program. Full results regarding the relationship between other names

and authors and programs are shown in Tables 4.10 and 4.11.

Table 4.9 Frequency of other forms of the KSRE name appearances by media type (N= 1,080).

Communications or marketing	n	%	Medium(s)
K-State Research and Extension News	63	5.8	Website (48), Press Release (15)
K-State Research and Extension News Media Services	24	2.2	Press Release
Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University	25	2.3	Radio
K-State Research and Extension Department of Communications News Unit	16	1.5	Press Release
Department of Communications and Agricultural Education	15	1.4	Website
K-State Research & Extension News	13	1.2	Press Release
Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University over the K-State Radio Network	7	.6	Radio
Versions of K-State Research and Extension			
K-StateRes&Extension And @KStateResExt	46	4.3	Twitter
Research and Extension at Kansas State University	24	2.2	Radio
Research and Extension	12	1.1	Radio (7), Website (3), YouTube (2)
Produced by Research and Extension at Kansas State University	15	1.4	Radio
Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station	6	.6	Website (3), Press Release (1), Publication (1), YouTube (1)
K-State Research and Extension entities			
K-State Research Extension Bookstore	13	1.2	Website
K-State Research and Extension Events	10	.9	Website

*The bolded themes were determined through a qualitative analysis.

As shown in Table 4.10, the other KSRE name versions that appeared in multiple press releases (five versions from Table 4.9) are attributed to five unique authors. Three of the five other versions can be attributed to a single author.

Table 4.10 Other KSRE name appearances in press release units and respective author attributions

Name	Author(s)
K-State Research and Extension News (n=15)	Author D (7), Author A (7), Author B (1)
K-State Research and Extension News Media Services (n= 24)	Author B (23), Author C & D (1)
K-State Research and Extension Department of Communications News Unit (n= 16)	Author A
K-State Research & Extension News (n= 13)	Author A
News Media and Marketing Services (n= 4)	Author E

As shown in Table 4.11, the other KSRE name versions that appeared in multiple radio units (five versions from Table 4.9) represent four unique radio programs. Nine programs were included in the study. Four of the six other versions of the KSRE name were only found in units from one radio program (e.g. "Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University" was only found in the Milk Lines program.)

Table 4.11 Other KSRE name appearances in radio units and respective radio programs.

Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University (n= 25)	Milk Lines
Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University over the K-State Radio Network (n= 7)	Perspective
Research and Extension at Kansas State University (n= 24)	Perspective (12), Sound Living (11), Agriculture Today (1)
Produced by Research and Extension at Kansas State University (n= 15)	Sound Living (10), Perspective (5)
Research and Extension (n= 12)	Agriculture Today

Additional references to the KSRE name occurred less frequently (n= 4 or less units, %= .4 or less). A total of 52 other forms of the KSRE name are shown in Table 4.12. Common themes were: version of the entire KSRE name; research and extension specialists; county, district and research center locations; research and extension entities, communications or marketing references, and other.

Table 4.12 Other forms of the KSRE name that appeared in 4 or less units.

Versions of K-State Research and Extension	n	Medium(s)
Agricultural Experiment Station	3	Website
K-State Extension	3	Website (2), Radio (1)
Research and Extension at Kansas State	2	Radio, YouTube
Kansas State University Research and Extension	2	Publication
K-State Research	1	Radio
Research- Extension Center	1	Radio
The Kansas Cooperative Extension Service	1	Radio
Kansas Cooperative Service	1	Press Release
Research and Extension Service	1	Press Release
Kansas Cooperative Extension Service	1	Website
Kansas State University Cooperative Extension Service	1	Publication
Kansas State University Extension	1	Publication
Research and extension specialists		
Research and Extension 4-H specialist at K-State	4	Radio
Research and Extension agricultural economist	3	Radio
Research and Extension farm safety specialist at Kansas State	2	Radio, YouTube
Professor and Extension beef veterinarian for Kansas State	1	Radio
Research and Extension 4-H specialist for K-State based in Northwest Kansas	1	Radio
Research and Extension 4-H specialist based in Northwest Kansas	1	Radio
Research and Extension 4-H specialist for Southeast Kansas	1	Radio
Research and Extension agricultural economist for K-State	1	Radio
Research and Extension crop entomologist at Kansas State	1	Radio
Research and Extension crop production specialist	1	Radio
Research and Extension economist for K-State	1	Radio
Research and Extension irrigation engineer here at Kansas State	1	Radio
Research and Extension farm livestock specialist for K-State	1	Radio
Research and Extension farm poultry specialist for Kansas State	1	Radio
Research and Extension specialist	1	Radio
Research and Extension specialist at Kansas State University	1	Radio
County or district names or research center locations		
Southwest Research-Extension Center	2	Press Release
Kansas State University Southeast Area Agricultural Research Center	1	Press Release
Rice County Research and Extension Office	1	Press Release
Johnson County Extension	1	Press Release
K-State Southwest Research-Extension Center	1	Press Release
Northwest Area Extension Office	1	Website
Post Rock Extension	1	Website
KSU Southwest Research-Extension Center	1	Publication
Agricultural Research Center Hays	1	YouTube
K-State Agricultural Research Center in Hays	1	Website
Southeast Area Extension	1	Publication
K-State Research and Extension entities		
K-State Research and Extension Web site	3	Website
PRIDE Office	1	Press Release
K-State Research and Extension PRIDE Coordinator	1	Press Release
K-State Research and Extension Operations	1	Press Release
K-State Research and Extension Prepare Kansas Team	1	Website
K-State Research and Extension Entomology	1	Publication
Horticulture Research and Extension Center	2	Press Release, Publication
Kansas State University Research and Extension's Rapid Response Center	1	Press Release
Communications or marketing		
News Media and Marketing Services	4	Press Release
K-State Research and Extension News Media and Marketing	1	Press Release
Department of Communications at Kansas State University	2	Radio
K-State Research and Extension's Department of Communication	1	Website
Communications and Agricultural Education	1	Website
Other		
Ag AM in Kansas	1	YouTube
KSAC-Kansas State Agricultural College	1	YouTube

*The bolded themes were determined through a qualitative analysis.

Kansas State University Name Use

To compare with appearances of the K-State Research and Extension name, appearances of the Kansas State University name were also recorded. Appearances of versions of the Kansas State University name are shown in Table 4.13 and 4.14. The version that appeared most frequently was "Kansas State University" (n= 558 units, %= 51.7). The Kansas State University name appeared most frequently in publications (n= 92, %= 98.9), followed by websites (n= 119, %= 85.6) and press releases (n= 114, %= 68.7). This name appeared slightly less than the correct version of the K-State Research and Extension name, which appeared in 611 (%= 56.6) units (from Table 4.1).

Table 4.13 Frequency and percentage of Kansas State University name appearances by media type.

Medium	Kansas State University		K-State		Kansas State		KSU	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	114	68.7	162	97.6	7	4.2	1	.6
Facebook (N=39)	10	25.6	20	51.3	2	5.1	3	7.7
Twitter (N= 46)	18	39.1	45	97.8	6	13	5	10.9
Publication (N= 93)	92	98.9	16	17.2	1	1.1	1	1.1
YouTube (N=100)	21	21	25	25	10	10	2	2
Radio (N= 497)	184	37	80	16.1	42	8.5	2	.4
Website (N= 139)	119	85.6	120	86.3	4	2.9	16	11.5
Total (N=1,080)	**558**	**51.7**	**468**	**43.3**	**72**	**6.7**	**30**	**2.8**

The K-State name appeared most frequently in Twitter (n= 45, %= 97.8) and press release units (n= 162, %= 97.6), followed by websites (n= 120, %= 86.3). The "Kansas State" and "KSU" names were not specifically included in the codebook, but coders recorded the names as other versions of the Kansas State University name. Kansas State and KSU were found in 6.7% (n=

72) and 2.8% (n= 30) of all units respectively. Nine (%= .83) other versions of the Kansas State

University name appeared only one time and are shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14 Other forms of the Kansas State University name (that appeared one time) and media type.

Name	Medium
Kansas State University Libraries	Website
K.S.U.	Website
Kansas St.	Website
The University	Website
K-State Manhattan	YouTube
K-State University	YouTube
Kansas State University Foundation	Radio
K-State Olathe	Radio
Kansas State Agricultural College Livestock	Twitter

Most used KSRE and Kansas State University Names Within Units

Table 4.15 demonstrates how frequently the previously mentioned names appeared within units.

As previously shown in Table 4.3, the KSRE name only occurs more than two times within a

unit in 144 instances (13.3%). The Kansas State University name occurs more than two times

within a unit slightly more frequently (n= 214, %= 19.8). However, the KSRE name occurs one

to two times within a unit (n=467, %= 43.2) more frequently than the Kansas State University

name (n= 344, %= 31.9).

The K-State name also appears quite frequently within units, one to two times (n= 332, %= 30.7)

and two or more times (n= 135, %= 12.5). The K-State Radio Network name and KSRE

acronym appeared in much smaller percentages than the other names, in both one to two

appearances within units (n= 166, %= 15.4 and n= 51, %= 4.7, respectively) and two or more

appearances within units (n=6, %= 5.6 and n= 2, %= .19, respectively).

Table 4.15 Name appearances per unit (N= 1,080).

Appearances Per Unit	Kansas State University		K-State Research and Extension		K-State		K-State Radio Network		KSRE	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	**522**	**48.3**	**469**	**43.4**	**612**	**56.7**	**908**	**84.1**	**1,027**	**95.1**
1	269	24.9	339	31.4	236	21.9	154	14.3	49	4.5
2	75	69.4	128	.12	96	8.9	12	1.1	2	.19
3	156	14.4	47	4.4	32	3.0	2	.19	2	.19
4	29	2.7	40	3.7	25	2.3	0	0	0	0
5	10	.93	21	1.9	18	1.7	1	.09	0	0
6	7	.65	11	1.0	11	1.0	1	.09	0	0
7	3	.28	7	.65	5	.46	1	.09	0	0
8	0	0	5	.46	14	1.3	0	0	0	0
9	3	.28	0	0	7	.65	0	0	0	0
10-14	0	0	12	1.1	6	5.6	0	0	0	0
15- 50	6	5.6	1	.09	15	1.4	1	.09	0	0
123- 126	0	0	0	0	2	.19	0	0	0	0
1 to 2	**344**	**31.9**	**467**	**43.2**	**332**	**30.7**	**166**	**15.4**	**51**	**4.7**
More than 2	**214**	**19.8**	**144**	**13.3**	**135**	**12.5**	**6**	**5.6**	**2**	**.19**

K-State Research and Extension Slogan Use

The Knowledge for Life slogan appeared three times across all units (0.3%), as shown in Table

4.16. These appearances do not include appearances of the slogan within the official Knowledge

for Life wordmark (shown in Table 4.17). The Knowledge for Life wordmark appeared at least

one time in all media types, excluding press releases. The wordmark version of the slogan

appeared in 17 units (n= 2.9%).

Table 4.16 Frequency and percentage of Knowledge for Life slogan appearances (excluding appearances in wordmark).

Medium	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	0	0
Facebook (N=39)	0	0
Twitter (N= 46)	0	0
Publication (N= 93)	1	1.1
YouTube (N=100)	1	1
Radio (N= 497)	0	0
Website (N= 139)	1	.7
Total (N=1,080)	**3**	**.3**

K-State Research and Extension and Kansas State University Graphic Use

The coders recorded appearances of nine K-State Research and Extension and Kansas State

University graphics, shown in Table 4.17. Radio units were not included in the table because the

medium does not allow for use of graphics. The K-State Research and Extension wordmark with

Powercat and the Knowledge for Life wordmark appeared in at least one unit in all media types,

except press releases. No graphics appeared in any of the press release units (n= 0, %= 0).

Graphics that appeared in the highest percentage of units were the K-State Research and

Extension wordmark with Powercat (n= 205, %= 35.2), the K-State Research and Extension

wordmark (without Powercat) (n= 137, %= 23.5), and the University seal (n= 93, %= 16).

The most popular graphic (KSRE graphic with the Powercat) occurred in 100% of the Facebook

(n= 39) and Twitter units (n= 46). This graphic also appears in 98% of the publication units (n=

91). Overall, across all possible media types, the graphic appears in 35.2% of units (n= 205). The graphic occurs in 23% of the YouTube videos (n= 23).

The KSRE wordmark without the Powercat only appeared in YouTube (n= 37, %= 37) and website (n= 98, %= 70.5) units, but it was still the second most frequently used graphic across all media (n= 137, %= 23.5). This wordmark appeared in the majority of website units (n= 98, %= 70.5). The University seal was only found in websites, but was the third most frequently used graphic across all media (n= 93, %= 16), appearing in the majority of website units (n= 93, %= 66.9). The President's seal and the K-State wordmark did not appear in any of the units. The Kansas State University wordmark (n= 59, %= 10.1), Knowledge for Life wordmark (n= 17, %= 2.9), K-State Radio Network logo (n= 7, %= 1.2), and Powercat (n=3, %= .5%) appeared in percentages of 17% or lower. Full results are found in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17 Frequency and percentage of K-State Research and Extension and Kansas State University graphics by media type.

Medium	K-State Research and Extension wordmark with Powercat		K-State Research and Extension wordmark		University seal		Kansas State University wordmark		Knowledge for Life wordmark		K-State Radio Network logo		Powercat alone		President's seal		K-State wordmark		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facebook (N=39)	39	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.3	1	2.6	1	2.6	0	0	0	0	43	110.3
Twitter (N= 46)	46	100	0	0	0	0	3	6.5	1	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	108.7
Publication (N= 93)	91	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	1	1.1	2	2.2	0	0	0	0	95	102.3
YouTube (N=100)	23	23	37	37	0	0	22	22	11	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	95
Website (N= 139)	6	4.3	98	70.5	93	66.9	34	24.5	2	1.4	3	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	169.9
Total (N=583)	205	35.2	137	23.5	93	16	59	10.1	17	2.9	7	1.2	3	.5	0	0	0	0	519	48.1

*Radio units are excluded because the medium does not allow for graphics.

The coders checked for other, compressed, stretched or manipulated graphics. No graphics appeared in any color besides purple and black and white. All 17 manipulated graphics or other graphics related to KSRE or Kansas State University (%= 2.7%) are shown in Table 4.18. These graphics included the Kansas State University sesquicentennial logo, an older version of the KSRE wordmark, a manipulated and a cropped version of the K-State Radio Network logo, and other graphics representing KSRE-affiliated programs. One version of the KSRE wordmark appeared directly above the Department of Agronomy name, which gives the same visual impression of a manipulated graphic, cobranding the two entities. The most popular of the other or manipulated graphics was the Kansas State University sesquicentennial logo, which appeared five times (.84%), in two different versions.

Table 4.18 Frequency and percentage of other or manipulated K-State Research and Extension or Kansas State University graphic appearances.

Graphic	N (N= 583)	%	Medium(s)
	4	.67	YouTube (3), Website (1)
	2	.34	YouTube
	1	.17	Publication
	1	.17	Publication
	1	.17	Publication
	1	.17	Publication
	1	.17	Publication
	1	.17	Website
	1	.17	Website
	1	.17	Website
	1	.17	Website
	1	.17	YouTube
	1	.17	Facebook

Cobranding

To determine the extent of cobranding and proper cobranding, the coders gathered information

regarding other organizations or brand names mentioned within a unit. The frequency of other

organization or brand appearances is shown in Table 4.19. Units in each media type contained

high percentages, ranging from 46.2% (n= 18) to 95.7% (n= 44) of other organization or brand

name appearances, with Facebook units containing the smallest percentage (n= 18, %= 46.2).

Overall, 79.9% (n= 863) of all units included at least one appearance of an other organization or

brand name.

Table 4.19 Frequency and percentage of other organization or brand name appearances by media type).

Medium	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	145	87
Facebook (N=39)	18	46.2
Twitter (N= 46)	44	95.7
Publication (N= 93)	83	89
YouTube (N=100)	75	75
Radio (N= 497)	421	84.7
Website (N= 139)	77	55.4
Total (N=1,080)	**863**	**79.9**

To make inferences about cobranding, coders also recorded appearances of graphics attributed to

the other organization or brand names. Only 10.5% (n= 61) of all units contained such graphics.

YouTube units contained the greatest percentage of other organization or brand graphics (n= 35,

%= 35). Codebook instructions included criteria for determining if these graphics were properly

cobranded with KSRE graphics, based on branding guidelines. Overall, 7.1% (n= 41) of units

contained at least one instance of improper cobranding. YouTube units contained the greatest

percentage of units with at least one instance of improper cobranding (n= 32, %= 32). The

appearances of other organization or brand graphics and improper cobranding are shown in Table

4.20.

Table 4.20 Frequency and percentage of other organization of brand name graphic appearances and proper cobranding by media type.

Medium	Other Organization Graphic Appearances		Improper Cobranding		Proper Cobranding	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	2	1.2	0	0	2	1.2
Facebook (N=39)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twitter (N= 46)	7	15.2	2	4.3	5	10.9
Publication (N= 93)	7	7.5	3	3.2	4	4.3
YouTube (N=100)	35	35	32	32	3	3
Website (N= 139)	10	10.5	4	2.9	6	4.3
Total (N=583)	**61**	**10.5**	**41**	**7.1**	**20**	**3.4**

* Radio units were excluded because the medium does not allow for graphics.

Table 21 lists all organization or brand names coders recorded as improperly cobranded with K-State Research and Extension. The table includes the number of units in which the improper cobranding occurs and the type of unit. Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities, a program of K-State Research and Extension, was the most common cause of improper branding (n= 24, %= 58.5 of the improper branding instances). Three organization/brand names occurred two times (4.9%), and 11 organization/brand names occurred one time (2.4%).

Table 4.21 Frequency of other organization or brand logos improperly cobranded with K-State Research and Extension.

Organization or brand name (N= 41)	n	%	Medium(s)
Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities	24	58.5	YouTube (22), Twitter (1), Website (1)
Animal ID, Inc.	2	4.9	YouTube
Kansas 4-H	2	4.9	YouTube
Swine Day	2	4.9	YouTube
Frito Lay (Alternative Fuel)	1	2.4	YouTube
KAT Nurseries	1	2.4	YouTube
Kansas State University (Research Video)	1	2.4	YouTube
multiple environmental organizations (Prescribed Burns Video)	1	2.4	YouTube
Integrated Pest Management graphic	1	2.4	Publication
Department of Agronomy	1	2.4	Publication
Kansas Forest Service and 811 logo	1	2.4	Publication
Kansas Association of County Agricultural Agents	1	2.4	Website
PLANET Student Career Days	1	2.4	Website
Walk Kansas	1	2.4	Website
Kids a Cookin'	1	2.4	Twitter

Image Use

Branding guidelines recommend using photos that portray a teaching moment. As instructed by the codebook, coders recorded the number of images and the number of times at least one teaching moment occurred within an image, shown in Table 4.22. Overall, 46.3% (n= 270) of all units that could contain images (excluding radio units) contained at least one image. Moving images were counted in the case of YouTube videos, so 100% (n= 100) of the YouTube units contained images. Press releases contained the lowest percentage of images (n= 19, %= 11.4). Facebook contained the highest percentage of images (n= 35, %= 89.7), after YouTube (n= 100, %= 100).

The percentage of teaching moment appearances (n= 46, %= 7.9) was much lower than the percentage of image appearances (n= 270, %= 46.3). Only 17% (n= 46) of units that contained image appearances (n= 270) contained at least one teaching moment image. Overall, 7.9% (n= 46) of all units that could contain images contained at least one teaching moment. YouTube videos contained the highest percentage of teaching moments (n= 270, %= 23). Twitter contained the lowest (n= 0, %= 0), followed by the second-lowest, press releases (n= 1, %= .6).

Table 4.22 Frequency and percentage of images containing a teaching moment by media type.

	Image Appearance		Image Containing Teaching Moment	
Medium	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	19	11.4	1	.6
Facebook (N=39)	35	89.7	6	15.4
Twitter (N= 46)	33	71.7	0	0
Publication (N= 93)	17	18.3	2	2.2
YouTube (N=100)	100	100	23	23
Website (N= 139)	66	47.5	14	10.1
Total (N=583)	**270**	**46.3**	**46**	**7.9**

*Radio units were not included because the medium does not allow for images.

Lack of Correct Brand Name and Other Brand Representations.

Only 56.6% of units (n= 611) contained at least one appearance of the correct K-State Research

and Extension name, meaning 43.4% of units (n= 469) did not contain the correct name. To

evaluate brand representation within those units, the 469 units were examined separately for

appearances of graphics and names.

A total of 223 graphics (%= 142) were displayed within the 469 lack-of-correct-name units. Full

results are found in Table 4.23. The radio medium does not allow for graphics, so the 312 lack-of-

correct-name radio units were left out of Table 4.23, making n= 157. None of the graphics

appeared in more than 26% (n=89) of the lack-of-correct-name units. The most popular graphic to

appear in these units was the K-State Research and Extension wordmark without the Powercat

(n= 89, %= 26), followed by the Powercat version (n= 43, %= 12.6). Graphics predominately

occurred in YouTube and website lack-of-correct-name units. An incorrect, outdated version of

the KSRE wordmark appeared in three (%= 1.9) of the lack-of-correct-name YouTube units.

Table 4.23 Frequency and percentage of graphic appearances within the lack-of-correct-name units.

Medium	KSRE wordmark		Kansas State University wordmark		KSRE wordmark with Powercat		University seal		Knowledge for Life wordmark		Incorrect version		K-State Radio Network logo	
Press Release (N= 2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twitter (N= 22)	0	0	1	4.5	22	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
YouTube (N= 87)	55	63	20	23	21	24	0	0	9	10.3	3	3.4	1	1.1
Website (N= 46)	34	74	29	63	0	0	26	56.5	1	2.2	0	0	1	2.2
Total (N=157)	**89**	**26**	**50**	**31.8**	**43**	**12.6**	**26**	**7.6**	**10**	**2.9**	**3**	**1.9**	**2**	**.58**

* Facebook and publication units are excluded because the units each contained at least one appearance of the correct KSRE name. Radio units are excluded because the medium does not allow for graphics.

In comparison, Table 4.24 shows all versions of the name that occurred in the units without a

correct name appearance (n= 469). The most popular name was Kansas State University (n= 185,

%= 39.4), followed by K-State (n= 142, %= 30.3), K-State Radio Network (n= 117, %= 24.9),

and other versions of the KSRE name (n= 104, %= 22.2). The other versions of the KSRE and

Kansas State University name categories were not examined closer, but based on examination of

all other versions of the names, shown in Tables 4.9, 4.12, and 4.14, these versions were

determined to be incorrect or less appropriate versions of the name. Overall, 270 (57.7%) of the

lack-of-correct-name units contained at least one incorrect or less appropriate version of the

KSRE or Kansas State University name.

Table 4.24 Frequency and percentage of other and incorrect name appearances within lack-of-correct-name units.

Medium	Kansas State University		K-State		K-State Radio Network		Other Version of KSRE Name**		Other Version of KSU Name**		Kansas State**		Extension**		KSU**		Full Name		K-State Extension**		KSRE**		K-State Research & Extension**	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 2)	1	50	2	100	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twitter (N= 22)	7	31.8	21	95.5	2	9.1	22	100	6	27.3	4	18.2	3	13.6	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	0	0
YouTube (N=87)	17	19.5	22	25.3	12	13.8	4	4.6	14	16.1	10	11.5	13	14.9	2	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radio (N= 312)	130	41.7	68	21.8	100	32.1	59	18.9	37	11.9	35	11.2	23	7.4	2	.6	0	0	2	.6	0	0	0	0
Website (N= 46)	30	65.2	29	63	3	6.5	18	39.1	2	4.3	1	2.2	6	13	2	4.3	1	2.2	0	0	0	0	1	2.2
Total (N=469)	**185**	**39.4**	**142**	**30.3**	**117**	**24.9**	**104**	**22.2**	**59**	**12.6**	**50**	**10.7**	**46**	**9.8**	**7**	**1.5**	**3**	**.6**	**2**	**.4**	**1**	**.2**	**1**	**.2**

*Facebook and publication units are excluded because the units each contained at least one appearance of the correct KSRE name.
**These versions of the name are considered to be incorrect and/or less appropriate representations of the organization.

A small percentage (n= 94, %= 20) of the lack-of-correct-name units did not contain any version

of the KSRE and Kansas State University names, as shown in Table 4.25. Additionally, 24.2%

(n=38) of the lack-of-correct-name units that could include a graphic did not contain a graphic. A

lower percentage of the lack-of-correct-name units (n= 20, %= 12.7%) contained neither a name

nor graphic.

YouTube was the medium with the greatest percentage of units with neither a name nor graphic

(n= 17, %= 19.5). Three of the 87 (3.4%) YouTube units with no correct name included an

incorrect version of a KSRE graphic (as shown in Table 4.23). Website is the only other medium

that contained units with no correct name and neither versions of the KSRE or Kansas State

University name nor graphics (n= 3, %= 6.5).

Table 4.25 Frequency and percentage of lack-of-correct-name units without a K-State Research and Extension or Kansas State University name or graphic of any form, by media type.

	Without a name		Without a graphic		Without a name nor graphic	
Medium	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 2)	0	0	2	100	0	0
Twitter (N= 22)	0	0	0	0	0	0
YouTube (N= 87)	27	31	33	37.9	17	19.5
Radio (N= 312, 0)	58	18.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
Website (N= 46)	9	19.6	3	6.5	3	6.5
Total (N= 469, 157, 157)	**94**	**20**	**38**	**24.2**	**20**	**12.7**

* Facebook and Publication units are excluded because the units each contained at least one appearance of the correct KSRE name. Radio units are excluded from the graphic portions because the medium does not allow for graphics.

RO2: Extent of Calls to Action Provided in External Communication

To gather information needed for RO2, "assess the extent to which KSRE audience members are provided with a call to action in external communication," the coders recorded appearances of website links, social media links, phone numbers, email addresses, and mailing addresses provided in the external communication pieces.

Website links

Coders determined if each unit contained at least one link to a website in written or hyperlink form, as shown in Table 4.26. Overall, 476 (44.1%) of units contained at least one website link. The overall percentage is low, partially because radio units (the largest represented media type) contained a very low percentage (n= 12, %= 2.4) of links. Beside radio units, all other media types, with the exception of YouTube at 14% (n= 14), contained website links within more than 75% of units.

The coders also determined the type of links provided: to the home page (n= 190, %= 17.6), to another KSRE website page (n= 328, %= 30.4), and to a non-KSRE page (n= 321, %= 29.7). The publication units contained the largest number of home-page links (n= 91, %= 97.8).

Table 4.26 Frequency and percentage of website link type by media type.

	Any website link		Home page		Other KSRE page		Non-KSRE page	
Medium (N)	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (n= 166)	156	94	14	8.4	145	4.2	93	56
Facebook (n=39)	30	76.9	1	2.7	29	74.4	13	33.3
Twitter (n= 46)	46	100	2	4.3	44	97	31	67.4
Publication (n= 93)	93	100	91	97.8	2	2.2	77	83
YouTube (n=100)	14	14	6	6	8	8	8	8
Radio (n= 497)	12	2.4	1	.2	11	2.2	11	2.2
Website (n= 139)	125	89.9	75	54	50	36	88	63.3
Total (n=1,080)	**476**	**44.1**	**190**	**17.6**	**328**	**30.4**	**321**	**29.7**

Social media links

Coders recorded every time one of the five KSRE social media sites was provided in a hyperlink or written link. Other social media sites related to KSRE, such as blogs, were recorded as "other." Table 4.27 shows how frequently each of the sites were provided as a potential call to action. YouTube was the most popular at (n= 128, %= 11.9), followed by Facebook (n= 87, %= 8.1). When provided, all social media sites were most frequently found in Twitter (n= 94, %= 204.3%) and website units (n= 131, %= 94.2), with the exception of Flickr (most commonly found in press releases, n= 19, %= 11.4). Twitter was the social media site provided least often as a potential call to action (n= 2, %= .19), and it was only provided in website units.

Some of the social media links provided in website units were broken or led to Kansas State University social media sites; these are not included in the findings. Eighty-seven units (8.1%) contained links to more than one social media site.

Table 4.27 Frequency and percentage of social media links by social media and media type.

	YouTube		Facebook		Flickr		Other		Pinterest		Twitter		Total	
Medium	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	**n**	**%**
Press Release (N= 166)	8	4.8	0	0	19	11.4	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	**29**	**17.5**
Facebook (N=39)	6	15.4	0	0	0	0	1	2.7	0	0	0	0	**7**	**17.9**
Twitter (N= 46)	35	76	38	83	1	2.2	8	17.4	12	26.1	0	0	**94**	**204.3**
Publication (N= 93)	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	**3**	**3.2**
YouTube (N=100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Radio (N= 497)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Website (N= 139)	78	56.1	48	34.5	0	0	2	1.4	1	.7	2	1.4	**131**	**94.2**
Total (N= 1,080)	**128**	**11.9**	**87**	**8.1**	**20**	**1.85**	**14**	**1.3**	**13**	**1.2**	**2**	**.19**	**264**	**24.4**

Phone, Email, Mailing, and QR Codes

Appearances of phone numbers, email addresses, and mailing addresses were recorded. The coders also checked for appearances of QR codes, but none appeared in any of the units. Table 4.28 shows the frequency of phone number, email addresses, and mailing address appearances, along with the previously mentioned website and social media links. The table demonstrates website links were the most commonly provided type of call to action (n= 476, % 44.1), followed by phone numbers (n= 280, %= 25.9), and email addresses (n= 212, %= 19.6). Phone numbers were only provided in press release (n= 158, %= 95.2), website (n= 114, %= 82), and publication units (n= 7, %= 7.5). Email and mailing addresses were primarily only provided in these media types as well, but did occur in low percentages of other types; email addresses occurred in three (.6%) of the radio units and mailing addresses occurred in one Facebook unit (2.6%) and one radio unit (.2%).

Table 4.28 Frequency and percentage of calls to action by media type.

Medium	Website link n	Website link %	Phone number n	Phone number %	Email address n	Email address %	Social media link n	Social media link %	Mailing address n	Mailing address %	Total n	Total %
Press Release (N= 166)	156	94	158	95.2	165	99.4	26	15.7	5	3	**510**	**307.2**
Facebook (N= 39)	30	76.9	0	0	0	0	7	18	1	2.6	**38**	**97.4**
Twitter (N= 46)	46	100	0	0	0	0	45	98	0	0	**91**	**197.8**
Publication (N= 93)	93	100	7	7.5	9	9.7	2	2.2	3	3.2	**114**	**122.6**
YouTube (N=100)	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**14**	**14**
Radio (N= 497)	12	2.4	0	0	3	.6	0	0	1	.2	**16**	**3.2**
Website (N= 139)	125	90	114	82	35	25.2	78	56	111	79.9	**463**	**333.1**
Total (N=1,080)	**476**	**44.1**	**280**	**25.9**	**212**	**19.6**	**158**	**14.6**	**121**	**11.2**	**1,246**	**115.4**

RO3: Extent of Targeted Audiences in External Communication

To gather information needed for RO3, "determine the extent to which KSRE targets its key audiences in external communication," coders decided whether content would be of interest to 12 audience groups (defined in the codebook) and whether the words "urban" and "rural" were included within the units. The targeted content was also examined in relation to calls to action provided.

Target Audiences

Table 4.29 shows the frequency in which content of interest was provided to each audience group, by media type. Agricultural professionals were the most targeted group (n= 729, %= 67.5), followed by funding sources (n= 302, %= 28), all Kansans (n= 276, %= 26.8), and

gardeners (n= 152, %= 14.1). The least targeted groups were senior citizens (n= 19, %= 1.8) and youth (n= 93, %= 8.6).

Twitter contained the most content of interest to all audience groups (a total of n= 298, %= 647.8), except for senior citizens. Content of interest to senior citizens was found slightly more frequently in websites (n= 7, %= 5) than in Twitter units (n= 2, %= 4.3). All media types displayed zero or small percentages of content of interest to senior citizens; website units contained the most content of interest to senior citizens (n= 7, %= 5) and YouTube and Facebook contained none (n= 0, %= 0).

The least used media type varied with each audience group, and the percentages were close. In terms of percentage, Facebook was the least used media type for agricultural professionals (n= 23, %= 59), followed closely by website units (n= 83, %= 59.7). Publications were the least common medium containing content for funding sources (n= 8, %= 8.6), all Kansans (n= 6, %= 6.5), and students/perspective students (n= 1, %= 1.1). Radio contained the least amount of content for gardeners (n= 23, %= 4.6), KSRE volunteers (n= 14, %= 2.8), and youth (n= 18, %= 3.6). YouTube contained the least amount of content for employees (n= 2, %= 2), parents (n= 6, %= 6), adults (n= 2, %= 2), and homeowner/landowners (n= 7, %= 7).

Table 4.29 Frequency and percentage of content of interest to audience groups by media type.

Medium	Agricultural Professionals		Funding Sources		All Kansans		Gardeners		Employees		Parents		Adults		Homeowners/ Landowners		KSRE Volunteers		Students/ Perspective Students		Youth		Senior Citizens	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	106	63.9	58	34.9	40	24.1	17	10.2	46	27.7	31	18.7	27	16.3	14	8.4	25	15.1	10	6	23	13.9	5	3
Facebook (N= 39)	23	59	12	30.8	6	15.4	7	17.9	12	30.8	10	25.6	11	28.2	3	7.7	10	25.6	11	28.2	9	23.1	0	0
Twitter (N= 46)	45	97.8	23	50	33	71.7	38	82.6	26	56.5	26	56.5	23	50	19	41.3	26	56.5	16	34.8	21	45.7	2	4.3
Publication (N= 93)	79	84.9	8	8.6	6	6.5	11	11.8	3	3.2	7	7.5	8	8.6	7	7.5	6	6.5	1	1.1	5	5.4	3	3.2
YouTube (N=100)	66	66	19	19	14	14	32	32	2	2	6	6	2	2	7	7	4	4	5	5	5	5	0	0
Radio (N= 497)	327	65.8	148	29.8	145	29.2	23	4.6	12	2.4	25	50	32	6.4	41	8.2	14	2.8	8	1.6	18	3.6	2	.4
Website (N= 139)	83	59.7	34	24.5	35	25.2	24	17.3	46	33	39	28.1	31	22.3	24	17.3	15	10.8	45	32.4	12	8.6	7	5
Total (N=1,080)	**729**	**67.5**	**302**	**28**	**279**	**26.8**	**152**	**14.1**	**147**	**13.6**	**144**	**13.3**	**134**	**12.4**	**115**	**10.6**	**100**	**9.3**	**96**	**8.9**	**93**	**8.6**	**19**	**1.8**

Target Audiences and Calls to Action

Table 4.30 demonstrates the frequency of each call to action type provided in units targeted to each audience group. The ratio of calls to action per unit was calculated. This ratio demonstrated the total number of calls to action provided in units tailored to the audience group divided by the total number of units containing content of interest to the audience group. The ratio is greater than one for all audience groups, meaning, on average, each time an audience group was targeted, at least one call to action was provided within the unit. Senior citizens and employees were provided with the greatest ratio of calls to action per audience group (2.8 to 1), followed by KSRE volunteers, adults, students/perspective students, and parents (2.5 to 1). The most frequently targeted group, agricultural professionals, had the lowest ratio of calls to action per unit (1.3 to 1), just slightly lower than the ratios for all Kansas and funding sources (1.4 to 1). Table 4.31 also shows which calls to action were provided in units targeted to each group. A Twitter link was only provided in a single unit containing targeted content.

Table 4.30 Frequency and percentage of calls to action provided within units containing content of interest to audience groups.

Medium	Phone number		Email address		Mailing address		Website link		Facebook link		Twitter link		YouTube link		Pinterest link		Flickr link		Other Social Media link		Total Calls to Action Ratio of calls per units	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	Ratio
Senior Citizens (N= 19)	15	78.9	7	36.8	9	47.4	17	89.5	7	36.8	0	0	8	42.1	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	54	**2.8 to 1**
Employees (N= 147)	89	60.5	56	38.1	43	29.3	131	89.1	32	21.8	0	0	49	33.3	5	3.4	4	2.7	7	4.8	416	**2.8 to 1**
KSRE Volunteers (N= 100)	40	40	28	28	15	15	84	84	28	28	0	0	34	34	6	6	5	5	8	8	248	**2.5 to 1**
Adults (N= 134)	62	46.3	36	26.9	34	25.4	95	70.9	39	29.1	0	0	51	38.1	6	4.5	1	0.7	7	5.2	331	**2.5 to 1**
Students/Perspective Students (N=96)	48	50	22	22.9	39	40.6	70	72.9	20	20.8	0	0	27	28.1	2	2.1	4	4.2	4	4.2	236	**2.5 to 1**
Parents (N= 144)	68	47.2	39	27.1	36	25	109	75.7	37	25.7	0	0	48	33.3	6	4.2	3	2.1	8	5.6	354	**2.5 to 1**
Youth (N= 93)	35	37.6	23	24.7	11	11.8	71	76.3	24	25.8	0	0	28	30.1	4	4.3	2	2.2	7	7.5	205	**2.2 to 1**
Homeowners/ Landowners (N= 115)	35	30.4	20	17.4	19	16.5	77	67	25	21.7	0	0	39	33.9	8	7	2	1.7	3	2.6	228	**2 to 1**
Gardeners (N=152)	39	25.7	22	14.5	22	14.5	105	69.1	41	27	0	0	53	34.9	10	6.6	3	2	6	3.9	301	**2 to 1**
Funding Sources (N= 302)	89	29.5	67	22.2	33	10.9	126	41.7	38	12.6	0	0	53	17.5	4	1.3	14	4.6	7	2.3	431	**1.4 to 1**
All Kansans (N= 279)	72	25.8	48	17.2	33	11.8	117	41.9	47	16.8	0	0	62	22.2	9	3.2	6	2.2	8	2.9	402	**1.4 to 1**
Agricultural Professionals (N= 729)	171	23.5	123	16.9	73	10	332	45.5	70	9.6	1	0.1	99	13.6	13	1.8	15	20.1	12	1.6	961	**1.3 to 1**

Although the ratio in Table 4.30 shows that on average, targeted audience groups were provided more than one call to action, there were instances where zero calls to action were provided. Table 4.31 demonstrates the frequency that zero calls to action were provided to each audience group, listed in order of the highest percentage. All Kansans (n= 153, %= 54.8) and agricultural professionals (n= 384, %= 52.7) were the audience groups with the most tailored units containing zero calls to action, in more than 50% of units. Every audience group's tailored units contained some units with zero calls to action, except for units tailored to volunteers (n= 0, %= 0), in which all units contained at least one call to action. Overall, 867 units of tailored content (%= 37.5) contained zero calls to action. Radio was the medium with the most units containing zero calls to action (n= 586, %= 25.4).

Table 4.31 Frequency and percentage of zero calls to action provided in content of interest to audience groups by media type.

Medium (N)	All Kansans (n= 279)		Agricultural Professionals (n= 729)		Homeowner /Landowner (n= 115)		Gardeners (n= 152)		Adults (n= 134)		Youth (n= 93)		Parents (n= 144)		Students/ Perspective Students (n= 96)		Senior Citizens (n= 19)		Employees (n= 147)		Funding Sources (n= 302)		KSRE Volunteer (n= 100)		Total (n= 2,310)	
	n	n	n	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Press Release	0	0	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	3.7	1	4.3	30	3.2	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	1	1.7	0	0	49	2.1
Facebook	0	0	5	21.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	0	0	3	27.2	NA	NA	1	8.3	2	16.7	0	0	15	.65
Twitter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	.82
Publication	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	.3
YouTube	11	78.6	59	89.4	5	71.4	25	78.1	0	0	3	.6	4	66.6	5	100	NA	NA	2	100	16	84.2	0	0	127	5.5
Radio	142	98	319	97.6	32	78	22	95.7	32	100	16	88.8	23	92	8	100	2	100	10	83.3	3	2	0	0	586	25.4
Website	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	2.6	2	4.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	2.8
Total	**153**	**54.8**	**384**	**52.7**	**37**	**32.2**	**47**	**30.9**	**33**	**24.6**	**72**	**22.6**	**29**	**20.1**	**18**	**18.8**	**2**	**10.5**	**14**	**9.5**	**22**	**7.3**	**0**	**0**	**867**	**37.5**

Target Audiences and Social Media

Table 4.32 shows frequency of at least one social media link being provided to each audience group. The audience groups are listed in order of the highest percentage (units with content of interest to the group and at least one social media link out of the total number of units with content of interest to the group). Senior citizens had the fewest units with content of interest (n=19, %= 1.8), but the highest percentage of those units contained at least one social media link (n= 10, %= 52.6). Agricultural professionals had the most units with content of interest (n= 729, %= 67.5), but the lowest percentage of those units containing at least one social media link (n= 122, %= 16.7).

Table 4.32 Frequency and percentage of content of interest to audience groups containing at least one social media link.

	n	%
Senior Citizens (n= 19)	10	52.6
KSRE Volunteers (n= 100)	48	48
Adults (n= 134)	58	43.3
Gardeners (n=152)	63	41.4
Employees (n= 147)	61	41.5
Parents (n= 144)	58	40.3
Youth (n= 93)	35	37.6
Students/Perspective Students (n=96)	35	36.5
Homeowners/Landowners (n= 115)	41	35.7
All Kansans (n= 279)	76	27.2
Funding Sources (n= 302)	72	23.8
Agricultural Professionals (n= 729)	122	16.7

Coders recorded all appearances of the words "urban" and "rural." Table 4.33 shows the frequency of both words, which appeared in low percentages. "Rural" (n= 100, 9.3%) appeared in a higher percentage of units than urban (n= 19, %= 1.8). "Rural" appeared most frequently in Twitter units (n= 13, %= 28.3), followed by press releases (n= 34, %= 20.5). "Urban" appeared most frequently in publication units (n= 4, %= 4.3).

Table 4.33 Frequency and percentage of "rural" and "urban" word appearance by media type.

	Rural		Urban	
Medium	n	%	n	%
Press Release (N= 166)	34	20.5	6	3.6
Facebook (N=39)	1	2.6	1	2.6
Twitter (N= 46)	13	28.3	1	2.2
Publication (N= 93)	3	3.2	4	4.3
YouTube (N=100)	0	0	1	1
Radio (N= 497)	36	7.2	4	.8
Website (N= 139)	13	9.4	2	1.4
Total (N=1,080)	**100**	**9.3**	**19**	**1.8**

Summary

A quantitative content analysis was performed to determine how K-State Research and Extension has established and maintained branding guidelines, communicated to targeted external audiences, and provided calls to action. The study included a representative sample of press release, Facebook, Twitter, publication, YouTube, radio, and website units available to external

audiences in one year. Researchers discovered areas where branding guidelines were followed, areas where guidelines were violated, and areas not clearly addressed in the guidelines. A variety of calls to action were provided within content of interest to target audiences.

In addressing RO1, evaluating application of branding guidelines, the chapter provided findings related to name, graphic, slogan, cobranding, and image elements of the brand. The correct version of the K-State Research and Extension name occurred in slightly more than half (56.6%) of the units (n= 611). Of the units that did not contain the correct name (n= 469, %= 43.4), a concerning percentage (24.2 to 12.7%) also lacked brand attribution such as a KSRE or Kansas State University name or graphic. Additionally, the study found appearances of incorrect, less appropriate, and other references to the brand and to Kansas State University. The official slogan appeared in low percentages in both written form (n= 3, %= .3) and graphic form (n= 17, %= 2.9 of visual units).

The study found a low percent (less than 50%) of visual units included images and each official graphic appeared in low percentages (less than 40%). Of the units containing images, only 17% (n= 46) captured a teaching moment. The most popular graphic was the KSRE wordmark with Powercat (n= 205, %= 35.2), followed by the wordmark without the Powercat (n= 137, %= 23.5). The University seal (n= 93, %= 16) was the third most popular graphic, but it appeared in website units only. Press release units contained zero graphics. Zero graphics appeared in colors besides black, white, and purple. There were few appearances of manipulated or other versions of KSRE and Kansas State University graphics.

Cobranding was observed in 863 (79.9%) units. However, less than 15% of visual units contained a graphic for the other organizations or brand names (n= 61, %= 10.5). Of those 61 graphic appearances, more than 40% contained instances of improper cobranding (n= 41, %= 7.1). More than half of these improper cobranding occurrences (n= 24, %= 58.5) involved the Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities program graphic.

In addressing RO2, assessing calls to action provided, the study found units contained a variety of calls to action, but in relatively low percentages (44.1% and lower). Zero QR codes appeared. The Twitter medium contained the most units with content of interest to all audience groups (except senior citizens), but links to KSRE Twitter content were rarely provided as a call to action (n= 2, %= .19).

For RO3, assessing targeted audiences, the study examined content considered to be of interest to 12 target audience groups. Content of interest to agricultural professionals (n= 729, %= 67.5) was provided more than twice as often as content for any other audience group. The least targeted group was senior citizens with content in only 1.8% of units (n= 19). On average, more than one call to action was provided in the targeted units. However, every audience group included a low percentage (ranging from 4% to 44.8%) of units with zero calls to action. The word, "rural" appeared more often than the word, "urban." However, both words appeared in low percentages, 9.3% and 1.8%, respectively.

Chapter 5 - Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations

Extension communicators must perform the challenging task of reaching diverse audience segments and conveying the organization's complex mission. Land-grant institutions have developed brand identities at a state level in order to create and strengthen public awareness and engagement (Baker et al., 2011). The purpose of this study was to identify how K-State Research and Extension has established and maintained its brand through external communication with target audiences. Furthermore, the purpose was to provide recommendations for improving communication between K-State Research and Extension and external audiences.

One challenge to managing the KSRE brand is ensuring all employees are communicating a consistent brand image in their external communication efforts. The K-State Research and Extension name has changed throughout the organization's history. The current name (K-State Research and Extension, KSRE acronym for internal use only) was adapted in 1996, following a public survey and focus groups (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). The name was changed as part of an effort to improve external audience's retention and understanding of the organization. A 2007 telephone survey found Kansas citizens perceived information from K-State Research and Extension to be credible (Communications and Agricultural Education Research, 2015). However, the telephone survey was not able to determine if Kansans were able to recognize when communication pieces were created by KSRE. This quantitative content analysis is the first step in examining external communication. The study aimed to measure how internal

audiences have responded to the name change and how they are communicating the organization's identity to external audiences.

This study examined a representative random sample of content made available to external audiences in one year (November 1, 2012, through October 31, 2013), guided by the concept of Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) and rooted in the concept of Social Exchange Theory (SET). Three coders recorded responses to 101 codebook questions for 1,080 units across seven media channels (radio podcasts, YouTube videos, weeks of Facebook content, weeks of Twitter content, website pages, publications, and press releases). The study set out to achieve four research objectives. The fourth research objective was removed from the study due to low intercoder reliability, leaving the following three objectives:

- RO1: Determine the extent to which branding guidelines were followed in KSRE external communication.
- RO2: Assess the extent to which KSRE audience members were provided with a call to action in external communication.
- RO3: Determine the extent to which KSRE targets its key audiences in external communication.

Conclusions, discussions, and recommendations from this research will be presented in this chapter.

Conclusions

RO1: Extent of Branding Guidelines Applied in External Communication

Correct K-State Research and Extension Name Use

According to the organization's branding guidelines (2015), K-State Research and Extension is "the abbreviated name for Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para 3). The guidelines imply but do not directly state that K-State Research and Extension is the correct name to use in all external communication pieces because the KSRE acronym "should only be used internally and when informal communication is appropriate (such as an email message)" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para 3). The guidelines state that K-State Research and Extension is the "short name," and it is "acceptable for general use in publications and other materials. However, the full name must appear at minimum as part of the disclaimer used on printed materials from all units of K-State Research and Extension" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para. 4).

In examining the implied branding policy, the study found the correct name of the organization (K-State Research and Extension) appeared in slightly more than half (n= 611, %= 56.6%) of the units examined. The media with the highest level of adherence were: Facebook (n= 39, %= 100), publications (n= 93, %= 100), and press releases (n= 164, %= 99). The 100%-appearance rate in Facebook units (n= 39) is supported by the nature of the social media site; each post a KSRE employee makes on the page appears next to the

Facebook account's icon image and name. The 100%-appearance rate in publication units

(n= 93, %= 100) is in part due to the appearance of the name within official statements at

the bottom of almost all publications (n= 92, %= 99). The KSRE correct name appeared

(along with the full name) in the non-discrimination and official statements within

publication and press release units, which explains the high percentages of at least one

appearance of the correct name within those units (n= 93, %= 100; n= 164, %= 99,

respectively).

The website (n= 93, %= 67) and Twitter (n= 22, %= 53) media contained more moderate

percentages of correct name appearances. Website pages contained the correct name in

67% of units (n= 93). This percentage was affected by the number of website pages within

the study associated with the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education

at Kansas State University, which were included in the website map (n= 31, %= 22.3), but

do not actually represent KSRE, and 83.9% of these pages (n= 26) do not include the KSRE

name. Excluding these 31 webpages, 83.8% of websites (n= 88) contained the correct

name. The other webpages with a low percentage of correct name appearances were the

pages containing historical information. YouTube (n= 13, %= 13) and radio (n= 185, %=

37) were media with the lowest percentages of units containing the correct name.

The percentage of Twitter units containing the correct name (n= 22, %= 53) may be

explained partially by the 140-character limit for writing tweets, which may have made

employees managing the site less likely to devote 30 characters to including the

organization's correct name. Twitter also limits social media managers in the number of

characters available for the account name and handle, which both appear near each of the

organization's tweets. Both the KSRE Twitter account (K-StateRes&Extension) and handle

(@KStateResExt) name are incorrect versions of the organization's name.

The number of correct name appearances per unit ranged from zero to 47, meaning

external audiences had anywhere from zero to 47 opportunities to recognize the

organization's name throughout the unit. About half of the units (n= 467, %= 43.3)

contained the name one to two times, and half contained the name zero times (n= 469, %=

43.4). A small percentage (n= 114, %= 13.3) of units contained the name more than two

times. Press release and publication units both had a mean score greater than two,

indicating that, on average, these units contained between two to three mentions of the

correct name. It is important to note that in 99% to 100% of the press release and

publication units, one of the name appearances was within a statement at the bottom of the

document. As Facebook units were defined as weeks of Facebook content, the units varied

in the number of posts they contained, affecting the mean score. It is important to note that

every post on Facebook did contain the name, making it easy for readers to associate all

Facebook content with the organization.

Overall, the appearance of the correct name (n= 611, %= 56.6) demonstrated an attempt to

practice organization branding. However, this still means 43.4% of the units (n= 469) did

not include the correct brand name, which makes it difficult for audiences to connect the

content with the organization and build awareness and memory of the brand. The units

missing the correct name bring to light that branding guidelines are unclear in stating which version should be used in which media and how frequently.

Lack of Correct Brand Name and Other Brand Representations

The branding guidelines do not state the K-State Research and Extension name or graphics *must* be used in communication. The only related requirements are that the full name must appear "at minimum as part of the disclaimer used on printed materials from all units of K-State Research and Extension" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para 4). Low percentages of units that did not include the correct brand name (n= 469, %= 43.4) also lacked other brand elements, including any mention of the KSRE or Kansas State University name (n= 94, %= 20) and any official KSRE or Kansas State University graphics (n= 38, %= 24.2). A low percentage of the lack-of-correct-name units contained no such name nor graphics (n= 20, %= 12.7). Three (1.9%) of the lack-of-correct-name units that could contain graphics (n=157) contained an outdated/incorrect version of the workmark. There were 270 instances (57.7%) of incorrect/less desirable versions of the KSRE and Kansas State University name that occurred within the lack-of-correct-name units (demonstrated in Table 4.24).

The graphics that appeared most frequently in the lack-of-correct-name units were appropriate official graphics: the workmark without the Powercat (n= 89, %= 26), followed by the Kansas State University workmark (n= 50, %= 31.8). This is a variation from the overall graphic appearances, in which the Powercat version (n= 205, %= 35.2) appeared more frequently than the version without the Powercat (n= 127, %= 23.5). This finding is

supported by the fact that the majority of lack-of-correct-name units were YouTube and

website units, which tended to use the KSRE workmark without the Powercat and the

Kansas State University wordmark more frequently than the KSRE wordmark with the

Powercat. This is also supported by the fact that some website units were actually pages on

the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education site, which used the Kansas

State University wordmark, rather than the KSRE wordmark, in the header.

The lack-of-correct-name units that included no version of the organization's name and no

graphics represent a challenge in promoting brand recognition. The three (%= 1.9)

instances of lack-of-correct-name units containing incorrect, outdated graphics and the 270

(%= 57.7) units containing incorrect or less appropriate versions of the KSRE or Kansas

State University names are also a challenge. The occurrences of incorrect graphics and

name versions are a violation of current branding guidelines. However, branding guidelines

do not state that including a correct version of the name and/or graphic is required, and

guidelines regarding less appropriate versions are not clarified.

Incorrect K-State Research and Extension Name Use

Incorrect versions of the name specifically examined in this study appeared in low

percentages, ranging from 4.9% (n= 53) to 0% (n= 0). This indicates deviation from the

branding guidelines, along with a level of success in avoiding what may have been more

common mistakes in the past. The only instructions found in the branding guidelines

regarding incorrect names (or names not to use) was a statement that the acronym was for

internal use only and a statement saying, "do not use the ampersand sign (&) in place of the word and" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para. 5).

The KSRE acronym was the most commonly used incorrect name version, but it only occurred in 4.9% (n= 53) units, primarily in website units (n= 49, %= 35.3). The majority of the KSRE acronym's occurrences within website units (n= 44, %= 89.8) were in the top right corner of the webpage, where KSRE staff members can log in. Two of the five occurrences (40%) that were not in the upper right corner of the webpage were on pages housing information that appeared to be directed to internal audiences. Overall, the appearances of incorrect versions specifically examined in this study are minimal, but they do represent deviation from branding guidelines. The occurrences also point out that some of the public pages on the KSRE website are intended for internal audiences.

K-State Radio Network Name Use

The K-State Radio Network name was examined as an extension of the K-State Research and Extension brand, as the website states:

> The K-State Radio Network is a free audio service from K-State Research and Extension, the Department of Communications, and Kansas State University to radio stations throughout Kansas and the U.S. It is distributed on-line. The features are also available to the general public in streaming formats. (K-State Radio Network, 2015, para. 1)

It should be noted the description of the K-State Radio Network's reference to the "U.S." does not agree with the Associated Press Stylebook (Christian, Jacobson, & Minthorn, 2013), and the department name is incorrect. The KSRE and Kansas State University branding guidelines do not mention the K-State Radio Network name and when it should be used versus using the K-State Research and Extension name or K-State Research and Extension News (n= 63, %= 5.8). The study did not set out to examine use of the K-State Research and Extension News name, but it was found in website (n= 48, %= 34.5%) and press release units (n= 15, %= 9%) and was recorded as "other". The K-State Research and Extension News name was the most commonly used other version of the KSRE name (n= 68, %= 5.8). The use of the name seems to refer to the team of employees writing press releases and creating radio and video content; however, other names were also used to describe these entities, available in Tables 4.9 and 4.12. The correct way of referring to this entity is K-State Research and Extension News Media Services (K. Boone, personal communication, April 2, 2015); however, this is not reflected in branding guidelines.

The K-State Radio Network name appeared in a low percentage of units, most frequently in radio units (n= 135, %= 27.2). Each radio program had a unique way of introducing the organization(s) and entities(s) involved in producing the podcast or podcast segment. In some cases, no production credit was given within the coded portion of the unit (the first two minutes of the podcast or podcast segment). Since the branding guidelines make no mention of the radio network name and radio communication, these occurrences are neither in line with or in violation of branding protocol.

K-State Research and Extension Full Name Use

Coders recorded appearances of the full name, "Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service," to see if the name's use was in accordance with branding guidelines. The organization's brand guidelines state:

> K-State Research and Extension [is] the abbreviated name for Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. The short name is acceptable for general use in publications and other materials. However, the full name must appear at minimum as part of the disclaimer used on printed materials from all units of K-State Research and Extension. (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para. 3-4)

An additional note about the full name appears in the "Guidelines for Placing the KSRE Workmark" section of the KSRE branding guidelines:

> In addition, the full name of the organization must appear on all printed and digital publications. The organization's full name is: Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. (Guidelines for Placing the KSRE Workmark section, para. 4-5)

Use of the correct name was primarily aligned with branding guidelines, but there is need for clarity regarding official statements containing the full name. The branding guidelines imply that there is a singular disclaimer statement to be uses; this study found three official statements including the full name throughout three media. The full name only appeared in press release, publication, and website units. The name appeared in all of the printed

documents in the study (100% of the publication units). Press releases are submitted to news agencies in an electronic format. The full name was included in all but three of the 166 press releases (n= 133, %= 98.2).

When the full name appeared within press release units and press releases found in website units, at least one occurrence was within a consistent statement at the bottom of the document, Statement A:

> K-State Research and Extension is a short name for the Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, a program designed to generate and distribute useful knowledge for the well-being of Kansans. Supported by county, state, federal and private funds, the program has county Extension offices, experiment fields, area Extension offices and regional research centers statewide. Its headquarters is on the K-State campus, Manhattan.

The About Us page of the website (one of the website units coded in this study) was the only other place where the full name was found. It appeared in the following statement, which varies slightly from the statement found in press release units, Statement B:

> K-State Research and Extension is a short name for the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. We are a partnership between Kansas State University and federal, state, and county government, with offices in every Kansas county. We conduct research through Kansas that is then shared by Extension agents and others on our Web sites and through numerous conferences, workshops, field days, publications, newsletters and more.

When the full name appeared within publication units, it consistently appeared in the following nondiscrimination statement, Statement C:

> K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, as amended. Kansas State University, County Extension Councils, Extension Districts, and United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating, John D. Floros, Director.

All but one of the publication units contained at least one appearance of the full name within a nondiscrimination statement. In the case of the exception, the full name appeared unattached to a statement of any kind.

Overall, use of the organization's full name was mainly in line with guidelines, but there is a need to clarify how the name should be included within official statements. Press releases and publications presented the name fairly consistently within all units or the majority of units and within a consistent set of text (with the exception of one instance). The guidelines refer to Statement C, but do not provide an example of a nondiscrimination statement. The guidelines do not mention Statements A and B.

Extension Name Use

The branding guidelines state, "avoid using extension alone because it does not encompass the scope of the organization in Kansas" (Using the K-State Research and Extension

acronym section, para. 5). The Extension name appeared in 99% of press release (n=164) and publication units (n= 91) because coders included appearances within the official statements at the end of the documents. Other appearances of the Extension name were low in each of the media types. The branding guidelines do not clarify if including Extension (capitalized, alone) within the official statements is acceptable, as the there is no specific mention of Statement A and B, and only refers vaguely to Statement C. The KSRE style guide includes an additional note, which explains how some appearances of the capitalized extension name within Statements A, B, and C (e.g. Cooperative Extension Service) are acceptable and others (e.g. Extension offices) are not acceptable.

> Extension – Abbreviated reference to the Cooperative Extension Service. Use K-State Research and Extension. Use K-State Research and Extension or Cooperative Extension Service. Use capitals when it is part of a proper name. Avoid using extension alone when referring to the organization in Kansas because it does not encompass its organizational scope within the state. Don't capitalize the term when it is used generically. She is an extension specialist. Preferred: She is a human nutrition specialist with K-State Research and Extension.

Other Versions of the K-State Research and Extension Name Use

The study found a variety of name versions used to refer to the communication or marketing aspect of KSRE; the entire KSRE organization; and entities of KSRE. Less commonly used versions of the name also included references to research and extension specialists, and county, district, or research station locations. Each of the most commonly used other versions in press releases can be attributed entirely to one to three unique press release writers. Each of the most commonly used other versions in radio units can be

attributed entirely to one to three programs. This means the sources of potential confusion or unique interpretations regarding brand guidelines can be easily identified in the majority of instances. The branding guidelines do not currently address these other versions of the KSRE name found in this study, so it is not possible to determine if use is appropriate.

Kansas State University Name Use

The study found several unique ways of referring to Kansas State University and identified a need for added clarity in KSRE guidelines to support the style guides. The Kansas State University Style Guide (2015) is found on the Division of Communications and Marketing page of the Kansas State University website. Under the Kansas State University, the guide outlines appropriate ways to refer to the university name:

> Avoid using *KSU* unless space limitations require it. *K-State* is acceptable on second reference for an on-campus or in-state audience or for publications directed at alumni. In general, *Kansas State* is only used for athletics-related news and publications. Lowercase *university* when used alone. (Style, K – L – M section, para. 1)

Proper use of the Kansas State University name is not directly addressed in the KSRE branding guidelines, but is addressed in the K-State Research and Extension Style Guide. The publishing unit of the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education created a style guide for KSRE employees, which is available in PDF form on the KSRE website (K-State Research and Extension Style Guide, 2010). The guide in includes a similar

note regarding the Kansas State University name. However, this style guide does not address the Kansas State name specifically.

> Kansas State University – K-State on second reference. Do not use K-State University. Avoid using KSU unless space limitations require it. Lowercase university when used alone. (K-State Research and Extension Style Guide, 2010, p 7-8)

This study found most references to the university were made in the appropriate form (Kansas State University and K-State), the name also made a few appearances as Kansas State (n= 72, %= 6.7) and KSU (n= 30, %= 2.8). There were nine other versions of the name that appeared only one time each. The percentages of these less appropriate name occurrences are low (n= 9, %= .83), but they are a violation of the Kansas State University style guide, the KSRE style guide, or both. The study did not verify if each occurrence of the K-State name was used only as a second reference to Kansas State University.

K-State Research and Extension Slogan Use

KSRE's official slogan only appeared in three of the 1,080 units (0.03%). The official workmark of the Knowledge for Life slogan was included in 17 of the 1,080 units (2.9%). The extremely low appearance of the official slogan is not a violation of branding guidelines, as there is no description of how often the slogan should be used and within which media. The branding guidelines state:

> Use the slogan in all internal written and electronic publications, as possible. The slogan should not be used instead of the K-State Research and Extension wordmark;

if faced with the choice of using one or the other, you should always choose to use

the wordmark. (Slogan: Knowledge for Life section, para. 2)

K-State Research and Extension and Kansas State University Graphic Use

Overall, use of graphics was minimal, as the most popular graphic (KSRE graphic with the

Powercat) only occurred in 35% of the visual units (n= 205), followed by the version

without the Powercat at 23.5% (n= 137).

The publications (printed materials) contained at least one appearance of the KSRE

wordmark with Powercat in 98% of units (n= 91). The Guidelines for Placing the KSRE

Workmark section of the KSRE branding guidelines state:

> The wordmark must appear on the front of all printed materials and digital files. It
>
> is preferred that the wordmark appear in the top half of printed materials. (para. 2)

Therefore, the two publication units that did not include any version of the KSRE

workmark violated branding guidelines. The branding guidelines make an additional note

regarding the KSRE workmark:

> The K-State Research and Extension wordmark must appear on all printed
>
> materials, including newsletters, brochures, or fliers. It must also appear in digital
>
> media, such as websites and PowerPoint presentations. (Guidelines for Placing the
>
> KSRE Workmark section, para. 6)

This study examined printed materials (classified as publication units) and digital media in

the form of press releases, Facebook, Twitter, online radio podcasts, and website units. The

most popular graphic (the KSRE wordmark with Powercat) occurred in 100% of the

Facebook and Twitter units because each post in the social media sites appears beside a

small icon. This graphic has been selected as the icon or profile photo for both Facebook

and Twitter, and these appearances were recorded. The study found 98 of the 139 website

units (70.5%) included the KSRE wordmark without the Powercat. This percentage was

also affected by the number of website pages within the study associated with the

Department of Communications and Agricultural Education at Kansas State University.

Excluding these webpages, 90.7% of websites (n= 98) were branded consistently with the

KSRE workmark (without the Powercat). Only six website units (4.3%) contained at least

one appearance of the version with the Powercat.

Overall, four of the six media (Facebook, Twitter, publication, and website) had a high

percentage of units containing at least one of the official graphic types. YouTube units

contained low percentages of every graphic type, ranging from zero appearances (0%) to

37 appearances (37%). Overall, there were 95 unique appearances of KSRE and Kansas

State University graphics throughout the 100 YouTube units. Press release units contained

zero graphics. The low percentage of graphics in YouTube units and the absence of

graphics in press release units are not violations of branding guidelines, as there is no

description of how often each graphic should appear in those media.

The study found few manipulated or compressed graphics, indicating only minor instances

of improper graphic use. Zero graphics appeared in a color besides black, white, and

purple. The branding guidelines state, "do not introduce new type treatments for K-State

Research and Extension wordmarks (for example, backgrounds, "flames" on the Powercat, etc...)"(Co-Branding K-State Research and Extension section, para. 7). Although the study did not find any flames on Powercats, the coders did record any seemingly official graphic that did not match the previously discussed graphics. The most popular (n=5) of these recorded versions was the Kansas State University sesquicentennial logo; the time period reviewed was the year of the University's sesquicentennial celebration. The second-most popular of the graphics recorded as manipulated was an older version of the organization's workmark, which appeared twice in YouTube units and once in a website unit. Although these and other incorrect versions appeared in low occurrences, they are an implied violation of the branding guidelines. The guidelines do not clarify how to address special occasions or events when unique graphics may be used to represent KSRE or Kansas State University. The guidelines also do not clarify that older versions of the KSRE wordmark should not be used, and the wordmark should not be placed above text in a manner that makes the KSRE organization appear to be cobranded with another organization.

Cobranding

The study found other organizations or brand names appeared in 79.9% (n= 863) of units, more frequently than appearances of the K-State Research and Extension name (n= 611, %= 56.6). The branding guidelines mention including partners' logos in communication pieces and explain how to maintain proper proportion between cobranded logos. However, the guidelines do not explicitly state that the KSRE name and/or workmark should appear along with names and/or graphics representing other organizations or brands.

The appearance of other organizations or brand name graphics was much lower (n= 61, %= 10.5). However, when those other graphics appeared, 67.2 % (n= 7.1) of the time, the graphics were improperly cobranded with the K-State Research and Extension wordmark. Branding guidelines emphasize including "partners' logos in newsletters, letters, publications, signs, flyers, brochures, and electronic presentations," in order to "combine the strength of two or more brands for the overall good" (Co-Branding K-State Research and Extension section, para. 2-3). Branding guidelines provide visual examples of how to arrange logos in relation to one another, in cases where cobranding is appropriate. The overall percentage of improper cobranding within visual units was only 7.1% (n=41). However, these recorded instances were primarily cases where other organization graphic(s) appeared and the KSRE graphic did not. There is no note in the guidelines to clarify that employees should always use the organization's graphic along with the partners' or KSRE program's graphics or logos.

Image Use

The study found less than half (n= 270, %= 46.3) of units that could contain images contained at least one image. Only 46 units (%= 7.9) contained at least one image depicting a teaching moment. Press release units were the visual medium with the lowest percentage of units containing images; only 19 of the 166 units (11.4 %) contained a link to a Flickr account of images available for use with the story. Publications were the second-lowest percentage in this area (n= 17, %= 18.3). The majority of the publication units were documents with information for farmers to use in decision-making; in general, these documents did not contain images, but some contained other visuals, such as tables.

The branding guidelines state that, "photographs of field days and similar events should depict the teaching moment. When possible, include youth or other audience members in the picture" (Photos: Branding K-State Research and Extension, para. 2). The study found 17% (n= 46) of units that contained image appearances (n= 270) contained at least one teaching moment image. Overall, only 7.9% (n= 46) of all units that could contain images contained at least one teaching moment. This measurement can serve as a benchmark as the use of images may change over time.

Overall, conclusions related to RO1 indicate KSRE and Kansas State University branding guidelines are followed to an extent, but there is much room for improvement. Results from this study demonstrate limited or partial adherence to branding guidelines in the areas of use of the KSRE name; use of the full version of the KSRE name; and use of images containing a teaching moment. The study also found areas of deviance from the branding guidelines, including a limited use of incorrect KSRE and Kansas State University names, and a limited use of incorrect KSRE graphics. The most prominent findings were areas of the branding guidelines in need of clarification: the appropriate extent of correct name and graphic use per medium; the appropriate extent of official slogan use per medium; the K-State Radio Network name and appropriate introduction of radio programs; the need for the KSRE wordmark in instances of cobranding; appropriate official statements for press releases and publications; the use of Extension in official statements; use of unique graphics for special occasions; and the use of other versions of the KSRE name.

RO2: Extent of Calls to Action Provided in External Communication

Links to the website were the most commonly provided call to action; links appeared in 44.1% of units (n= 476), including print, website, and social media units. A low percentage of radio (n=12, %= 2.4) and YouTube units (n= 14, %= 14) contained at least one website link. However, all other media contained website links within more than 75% of units (ranging from 76.9% to 100%). When website links appeared, they most commonly led to a page on the KSRE website besides the homepage (n= 328, %= 30.4) or a site outside of the KSRE website (n= 321, %= 29.7). All publication units (n= 91, %= 100) contained at least one website link: 97.8% of publication units contained a link the homepage, 2.2% contained a link to another page on the KSRE website, and 83% contained a link to a non-KSRE webpage.

Links to KSRE's social media sites were provided less frequently than website links (n= 264, %= 24.4). The branding guidelines (2015) provide a tip for local units (county and district offices) to "add links to your social media pages, if applicable" (Websites section, para. 3). However, only 56% (n= 78) of the state agency's website units contained a link to at least one of its social media sites. The most common social media site provided as a potential call to action across media was YouTube (n= 128, %= 11.9), followed by Facebook (n= 87, %= 8.1). Links to other social media sites (Flickr, blogs, Pinterest, and Twitter) were each only provided in less than 2% of units. Most concerning, links to the Twitter account were only provided in a total of two units (n= 2, %= .19). This demonstrates that although KSRE posts content to Twitter each week, the medium is rarely promoted through other communication. It is important to note that one of the two appearances of the Twitter

links was on a website page that appeared to be tailored to employees, rather than external audiences.

The audit of social media links revealed two additional concerns: the "other" social media pages and the broken links or links to the university sites. KSRE blogs or blogs managed by KSRE employees sometimes appeared with unique brand elements; coders made a note that some branding on these external sites may not be appropriate. The coders also found links to social media sites within the website units that were broken or directed to Kansas State University social media sites rather than KSRE social media sites. The broken links and links to Kansas State University social media are a missed opportunity for promoting KSRE's social media presence, and the branding displayed on KSRE-affiliated blogs may be in violation of branding guidelines.

Beyond website and social media links, the study found KSRE provides a variety of calls to action including phone numbers and email addresses. No QR codes were found. A high percentage of website units contained at least one website link (n= 125, %= 90) and/or at least one phone number (n= 156, %= 94). A slightly higher percentage of press release units contained at least one website link (n= 156, %= 94) and/or at least one phone number (n= 158, %= 95.2). It is important to note the phone number that appeared most frequently on website units (at the bottom of the page) was a line to the general operator at Kansas State University, who may be less capable of connecting the caller with the best-suited KSRE specialist. Press release phone numbers were for K-State Research and Extension specialists and/or writers. Although all publication units (n= 91, %= 100)

contained at least one website link, the units contained low percentages of all other calls to action, ranging from 2.2% (n=2) to 7.5% (n= 7).

Overall, units contained a variety of calls to action, but some types only appeared in low percentages. For example, press releases contained a high percentage of some calls to action including email addresses (n= 156, %= 99.4), but low percentages of other calls to action including mailing addresses (n= 5, %= 3). All but one of the press release units (n= 165, %= 99.4) included at least one email address, and more than 90% of press release units contained at least one website link (n= 156, %= 94) and phone number (n= 158, %= 95.2). Only 15.7% of press release units (n= 26) contained a social media link and only 3% of press releases (n=5) contained a mailing address.

RO3: Extent of Targeted Audiences in External Communication

The study provides a benchmark measurement of how much content KSRE generates that would be of interest to 12 target audience groups and what calls to action KSRE currently provides those audiences. The study found the greatest percentage of targeted content (by more than double) was tailored to agricultural professionals (n= 729, %= 67.5). The second-most targeted group was funding sources (n= 302, %= 28), followed closely by all Kansans (n= 279, %= 26.8). The amount of content tailored to other targeted groups was fairly equal, ranging from 8.6% (n= 93) to 14.4% (n= 152), with the exception of senior citizens. Content specifically tailored to senior citizens appeared in only 1.8% of units (n= 19). Twitter was the largest source of content of interest to all audience groups (a total of

n= 298, %= 647.8), except for senior citizens, who's largest source of content was the website.

The ratio of calls to action provided per unit was greater than one for each audience group; however, not all targeted units contained at least one call to action. A total of 867 targeted units (37.5%) contained zero calls to action. (Units of analysis could contain content targeted to multiple audiences, so n= 2,310.) Units with content of interest to senior citizens and employees contained the highest ratio of calls to action per unit (2.8 to 1). Units with content of interest to agricultural professionals contained the lowest ratio of calls to action per unit (1.3 to 1), followed closely by all Kansans and funding sources (1.4 to 1). Most concerning, more than half of the units tailored to agricultural professionals (n= 384, %= 52.7) and all Kansans (n= 153, %= 54.8) contained zero calls to action. Radio (n=586) and YouTube (n= 127) were the media with the most units containing zero calls to action for target audiences.

Social media links were provided in the targeted pieces, ranging from a 52.5% (n= 10) to a 16.7%-appearance rate (n= 122). Senior citizens had the fewest units with content of interest (n=19, %= 1.8) and the highest percentage of those units containing at least one social media link (n= 10, %= 52.6). Agricultural professionals had the most units with content of interest (n= 729, %= 67.5), but the lowest percentage of those units contained at least one social media link (n= 122, %= 16.7).

To gauge potential indicators of the content's nature, coders recorded all appearances of the words "rural" and "urban." Rural appeared more than five times as often (n= 100, 9.3%) as urban (n= 19, %= 1.8), but both appeared in less than 10% of units. Appearances of the word "rural" most commonly occurred within the name, "Huck Boyd National Institute for Rural Development," in press release, website, or radio units or within the phrase, "now, that's rural," used in the Kansas Profiles radio program and press releases written by the director of the Huck Boyd National Institute for Rural Development.

Discussion

Branding guidelines

A significant finding in this study was the identification of ways to improve clarity in the branding guidelines and better assist employees in communicating the KSRE brand. A set of branding guidelines serves as the basis for all interaction between members of an organization and all external audiences (Cousins, 2013). The document can range in length from less than ten pages to several hundred (Cousins, 2013). This study brings to light that KSRE's branding guidelines do not provide enough detail to guide employers to communicate a consistent brand to external audiences across multiple media. KSRE's guidelines are posted on the organization's website and are designed to help employees at the state, county, and district levels maintain consistent communication.

> This guide introduces K-State Research and Extension's branding strategy and helps employees understand the correct ways to represent the brand and strengthen our image with the world. We all can help make K-State Research and Extension a well-known brand. (What is 'Branding?', para. 4)

Branding guidelines can explain, "what marketing tactics are preferred or encouraged versus what marketing tactics should not be used" (Cousins, 2013, para. 4). This study found the guidelines to be helpful in achieving some of the organization's communication goals. However, it also identified changes and clarifications to be made regarding how often brand elements such as names, graphics, images, and calls to action should appear in which media and what audiences should be targeted in each medium. Essentially, the branding guidelines need additional detail and strategy in order to promote use of IMC and communicate a consistent brand.

Consistent name, look, and feel

The study found a consistent name appeared in 56.6% of communication units (n= 611), and there were some levels of consistency in names, graphics, and images across media. However, this means nearly half of the units (43.4%) did not contain the correct name, and there is much room to improve this consistency. Of the 43.4% of units (n= 469) that did not contain the correct name, 20% (n= 94) were also missing any mention of KSRE or Kansas State University; 38% (n= 38 of the visual units) did not contain an official graphic; and 12.7% (n= 20 of the visual units) did not contain any such name or graphic. Additionally, no graphics appeared in press release units, and the official slogan only appeared three times in written or verbal form (.03%) and 17 times in wordmark form (2.9%). When graphics for other organizations or brand names appeared, 67. 2% of the time, they were improperly branded with KSRE (n= 41, %= 7.1).

"One of the most important, and often most difficult, tasks for IMC is ensuring consistency in executions within and across the different types of marketing communication a brand is using, as well as over time" (Percy, 2008, p. 202). This study indicates KSRE is struggling with IMC and provides further evidence of the difficulty in practicing IMC within the land-grant system, across multiple media. Including the brand name within external communication is critical (especially with the constant arrival of new audiences), but beyond the name, all communication should have a stable "look and feel" that would allow the target audience to recognize and understand the brand, even without a name (Percy, 2008, p. 203-204). Although this quantitative study did not necessarily address "feel," it did identify communication of the organization's name and the appearance of images, graphics, and slogans. This study found, although there were some consistent patterns within media, the patterns were not necessarily desirable. The established brand values and the organization's desired look and feel were under-communicated across media. Overall, the use of images, graphics, and slogans were minimal, and the correct brand name only occurred in slightly more than half of the units.

KSRE name appearances

The correct name, K-State Research and Extension (n=611, %=56.6), was used more frequently than recognized incorrect versions of the name (ranging from 0 to 4.9%). However, this means use of the name was not entirely in line with the IMC objective of consistency. The Kansas State University name appeared in an almost equal percentage of units (n= 558, %= 51.7). This study found the name appeared frequently in some media and infrequently in others. YouTube (n= 13, %= 13) and radio (n= 185, %= 37) media

contained the correct name in a low percentage of units, making it more difficult for audiences to recognize the brand each time they encounter it. Consistent appearances of the brand name across all communication help build brand recognition among audiences (Percy, 2008). The Facebook and Twitter posts always appear next to the KSRE wordmark (and the Facebook posts appear next the correct name as well), so it is easier to build brand recognition when audiences encounter these posts and tweets. Although this use of the correct name in partnership with the university name is positive, there is concern regarding those communication units that did not contain the correct name in addition to other brand elements, including graphics, slogans, and images. YouTube and radio units were found to be the media with the lowest percentages of at least one correct name appearance, which could be related to only analyzing the first two minutes. However, viewers and listeners should be able to recognize who is responsible for the content within the first two minutes.

Lack of brand elements

Brand elements must be communicated consistently, "so there is no confusion in people's minds" (Ang, 2014, p. 5). The inconsistent brand elements found in this study and the lack of correct brand elements (most critically, the brand name and/or wordmark) are a challenge to building brand awareness and loyalty (Percy, 2008). Due to their lack of brand consistency, radio and YouTube units will be addressed separately in the upcoming sections. Kansans view information from K-State Research and Extension to be credible (Communication and Agricultural Education Department Research, 2015), so it is important Kansans know when information is provided by KSRE versus other

organizations. Additionally, it is important for members of the legislature and other funding sources to recognize all of the effort KSRE makes to communicate with audiences across the state and the impact and public value the organization creates. If the name does not appear, KSRE will not receive credit.

Kansas State University departments and the KSRE brand

There are a few branding technicalities that arose in the findings. Kansas State University's Department of Communication and Agricultural Education website was included in the website map, although the entity does not directly represent K-State Research and Extension to external audiences. The inclusion of these website units within the sample was an oversight. Additionally, the study found instances of improper cobranding between KSRE and other departments at Kansas State University, including the Department of Entomology (in written form) and the Department of Agronomy (in graphic form). Cobranding between KSRE and Kansas State University departments is not addressed in the branding guidelines, which may explain the appearances of what seem to be inappropriate references.

The KSRE acronym

Branding guidelines state the KSRE acronym is for internal use only. The acronym was only found in 4.9% of units (n= 53) and the majority of these units (n= 49, %= 92.5) were website pages. In the majority of these cases (n= 44, %= 89.8) the acronym appeared out of immediate eyesight, in the top right corner of the webpage, where employees could log in.

Overall, the use of the acronym was minimal, primarily in line with current branding

guidelines. However, the policy of avoiding the acronym in external communication could

be a missed opportunity to build brand recognition. The correct name (K-State Research

and Extension) is long, which makes it difficult to use frequently within units, as

conciseness is appreciated in modern communication and the name is 30 characters long.

AP style, used in news writing, accepts the use of acronyms upon second reference of an

organization (Christian et al., 2013). The organization and acronym are introduced

together in the first reference. For example, the organization could be introduced as K-State

Research and Extension (KSRE) and then referred to as KSRE in later references. Audiences

could build recognition of the KSRE name and understand what it stands for. This study did

not count appearances of the KSRE acronym within web addresses, although the acronym

does occur in the KSRE website address for all pages. Allowed use of the acronym in

external communication could allow for increased recognition of the acronym and

understanding of what the website address means, when encountered. For example, the

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) commonly uses its acronym for brevity

and people can recognize that acronym when it appears in website addresses, allowing for

understanding of what that source is.

A related concern is minimal appearances of the correct name on Twitter, which is most

likely due to the character limits for creating tweets, as well as the account name and

handle. The abbreviated names on Twitter attempts to capture the entire name (K-

StateRes&Extension and @KStateResExt). The audience that connects with KSRE on

Twitter may be familiar enough with the brand to recognize this connection, without

having the correct version of the name and the wordmark shown at a readable size.

However, this communication may be confusing to audiences less familiar with KSRE and

the land-grant system. Although the branding guideline does include a social media section,

the section does not mention strategy for using social media (i.e. Who's the intended

audience? What are measurable objectives for social media use? How should the name be

used in social media?). Furthermore, accepted use of the KSRE acronym could help build

awareness and recognition of the brand among Twitter audiences, in a platform where

characters are limited and brevity is required. If an acronym is unacceptable, perhaps the

name should be shortened. The name originated before social media was an important

component of IMC.

Internal content on the website

This study brings to light that a number of pages available for the public to view on the

KSRE website are actually designed with an employee audience in mind. As all interaction

with external audiences is critical to shaping perceptions and building brand recognition

(and eventually brand loyalty) (Ang 2014), public encounters on these website pages are a

missed opportunity to instead present audiences with information tailored to their needs

and interests. Removing employee-tailored content from the public website would help

improve website navigation. Ray et al. (2014) found KSRE employees believe the website

needs to be more user-friendly. Website pages with content for internal audiences can be

stored on the employee Intranet, which would result in less pages for external audiences to

navigate and more control in messages presented or available to external audiences on the

website. A more organized structure of resources on the employee Intranet would also

benefit the internal audiences and may improve productivity by allowing employees to find the information they need faster.

The Extension name

A 2007 telephone survey found Kansans recognize the extension name more than the KSRE name. Results showed 70% of Kansans had heard of the name Extension and 55.5% of Kansans had heard of the K-State Research Extension name; 51.2% had heard of the full version of the name. The branding guidelines instruct employees to "avoid using extension alone because it does not encompass the scope of the organization in Kansas" (Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym section, para. 5). Coders in this study recorded occurrences of the Extension name appearing alone as a proper noun, capitalized or not. The majority of findings of this name were within official statements. It is not likely that the general public actually reads those statements, and the KSRE name appears in those statements as well. However, some of these appearances violate branding guidelines. Previous research indicates the Extension name may have stronger recognition among Kansans (Agricultural Communication and Education Research, 2015). This awareness could be due to KSRE's continual use of the name alone, or it could be due to a pre-established stronger brand awareness for Extension.

Other versions of the name

The study found several other versions of the name that indicate employees may be unaware of, confused by, or misinterpreting branding guidelines. Several of these versions

occurred. For example, the K-State Research and Extension News name occurred in 68 units (48 website units and 15 press release units). This name is not included in the guidelines. Several similar versions of this name (referring to the news, marketing, or communication aspect of KSRE) also appeared in press releases. These versions are each being used by three or fewer unique authors, making it easy to trace individual interpretations of the guidelines. Similarly, there were unique ways of introducing KSRE via radio, which can all be traced back to four of the nine radio programs in the study. It is important for organization leaders to recognize how individual employees are or are not using the branding guidelines on a daily basis and how they are communicating the brand name. As the KSRE branding guidelines state, "all employees contribute to K-State Research and Extension's brand every time we greet a customer, give a program, shake a hand, volunteer, answer the phone and other routine activities" (What is 'Branding?', para. 5). The branding guidelines do not explicitly state that all employees contribute to the brand each time they publish a piece of verbal, visual, or written communication and reinforce the need for consistency in this communication.

Areas not addressed in the KSRE codebook

The study revealed some specific aspects of brand communication that are not directly addressed in the KSRE branding guidelines, making it challenging for employees to know exactly how they should be communicating the brand in their work. The codebook states not to use the KSRE acronym in external communication, but does not address shortened versions of the Kansas State University name (which are addressed in the Kansas State University Style Guide on the Division of Marketing and Communications website).

Additionally, the branding guidelines do not provide a full list of other versions of the name to avoid using; proper ways to introduce KSRE specialists, departments, and programs affiliated with KSRE; and appropriate ways to communicate the brand via each medium.

Appearances of graphics

Graphics play a role in the visual aspect of the brand, which contributes to the look and feel of branded materials and helps build recognition faster than encounters with names and messages (Percy, 2008). The study found some version of the official wordmark was used in all Facebook (n= 39, %= 100) and Twitter (n= 46, %= 100) and nearly all publication (n= 91, %= 98) and website units (n= 98, %= 70.5). However, use of graphics was minimal in YouTube videos, in both the Powercat version (n= 23, %= 23) and the version without the Powercat (n= 37, %= 37), and no graphics appeared in press release units (n= 0, %= 0). This makes it difficult for audiences encountering communication from KSRE in different media to make the connection that all communication comes from the same organization and to build recognition of the KSRE brand. Members of the media are a critical target audience for KSRE to build recognition with, and providing more visuals cues of the brand through press releases and videos would help (Business Wire, 2015).

Frequency of name appearances per unit

The rule of thumb in advertising is that a target audience member must encounter an advertising message at least three times within the purchasing cycle (in the same medium or in multiple media) in order to remember and potentially purchase the brand (Ang,

2014). For each encounter with the brand to resonate, the audience must (at a minimum) learn the brand name and understand the primary benefit, which requires conscious attention (Percy, 2008). This means, even when the KSRE name appeared within a unit, audience members may not always consciously process the name and key message. Repeated appearances within media can increase the likelihood that audiences will process and remember the name (Percy, 2008). This is an area where KSRE can improve. Press release (M= 2.55, ST= .53) and publication units (M= 2.25, %= 5.07) contained an average of more than two (between two and three) correct name appearances per unit. However, it is important to note that, in the majority of cases (99-100%), one appearance of the name was always within the official statement at the bottom of the publication or press release. Information at the bottom of online and print media tends to be ignored (Eyetrack III, 2004). Name location is especially important in press releases because (if press releases are actually used to create news content,) they may be shortened and the boilerplate (official statements) may not appear in the actual article. In this situation, the intended final audience (members of the public) would only encounter one to two appearances of the name within the shortened version of the article. The KSRE branding guidelines do not include a strategy for repeated brand name appearances. It is important to note that although the KSRE workmark (both versions) were classified as graphics in this study, the artwork does include the KSRE name. When the workmark appears in a readable size, it is an added opportunity for name recognition, and visuals can be highly effective in building brand memory (Percy, 2008).

Image, slogan, and graphic frequency

"The key to consistency is the visual feel. This is because the visual memory for the imagery associated with the brand actually elicits faster brand identification than the brand name itself" (Percy, 2008, p. 204). KSRE has attempted to create a common visual look and feel by asking employees (through the branding guidelines) to capture teaching moments and action shots in their photos. This study found a limited number of images within visual media (n= 270, %= 46.3), especially in press release units (n= 19, %= 11.4). Use of the official slogan in written or verbal form was almost non-existent (n= 3, %= .3%), as was use of the workmark graphic form (n= 17, %= 2.9). An official graphic of some form appeared in the majority of units across all media, except all press release units, which contained zero graphics (n= 0, %= 0). At least 33% of the YouTube videos (n=33) also contained zero graphics.

One positive finding was the overall consistency in the types of official graphics used. There were only a limited number other and manipulated versions of KSRE graphics that occurred (a total of 16 units, %= 2.7). These manipulated versions of the graphics could be avoided with greater clarity and ease of use in the branding guidelines. For example, the only note the branding guidelines make regarding treatments to the wordmarks is found in the Co-Branding K-State Research and Extension section, where employees may not think to look. The note does not provide any guidelines related to the types of manipulated or other versions of graphics found in this study, which graphics should and should not be used, and when special graphics for celebrations may be acceptable.

The existence of manipulated or other versions of official graphics and the limited

frequency of desired image, slogan, and graphic appearances represent a low potential for

building visual memory among target audiences. Some cases may cause members of the

public to attribute the content to another source. Improving the consistency of these visual

brand elements would allow for greater brand recognition and increased distinction from

other organizations (brand positioning).

Cobranding

A key aspect of IMC is brand positioning, building a perception of the brand in relation to

the competition (Ang, 2014). Although KSRE may not necessarily be in competition with

other organizations providing outreach and education to the public, KSRE does strive to

build recognition for its efforts and accomplishments, in order to generate and maintain

funding support. The KSRE branding guidelines state that the KSRE brand is, "something

that separates K-State Research and Extension from every other organization" (What is

'Branding?' section, para. 1). For this reason, it is alarming that this study revealed other

organization or brand names occur more frequently in external communication (n= 863,

%= 79.9) than the KSRE name (n= 611, %= 56.6). These other brand names include

programs and organizations within or associated with KSRE, such as radio program names,

4-H Youth Development, Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities, and Walk Kansas.

Although these names represent a part of the KSRE mission, external audiences may not

recognize these names as part of the same organization (KSRE). According to KSRE's 2007

telephone survey, Kansans show strong interest for many of the issues KSRE addresses

(such as environment, health and nutrition, youth development, and lawn and gardens). It

is critical that Kansans associate all KSRE's efforts regarding these issues with the actual

organization. Other brand names serve as "competitive clutter" and interfere with building

memory (Ang, 2014).

The low frequency of the KSRE name in relation to other organizations or brand names is

concerning. However, since visual memory triggers faster brand recognition (Percy, 2008),

the low frequency of KSRE graphics in relation to other organizations or brand graphics is

more concerning. The guidelines outline how KSRE employees should represent the brand

alongside partnering organizations, such as 4-H Youth Development. However, the

guidelines do not directly state that the KSRE graphic should always appear near the other

organization graphic(s). Additionally, the guidelines do not help clarify policy regarding use

of graphics for the Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities program and other brands or

organizations. Although graphics for other organizations or brands did not appear often

(only in 10.5% of visual units, n= 61), when they did appear, 67.2% of the time, they were

improperly cobranded (n= 41, %= 7.1). The Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities

graphic was the only graphic improperly cobranded with KSRE in more than two units (it

was improperly cobranded in 24 units.) Without public understanding that Kansas Healthy

Yards and Communities and KSRE are the same organization, the two may appear to be in

competition with one another. Moreover, target audiences who follow and appreciate

content from Kansas Healthy Yards and Communities will not associate the program with

KSRE and may believe KSRE has little to no value to them. For example, in a 2014 focus

group study of KSRE's internal members' perceptions of the brand, a participant mentioned

occasions where 4-H audiences would throw away mail marked with KSRE branding

because, although they were involved with 4-H, they did not associate 4-H Youth

Development with KSRE (Ray et al., 2014). Refinement in the cobranding procedures is

needed to help KSRE build stronger partnerships and increase effective brand positioning.

Press Release Branding

Press releases containing brand elements, such as names, images, graphics, and contact

information may help boost effectiveness in generating news content and promoting KSRE.

The PRESSfeed 2012 Online Newsroom and Digital Media Relations Survey found that 80%

of journalists believe it is important to include images with news content and 75% said

including videos was important (Press Feed, 2012). In 2011, a PR Newswire study found

visual elements within news releases can boost views by as much as 77% (Sherik, 2011).

This is an area where KSRE falls short.

All KSRE press release units (100%) contained zero graphics. Business Wire (2015), a

global leader in the distribution of press releases recommends including the organization's

logo at the top of the release to "build recognition" (para. 7). Furthermore, the lack of

mailing addresses and social media links in press releases are a potential missed

opportunity to connect the news media and public with the brand. As mentioned earlier, to

increase name recognition, press releases could also increase mentions of the KSRE's name

within the body of the release, particularly at the beginning.

Radio Branding

The lack of consistent brand name appearances in radio unit is a concern because listeners

may be unaware who is offering the service. Radio listeners do not receive visual cues,

which are powerful in building brand recognition (Percy, 2008). Effective techniques for

radio advertising include linking the content to television advertising (to trigger memories

of the visual elements) and repeating "phrases, brands, and any important information"

(Ang, 2014, p. 122). This study found each of the nine radio programs used a unique way of

attributing production credit to one or more of the following: K-State Radio Network, the

Department of Communications and Agricultural Education at Kansas State University, K-

State Research Extension, a different version of the KSRE name, or to no entity. Increased

consistency could help increase brand name recognition among radio audiences.

The low percentages of correct name appearances are a major concern for branding. These

results do not account for appearances of the name within the website pages that housed

the videos and podcasts. However, had the audience encountered the video or podcast in a

different setting, such as a live radio broadcast, they would not have encountered such

appearances. An assessment of the number of live listeners and online listeners would be

useful in determining how many audiences the podcasts are reaching and in what format.

There are some limitations in the way radio units were coded, but the study still reveals a

need for greater consistency in radio branding. A possible explanation for low percentages

of the KSRE name in radio units could be the segmentation of the Agriculture Today radio

program (the program that appeared in the greatest frequency within the sample). The

sample included opening, body, and closing segments of the Agriculture Today program. Although this study did not make note of the distinct differences in how the name appeared in opening, body, and closing segments, these differences surely exist. However, one could argue listeners tuning in to the beginning of any segments (ranging from about eight to 11 minutes in length) should be given an opportunity to recognize the name of the organization that produces the program.

YouTube Branding

YouTube videos contained several branding issues including lack of the correct name (n= 87, %= 87); lack of correct name and any version of the name (n= 27, %= 27); lack of the correct name and graphics (n= 33, %= 33); and lack of the correct name, any version of the name, and lack of any graphics (n= 17, %= 17). YouTube units also included 32 occurrences of improper cobranding (32%). Appearances of the correct name (n= 13, %= 13) and workmark with (n= 23, %= 23) and without the Powercat (n= 37, %= 37) were low. The coding process did not account for additional branding elements on the YouTube page, including the name and workmark outside of the video itself. However, when a viewer encounters the video outside of the YouTube site (i.e. embedded in a website, Twitter, or Facebook medium or shown at an event), they would not gather those external visuals anyway. The lack of KSRE branding in the majority of YouTube videos does not allow viewers to build recognition of KSRE's name and its desired look and feel. A comparison between views and units with improper or missing branding would help demonstrate the extent of this missed opportunity for building brand recognition.

Target Audiences

IMC involves understanding the target audience's media usage habits, in order to plan communication that can "break through the clutter" (Ang 2014, p. 11). KSRE uses a variety of communication media (seven examined in this study) and aims to reach a wide variety of audiences (twelve examined in this study). The study found the greatest percentage of targeted content (by more than double) was tailored to agricultural professionals (n= 729, %= 67.5). The finding that most units are tailored to agricultural audiences suggests KSRE's external communication may be mainly focused on reaching audiences already engaged with KSRE and using its services. After agricultural audiences, the groups with the most content of interest provided were funding sources (n= 302, %= 28) and all Kansans (n= 279, %= 26.8). The amount of content tailored to other targeted groups (youth, students/perspective students, KSRE volunteers, homeowners/landowners, adults, parents, employees, and gardeners) was fairly equal, ranging from 8.6% (n= 93) to 14.1% (n= 152), with the exception of senior citizens (n= 19, % 1.8). The minimal diversity among content (primarily tailored to agricultural audiences) is concerning as KSRE aims to reach and engage all publics. KSRE must reach and engage other audiences in order to improve its public value. The organization must also communicate how it impacts the lives of diverse audiences in order to demonstrate value and earn advocacy.

Targeted content for all audience groups (except for senior citizens) was found (to some extent) within all media. This implies KSRE communicators generally attempt to reach all audiences across all media. A current evaluation of target audiences' media usage and preferences may provide a more strategic approach for communication, or it may reaffirm

strategies already in place (such as not posting content for senior citizens on Facebook).

The greatest factor in satisfaction for extension clients is personal relevance, making

tailored content essential in engaging audiences (Galindo-Gonzalez & Israel, 2010).

Targeted Audiences and Twitter

Twitter was found to be the greatest source of content of interest to all audiences (n= 298,

%= 647.8), with the exception of senior citizens. To qualify as containing content of

interest, at least one tweet within a unit (a week of tweets) mentioned information of

interest to the particular group. Therefore, Twitter units recorded as containing content of

interest to one particular group may not contain a high volume of content for that

particular audience unit. The unit could contain as little as one tweet (with 140 characters

or less). However, that tweet might contain a link leading to more content. All Twitter units

contained at least one website link, which was the extent of link measurement conducted in

this study. Using Twitter as an extra medium to disseminate KSRE content published in

other media (press releases, YouTube videos, radio podcasts, website pages, Facebook

posts, and publications) may be an effective tool. Like the Facebook page, scrolling through

the Twitter feed does demonstrate to viewers that KSRE addresses a wide range of issues.

However, audiences may not view the feed, only seeing a few occasional tweets from the

organization. In order to utilize Twitter strategically, KSRE should consider which

audiences use Twitter and what their purposes are. Examining Twitter analytics including

views and interaction may help employees understand which audiences are engaged and

what content they are most interested in. The analysis may also reveal which audiences are

not currently engaged on Twitter.

Calls to Action

The ultimate goal in most applications of IMC is to motivate audiences to make a purchase (Ang, 2014). Although the goals of extension communication are unique (to expand engagement and learning among stakeholders and to generate support), they still require audience members to take action (Culp, 2013 A; Culp, 2013 B). This study found a variety of contact information types were provided to audiences as potential calls to action, including phone numbers (n= 280, %= 25.9) and email addresses (n= 212, %= 19.6). The study found zero use of QR codes (n= 0, %=0), which could be a missed opportunity to immediately drive audiences to more information and to measure that interaction. Calls to action in online media also allow a quantifiable measurement of engagement with the communication (Ewing, 2009). Of the content of interest to target audiences, 867 occurrences (37.5%) included zero calls to action. The majority of those cases were radio units (n= 586, %= 25.4). The lack of calls to action in these media makes it more challenging to measure audience engagement, and is a missed opportunity to invite audiences to connect with KSRE.

Social Media Links

The broken links and links to Kansas State University social media are a missed opportunity to drive traffic to KSRE's social media presence. Even though the branding guidelines mention that local offices should promote their social media presence through their website, only 56% (n= 78) of the state agency's website pages included a link to at least one KSRE social media site. Building a large fan base is critical for social media sites

because non-paid posts and tweets are now reaching a smaller percentage of an organization's Facebook and Twitter fan base (Luckerson, 2014; Sullivan, 2014). Not giving audiences the means to connect with KSRE on social media while they are already online and already viewing the organization's website is an incredible missed opportunity.

Every encounter with the brand should have a consistent look and feel (Percy, 2008). However, the audit of social media links revealed some unique blog pages associated with the organization. Although the pages were not extensively examined, coders made a note that the sites may be violation with branding guidelines. This inconsistency makes it harder for audiences to remember the look and feel of KSRE and understand when information is provided by KSRE, versus "any other organization" (Branding Guidelines, 2015, What is 'Branding?', para. 1).

Website Links

Website links were the most commonly used call to action (n= 476, %= 44.1). The number of website links provided to outside organizations (n= 321, %= 29.7) is also a concern for building brand recognition. Directing audiences to external sites makes it more difficult for target audiences to remember the look and feel of the KSRE brand. "The target audience should be able to immediately identify any execution within a campaign, and over time, as belonging to the brand" (Percy, 2008, p. 202). Of the units that contained a link to any website (n= 476), the majority (n= 476, %= 67.4) contained at least one link to an external organization's website link. The high percentage of units containing at least one link to an external site may make it difficult for target audiences to recognize KSRE services and

information, which may lead to a lack of awareness over time. Directing audiences to outside sources for information may help provide users with the answers to their questions, but it may also harm the effort to build awareness of the KSRE brand, particularly with newer audiences.

The method in which website links were recorded does not fully clarify the extent of this issue. This study did not examine the number of links provided within each unit that linked to internal and external website pages; this statistic would clarify the disparity between the amount of times KSRE promotes itself as a source for information and the amount of times KSRE directs audiences to external (or seemingly external sources) within each unit. Links to other entities on the Kansas State University campus (such as the agronomy department) were recorded as external website pages because these pages do not include the KSRE name and audiences may be unfamiliar with the relationship between Kansas State University and KSRE. Understanding how external audiences perceive this relationship is critical in determining the development of brand recognition and understanding of the land-grant system.

<div align="center">

Key Messages

</div>

Official Statements Containing the Full Name

It has been discovered that KSRE employees and board members at the county level would appreciate a vision or mission statement they can use while communicating to external audiences (Ray et al., 2014). The official statements found in this study (containing the organization's full name) represent key messages already being used in external

communication. Statement C, the statement found in publications, is a non-discrimination

statement that is a bit more formal and legal in tone. Statement A, the statement found in

press releases and Statement B, the statement from the About Us page of the website are

both a bit more descriptive of the organization. Although there are some similarities, there

are also some critical differences between Statement A and Statement B. Unlike Statement

A (in press releases), Statement B (on the About Us website page) does:

- emphasize KSRE is in "every" county;
- carry a more informal, conversational tone through the use of "we;"
- describe what KSRE's work looks like (tactics);

Unlike Statement B, Statement C does not

- directly address "funding;"
- describe the overall strategy behind those tactics, such as generating and distributing "useful knowledge for the well-being of Kansans."

None of the official statements include the official slogan, Knowledge for Life. Utilizing

multiple key messages and official statements can cause difficulty in building awareness

and understanding of the brand (Ang, 2014) and can make it difficult for audiences to

remember key messages (Percy, 2008).

Impact and Public Value Statements

This study attempted to examine key messages of impact and public value, using the

criteria KSRE communication leaders established to help employees write such statements.

These variables were removed from the study because an acceptable intercoder reliability

score was not achieved. This means coders could not come to consistent agreement of how

to identify and score these statements within KSRE communication. This implies the

guidelines KSRE created regarding public value and impact may also be difficult for the

KSRE employees to interpret, utilize, and recognize in practice.

Explaining KSRE Through Conversation

Previous research has shown Kansans are more familiar with the Extension name rather

than K-State Research and Extension (Communications and Agricultural Education, 2007),

indicating a need to communicate the mission and build understanding. A minor theme in

Ray et al.'s (2014) assessment of KSRE's internal audiences showed employees

communicated the brand differently based on their perception of the audience. Although a

major theme was that the Knowledge for Life slogan described the mission well, a minor

theme indicated the organization would benefit from having an elevator speech to best

describe the overarching mission to newer audiences (Ray et al., 2014). The branding

guidelines do not currently include strategy for explaining the KSRE mission through

conversation, leaving employees on their own to try to communicate that critical and

complex understanding of the mission. The KSRE website does not clearly state what the

KSRE mission is.

Recommendations for KSRE

Branding guidelines

The primary recommendation for KSRE is to make substantial edits and additions to the

branding guidelines in order to increase clarity, promote understanding among all

employees, and more strategically communicate to external audiences. The recommended

edits will address all aspects of branding (names, graphics, images, calls to action, target audiences, and key messages) across all seven media from this study and additional media currently in use, such as blogs, Flickr, and Pinterest.

Additionally, the branding guidelines should be compiled in one printable Portable Document Format (PDF). This is the same format as Kansas State University's branding guidelines and KSRE's style guide, which makes it easier for electronic searching for key terms and for printing. Like the university's guidelines, the document should have a table of contents that clearly outlines where to find information. This will be an improvement from the current format of guidelines on the KSRE website, which is difficult to navigate. For example, the guidelines regarding the assumed correct name (K-State Research and Extension) and the full version of the name are currently found under the Acronym (KSRE) tab with the section title, Using the K-State Research and Extension acronym. An employee looking for guidelines regarding the full name may not think to search under the acronym tab. Information regarding use of the correct name, the full name, and the acronym should be clearly labeled in the updated guidelines.

The branding guideline's audience should be better reflected. The audience includes all employees working in all units at state, county, and district levels. Wording such as, "tips for maintaining your site" should only be found in a specific section of guidelines and clarifications that only apply to local units. The guidelines should continue to emphasize that, "all employees contribute to K-State Research and Extension's brand…" (Branding

166

guidelines, 2015, What is Branding?). Special sections, like the local units and medium-specific sections, should be tailored to the appropriate segments of employees.

Changes to the KSRE branding guidelines should do the following.

- Explicitly state that the correct name (K-State Research and Extension) must be used at least once in all communication. Recommended correct name frequency per unit should be stated in the respective medium-specific section of guidelines.

- Reflect a change in policy that the KSRE acronym is acceptable for use upon second reference. This change would allow the name to be used more frequently and with greater ease. Guidelines will read that the acronym should always be introduced upon first reference: K-State Research and Extension (KSRE).

Leaders must reevaluate official statements to develop key messages and determine when such messages need to be used. Edited branding guidelines should reflect leaders' decisions and provide an example of the statements that must appear in all press releases and publications. Guidelines should clearly dictate where each statement must appear and within which media. The preference of the author is to remove inappropriate capitalization of "extension" within statements and to make the following changes to statement use.

- Edit Statement A (used in press releases) to better reflect KSRE's mission and structure. This message should be named as the organization's mission statement, and it should be used in all press releases and in any medium where a mission statement is appropriate. This edited statement should also replace Statement B on the About Us page of the website. One suggestion is

K-State Research and Extension (KSRE) generates practical information and promotes education for all Kansans through support from Kansas State University and federal, state, and county government. Educators are found in every county, helping community members apply research-based knowledge for life. KSRE is the short name for the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service.

- Since the non-discrimination statement is legally required to appear in all printed materials, the statement should be edited to also reflect the organization's mission. A suggestion for an edited version is

    K-State Research and Extension (KSRE) generates practical information and promotes education for all Kansans through support from Kansas State University and federal, state, and county government. Educators are found in every county, helping community members apply research-based knowledge for life. KSRE is the short name for the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. KSRE is an equal opportunity provider and employer. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, as amended. Kansas State University, county extension councils, extension districts, and United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating, John D. Floros, Director.

The Knowledge for Life slogan should appear more frequently in external communication once it is included in these key messages. The guidelines will provide additional clarification regarding use of the slogan.

- The slogan (in both written and wordmark form) should never appear within quotation marks. A discussion with a KSRE employee reflected previous slogan guidelines included uses of quotation marks, but that use is no longer accepted (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). Although no appearances of the slogan within quotes were found, the distinction should still be included in the branding guidelines.

- The slogan should not be capitalized when it occurs within the two official statements.

Considering previous research, the preference of the researcher is to provide a section in the guidelines specific to personal conversations regarding the brand.

- Employees should aim to include the name "K-State Research and Extension" when introducing themselves to new audiences.

- Explaining the entire size and scope of KSRE may be extremely challenging to do within conversations. Short phrases to use in conversation may include

  - "[We provide] practical education you can trust – to help people, businesses, and communities solve problems, develop skills, and build a better future" (Kansas Cooperative Extension Service, 2014, para. 2).

  - Our goal is to improve the quality of life for all Kansans.

  - We conduct research, interpret what it means, and share that knowledge with people at the state and local level.

  - We are in every county, and we work to address a wide range of issues, including health, food systems, and leadership development.

- K-State Research and Extension is part of a national system of extension programs tied to land-grant universities.

- The mission of the land-grant system is to research, teach, and extend knowledge to the general public through outreach.

- We are passionate about helping people find and understand information that will improve their lives, and we work alongside them to implement solutions.

The branding guidelines explain why communication must be consistent so newer audiences to build memory and understanding of the organization's name and purpose. To do this, guidelines will clarify use of names shown in Table 4.9 and 4.12. Guidelines will include a complete list of specific versions of the name to be used:

- **K-State Research and Extension News Media Services** will be used in all print, video, and website content related to news and feature stories.

  - The name should be used at the bottom of all press releases, below the writer's name and above their phone number and email address. This will be reflected in the press release template.

  - The name should appear in all website pages associated with press releases and video (YouTube) news content.

  - K-State Research and Extension News Media Services should NOT appear within radio programs and website pages containing podcasts because the K-State Radio Network name should be used instead.

- **K-State Radio Network** will be used to introduce all radio programs within the podcasts and on the website. The website description will be edited to better reflect the structure of the networking, clarify this brand name, and follow AP style.

  o The K-State Radio Network name will always appear alongside (but smaller than) the KSRE name, to ensure consistent and effective cobranding.

  o A complete set of guidelines specific to radio branding will be included in the Radio section.

Guidelines should include a complete list of specific versions of the name *not* to be used in any communication. Unless the name of the organization is changed, the following names should *not* be used to refer to the organization:

- Research and Extension at Kansas State University
- Research and Extension
- K-State Extension
- Research and Extension at Kansas State
- Kansas State University Research and Extension
- K-State Research
- Research- Extension Center
- The Kansas Cooperative Extension Service
- Kansas Cooperative Service
- Research and Extension Service
- Kansas Cooperative Extension Service
- Kansas State University Cooperative Extension Service
- Kansas State University Extension

Guidelines should include a complete list of specific versions of the name *not* to be used to refer to the communications, news, and marketing components of KSRE:

- K-State Research and Extension News
- Produced by the Department of Communications at Kansas State University
- K-State Research and Extension Department of Communications News Unit
- Department of Communications and Agricultural Education
- K-State Research & Extension News (with an ampersand in place of "and")

Guidelines should include a distinction that the following entities should be referred to in this form:

- **K-State Research Extension Bookstore —** refers to the online source for downloading and ordering publications, printed materials, and other promotional materials.

- **K-State Research and Extension events —** refers to any list of upcoming events or activities hosted by or coordinated in part by KSRE.

- **Agricultural Experiment Station —** refers to the agricultural research component of KSRE. Research is conducted at the main campus, at four research centers, six satellite units, and ten experiment fields.

- **K-State Research and Extension website —** refers to any references to the KSRE website.

- **Kansas PRIDE Program —** refers to a partnership between KSRE, the Kansas Department of Commerce, and Kansas PRIDE, Inc.

- **K-State Research and Extension PRIDE Coordinator —** serves as a title to the KSRE employee involved in coordinating the Kansas PRIDE Program.

- **K-State Research and Extension Prepare Kansas Team —** refers to the program, which offers an online financial challenge coordinated by KSRE. The program has its own graphic, which must be properly cobranded alongside the KSRE workmark (with Powercat), and smaller in size.

- **Huck Boyd National Institute for Rural Development —** refers to the public / private partnership between Kansas State University and the Huck Boyd

Foundation. The mission of the institute is to help rural people help themselves. The organization uses the tagline, "Now, that's rural" (does not appear within quotes).

Guidelines will include the note about references to the university (currently only found in Kansas State University branding guidelines.

- Avoid using *KSU* unless space limitations require it.

- *K-State* is acceptable on second reference for an on-campus or in-state audience or for publications directed at alumni.

- In general, *Kansas State* is only used for athletics-related news and publications.

- Lowercase *university* when used alone.

Guidelines will add medium-specific sections to clarify protocols dealing with the complexities and strategies behind of each medium:

- **YouTube —** All videos must contain at least one visual appearance of the KSRE wordmark with Powercat and one verbal use of the KSRE name within the first two minutes.

- **Radio —** All radio broadcasts must somehow announce each program by including the phrase, "K-State Research and Extension over the K-State Radio Network."

- **Website —** All website pages must include links at the bottom of the page that successfully direct viewers to the KSRE Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Pinterest channels. Observations of the absence or failure of such links should be reported to the appointed website administrator.

- **Press releases —** All press releases must be presented in the appropriate template, which includes letterhead and contact information. The template should be available for downloading along with other templates materials such as business

cards and PowerPoint presentations. Additional notes about press release units are found later in this chapter.

- **Publications —** A section in the guidelines should more clearly present the policy regarding branding elements on publication units. Additional notes recommendations for publications are found later in this chapter.

- **Facebook —** Guidelines should better highlight the policy of posting updates at least twice per week. The note encouraging use of photos on Facebook will direct employees to more information found in the Images section.

- **Twitter —** The section will make note that use of the KSRE acronym is encouraged on Twitter, due to the character limit. Strategies for target audience engagement on Twitter will be included.

- **Pinterest —** Strategies for target audience engagement on Pinterest will be included.

- **Blogs —** A note should be made that all social media sites should adhere to the same general branding guidelines. KSRE and Kansas State University can provide an online blog platform for all employees managing a blog to use. Guidelines should provide a standard blog site template to increase perceived credibility of the blog and build user associations between the blog content and other communication from KSRE, leading to brand awareness and positioning.

- **Flickr —** A note will be made of how KSRE should use Flickr to better share and utilize images that capture the essence of the brand. Further description is found later in this chapter.

The "Cobranding" section of the branding guidelines will be more specific to address issues found in this study. The section will:

- Clearly state the KSRE name must appear in all communication.

- Clarify that the relationship between names of other organizations and brands (including KSRE programs) must be explained in relation to KSRE.

- Clearly state the KSRE workmark (in either version) must appear in all instances of cobranding. The proper display of the KSRE workmark in relation to other graphics is already explained in current guidelines, but there is no specification that the workmark be present.

The proper way to refer to local offices and research centers needs added clarity and explanations. A complete list of county and district offices, in addition to research centers, research satellite units, and experiment fields should be kept in the branding guidelines, to make it easy for employees to verify they are making correct references. Currently, it is difficult to determine the correct way to reference the office names, particularly the district offices. For example, the website refers to the Southeast Area Extension Office and K-State Research and Extension, Southeast Area. The guidelines must clarify how these names should be used or not used. A note should be made that employees should contact an appointed individual for help if he or she is trying to reference an entity within KSRE that is not mentioned in the list above. For example, when referring to one of the research centers that studies horticulture, employees should *not* create a new proper noun, such as the Horticulture Research and Extension Center.

Currently, the Titles tab of the branding guidelines leads to the Professional Titles section, which leads to link (at the bottom of the page) for the correct names and titles for the university president, deans, directors, department heads and other campus leaders. It is of note that the Department of Communications and Agricultural Education is inappropriately referenced in the Professional Titles section (by the previous, outdated name). The correction to the department's name must be made, and this section must be easier to navigate in the updated branding guidelines.

Similar to the titles section of the current guidelines, a section should be added to explain how specialists, agents, researchers, and other KSRE employees should be introduced. The preference of the researcher is to specify how employees must be introduced.

- Emphasize that employees must be introduced along with the K-State Research and Extension name and their title, across all media.
- This can be done through verbal mentions in radio and YouTube communication, using either of the following formats:
  - K-State Research and Extension Crop Entomologist John Smith
  - John Smith, crop entomologist for K-State Research and Extension
- Guidelines should direct press release and publication writers to the pre-established page in the KSRE style guide for details related to professional titles.
- Additionally, branding guidelines should include a note regarding specialist and agent titles and provide a link to an employee directory.

Specifications must be added to explain how KSRE should be cobranded with Kansas State University departments. The KSRE name should appear near a department's name if the two entities are working in collaboration on a project. However, the two names should never be merged together. For example, the following combinations of names (found in this study) should *not* be used:

- K-State Research and Extension's Department of Communication
- K-State Research and Extension Entomology

Instead, these entities should be cobranded together, following protocols outlined in the cobranding section of the guidelines.

Adding more examples of quality images that meet the desired criteria would enhance the guidelines regarding images. Examples of unique ways to capture teaching moments and portray the same desired look and feel could help employees better understand how they can do this. Additionally, KSRE's most experienced photographers can share practical tips for capturing action shots and making the subject feel relaxed and comfortable during posed shots.

Press releases

It is recommended that KSRE staff make changes to procedures regarding press releases. All press releases should be submitted on a consistent letterhead that includes a version of the KSRE wordmark, along with contact information. Templates for business cards, car signs, envelopes, letterhead, newsletters, office signs, and PowerPoint presentations are currently available to download in the online branding guidelines; a template for press

releases should be added to this list. The template can be adjusted for use by county offices, but the overall look and feel (use of graphics and color) should be identical. Additionally, press release writers should increase the number of images included in press releases. Press releases should provide a link to a Flickr page that includes the official graphic in a useable format, along with any photos appropriate for the piece. For clarity, staff should implement a more consistent file saving system for press release documents. Additionally, staff should track when press releases are actually picked up by news sources, which sources (local, state-wide, and national) run articles from KSRE, which images were used, how many articles were adapted and/or shortened, how often the KSRE name appears within articles, and how often the extension and research components each appear within articles.

Publications

The publications section in the guidelines should clearly present policies regarding branding elements on publication units, including required use of the KSRE name, images, the KSRE graphic within the first half of the first page, and official statements. Additionally, guidelines should provide a link to any other relevant pages on the KSRE website. Publications should use QR codes and shortened web addresses whenever possible, to direct and track traffic from the printed documents to the KSRE website.

The guidelines should explain which publications (e.g. agricultural or family studies) must always contain at least one image and explain which types of images should be used. This specification, along with the recommended increased use of Flicker, would help employees increase the frequency of images found within publications and, ultimately, strengthen the

visual brand representation. Prior to publication, an appointed publication leader must approve any use of visual representations of other brand or organization names.

Flickr

To best take advantage of Flickr as a tool in building visual memory, KSRE should increase the number of quality photos uploaded to Flickr and the number of times those images are shared. Flicker is used to share images with media professionals and other stakeholders and to build an online visual representation of the organization. The branding guidelines should dictate that employees in any unit, including local units, should submit photos (to an appointed employee) to be stored in the organization's one Flickr account. The appointed employee at the state office will be responsible for obtaining the images, captions, and photo credits from KSRE employees, uploading them to the Flickr account, and emailing the submitter a link to where the image can be easily shared and downloaded. Notes regarding proper file size and file sharing procedure (how to transfer photos internally from the submitter to the appointed Flickr manager) must be included in the guidelines.

Name appearances

KSRE employees should work to increase the appearance of the correct brand name in all unit types. An area of focus may be the media that contained no brand elements at all, which were YouTube and radio. This area should be corrected with the previously stated clarifications and additions to the branding guidelines. Establishing a schedule for regular metrics will allow for monitoring the frequency of name appearances within KSRE communication efforts and within news media.

Training

KSRE should provide training to promote understanding of the revised branding guidelines. A follow-up staff meeting can help identify any potential areas of confusion in executing the revised branding guidelines. Unit leaders should encourage more focus on consistent branding, in order to replace occurrences of incorrect or less appropriate versions of the KSRE and Kansas State University name with the correct versions. Leaders should also encourage increased use of the appropriate visual elements, which will be measured in the recommended metric program.

Establishing metrics

This study was the first to measure how KSRE employees are communicating the brand to external audiences. Organizations should establish a schedule for gathering and evaluating metrics on a regular basis. Paine (2011) recommends organizations new at measurement start with an annual evaluation or pilot program.

A plan for annual measurement of brand consistency should be established for each medium at the state level. (After the state agency has developed effective strategies for this measurement, the local units should be trained to implement their own measurement systems.) Measurable objectives for strategic use of each medium should be created and shared among all employees involved with the particular medium. Routine tracking and readjustment of these objectives will foster continual growth and improvement and account for any potential changes in structure or personnel that may affect branding consistency.

Recommendations for Theory

This study provides additional support for IMC research. The findings align with Ang's (2014) statement that IMC is needed to establish consistency and clarity when there is more than one audience, more than one message, different geographical areas to be targeted, and many contact points. The study reaffirms the notion that the land-grant university system needs to use IMC in order to generate awareness and build memory and understanding. Additionally, this study reaffirms that the task is challenging. The unique aspects of various media (print, web, visual, audio, etc.) make it challenging to communicate a consistent look and feel over time through names, messages, and visuals, especially when addressing a wide range of target audiences, who are more or less familiar with the brand.

This study suggests clarifying vague areas and adding specification to the branding guidelines can help promote consistent communication from employees working throughout a large organization, but that is only the beginning stage of IMC planning and implementation (Ang, 2014). Continual measurement is required to monitor consistency and communication effectiveness (Paine, 2011). Before this study was conducted, KSRE employees and leaders were unaware that the correct name was only appearing in 56.6% of its annual communication efforts. The researcher's recommendations will help KSRE increase consistency. Ultimately, the organization must to do more than establish consistency. Brand consistency, such as using a consistent name and graphic, is almost assumed in IMC literature, as markers move beyond being consistent to being strategic in

positioning the brand in relation to the competition (Ang, 2014; Percy, 2008) and initiating two-way communication or engagement with key audiences (Irani et al., 2006).

This research challenges the idea that building brand consistency is a simple task and brings to light the need for more research regarding IMC implementation in the land-grant system. As communication technologies continue to develop at a rapid pace, the need for coordination and consistency (IMC) is growing (Ang, 2014). Land-grant communicators are behind the curve as other marketers have adapted their strategies to be focused on listening to target audiences and engaging them, rather than simply disseminating information (Young, 2014). State extension agencies need to adapt their strategies to be consistent and audience focused. Effective IMC execution today means walking alongside target audiences all the way from initial awareness, to involvement, consideration, purchase, consumption, relationship building, and advocacy (Young, 2014).

Extension has succeeded in building strong relationships with some members of the public who become advocates in promoting the brand (especially members of the agricultural and 4-H Youth Development community), but societal and structural changes mean extension must expand to reach new audiences and foster greater advocacy. Developing a body of literature specific to IMC and extension would allow communicators to help one another develop strategies for facing their complex and challenging task and better engaging all members of the general public with the extension brand. The model should help communicators select and focus communication to the most critical target audiences, as the budget and resources allow.

Recommendations for Practitioners

While this study examined one specific extension program, other extension communicators can gain insight for communication improvement. Extension leaders should build a knowledge management culture within their organization, where measurement is viewed as an essential tool to strategically operate (Paine, 2011). Measurement can often be viewed as a way to point out flaws and weakness (Paine, 2011). Instead, communication measurement should be embraced as a means to achieve improvement not only in promoting extension efforts (Paine, 2011), but also in reaching and serving more stakeholders and achieving the land-grant mission. Practitioners should examine their own branding guidelines, using similar methods to determine areas for improvement and implement internal methods for regular evaluation.

Recommendations for Researchers

Many of the findings in this study serve as a benchmark measurement. Benchmark measurements provide little value if they are not compared to other organizations or to the same organization over time (Paine, 2011). This study should be replicated to see how the organization's use of branding and calls to action, and the extent of targeted content change over time, specifically, after branding guidelines are improved and implemented. This should be done in the form of regularly scheduled evaluation, at least on an annual basis.

To best inform the strategy for writing measureable communication objectives, the data from this study should be compared to additional qualitative and quantitative data specific to individual communication media and audience segments. Website analytics available

183

through free programs such as Google Analytics and through Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube should be used to measure online reach, engagement, and patterns in online traffic. Online analytics can also be used to measure how frequently the KSRE name appears in online news sources; clipping services can be used to track appearances in print sources. Additionally, the live and online radio broadcast statistics should be analyzed for comparison. These comparisons would provide more meaningful data by determining which media are more successful in reaching and engaging audiences and how each audience prefers to interact with KSRE. Qualitative focus groups should be conducted to determine how audiences perceive the KSRE brand when they encounter it (both regular extension users and stakeholders less familiar with the brand). The assessment can also determine how the audiences prefer to receive information, and what calls to action they would appreciate. A survey of identified radio listeners should also be conducted to determine if listeners are familiar with the KSRE name and mission.

Making comparisons between data gathered from target audiences, website analytics, and media tracking to the findings from this study could best quantify and explain the extent of branding issues identified. This study identified how the brand was communicated, but did not examine the reach of this communication, and how audiences perceived it. The suggested steps for further analysis would provide information to most strategically address the challenges communicators at KSRE and throughout the entire land-grant system face in communicating to a wide range of audiences and building recognition and understanding of the complex mission. In relation to target audiences, future research should further examine which audiences are reached and where those audiences fall on the

consumer pathway model. An assessment should also be made in relation to the amount of content that is shared between internal audiences (employees and board members) through various media.

Additionally, future research should examine how the communication pieces created at the state level are used in district and county offices. Extension agents should be surveyed to determine which communication pieces are most useful, what makes them useful, how pieces are being used, and what pieces are used the most and the least in both digital and print form. The social media feeds from each of the county and district offices that use social media should also be examined to determine how often local offices share content from the state level, what other ways are offices using social media, and how is the brand being communicated in relation to the revised branding guidelines.

As this was the first attempt to measure KSRE's external communication and the study involved a large sample (1,080 units) and number of variables (109), the researcher faced challenges in efficiently setting up coding sheets and managing extensive electronic and print files. The complexity in the levels of variables (nominal and ratio) and the way those variables were ordered in the codebook created added difficulty in computing accurate and meaningful intercoder reliability scores. For these reasons, the researcher recommends conducting smaller studies in the future that are focused on one medium, but can still be compared to one another. This will shorten and simplify the coding process; the codebooks used will focus on one medium to best account for complexities and differences.

Upon replication of this study, or a similar version of this research, target audiences can be broken down into smaller, more specific segments, and additional audiences can be examined. For example, previous KSRE marketing strategy has included focus on reaching metropolitan adults and minority groups (P. Melgares, personal communication, November 20, 2013). Due to challenges in defining and identifying content of interest to these groups in the coding process, these audiences were left out of the study codebook.

Furthermore, setting up the codebook to collect data in a way that is easier to analyze key performance indicators (KPIs) on a regular basis would be wise. KPIs would need to be determined to best measure KSRE's communication objectives. For example, had this study asked coders, "Does the unit contain at least one appearance of the correct name OR at least one appearance of a correct wordmark (either version)?," analysis would have been faster. To obtain that same information in this study would require sorting through the 101 variables in this study to find the three variables needed for comparison (correct name use, wordmark with Powercat use, and wordmark without Powercat use). However, as the organization moves forward, this particular measurement would not be as useful. As KSRE improves the application of more strategic brand guides, the answer to that question should always be, "yes," 100% of the time and the name should appear multiple times within the unit, depending on medium. For these reasons, researchers must determine which KPI's are most valuable to the organization over time and how the required data can be acquired quickly on a regular basis.

Some additional recommendations for replication of this study are to make appropriate exemptions to the study sample, examine additional criteria regarding images, and to examine the first 250 words of press releases separately. Exemptions that could have been made to this study sample were the website pages for Department of Communications and Agricultural Education. Additionally, the study could have coded for images containing action shots and researchers positioned as experts, which are criteria included in the branding guidelines. Exclusively examining the first portion of press releases would determine how the brand is represented in the most critical part of the media release.

Examination of the public value and impact components of this study should be conducted via a qualitative analysis. These variables were too difficult to code via quantitative analysis. However, after studying this area through qualitative methods and determining what types of phrases are being used, researchers may unveil some critical themes. An initial qualitative approach may help inform a more efficient codebook for a later quantitative study, in which intercoder reliability may be achieved.

Although quantitative content analysis methods recommend the researcher is not one of the study coders (Lombard, et al., 2002), this research found it to be a useful tactic in the initial assessment of KSRE's branding. The researcher was able to observe complexities in the communication media and interesting trends within KSRE external communication including the unique branding (or lack of branding) found on website pages containing organization history, the most commonly provided phone number, and the existence of what appeared to be violations of branding guidelines found on KSRE-affiliated blog pages.

Had the researcher relied entirely on outside coders to report these instances, coders may have been too overwhelmed with the amount of data to keep track of all of these unique characteristics and communicate them to the researcher. Through participating in the coding process, the researcher developed a thorough understanding of the many complexities among the seven media that could not all be accounted for a single study codebook.

Future research in this field should address the use of the general Extension name versus branding using the state extension agency name. Previous research has shown that in 2007, Kansans recognized the organization as "extension" more frequently (70%) than by the K-State Research and Extension name (55.5%) (Communication and Agricultural Education Research, 2015). The survey should be replicated to determine current recognition of the two names. This measurement of name recognition over time, among audience segments should inform decisions made regarding key messages and use of the organization's name.

Summary

Extension communicators must promote the image of the organization through ensuring consistent branding, while also spreading the message of what extension is and why it is important (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005). This role is critical because members of the legislature and general public have historically had a vague understanding of the land-grant mission (Miller, 1988; Adkins, 1981) and how it is funded (Blalock, 1964). Furthermore, according to principles of the Social Exchange Theory (SET), the land-grant university must demonstrate accountability (Donnellan & Montgomery, 2005; Richardson, et. al., 2000) and explain to taxpayers how the resources and services it provides are

valuable, in order to build relationships, and achieve sustained advocacy and support (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Young, 2014).

A review of mass communication and extension research demonstrates extension communicators could benefit from applying the Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) planning process (Ang, 2014; Maddy & Kealy, 1998). Extension communication involves a great number of complexities including a need to share more than one key message with multiple target audiences; complexities such as these are reasons to practice IMC. Although extension research does provide a framework (i.e. nutrition education model) and demonstrates application of IMC concepts within individual campaigns or programs (Gillespie & Yarbrough, 1984; Brown & Kiernan, 1998), there is no framework or research provided for incorporating IMC across all extension communication efforts.

This study identified specific areas for improvement across all KSRE's external communication and created benchmarks for future measurement. The majority of findings in this study are related to objective one, which was a comprehensive overview of the extent to which KSRE applied its current branding guidelines through external communication. The study found areas where brand guidelines were followed and areas where guidelines were violated. The correct name of the organization only appeared in 56.6% of units examined in this study and the organization name was referred to in a variety of unique versions, meaning there is much room for improving branding consistency. Primarily, the study identified areas where branding guidelines were unclear and needed clarity and added specification. In accordance with objective two, the study

189

identified calls to action provided to external audiences across seven media. A variety of contact information was provided, but some types were only found in a small percentage of units; 867 of units with content tailored to key audiences contained zero calls to action (%= 37.5). The third objective was achieved, as KSRE now has a benchmark measurement of the amount and type of content it provided to 12 target audiences. The agricultural professionals group (n= 729, %= 67.5) was provided with more than two times the amount of content than all other audience groups. All three areas of external communication execution (brand consistency, targeted audiences, and calls to action) could be improved by editing the organization's branding guidelines to better direct employees in strategic communication, providing employee training to ensure proper implementation, and establishing a regular assessment of external communication.

K-State Research and Extension could improve communication and marketing efforts through practicing Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) to more effectively reach and engage target audiences and promote the organization's impact and public value through key messages. The study found that although there is some level of consistency in the way employees communicated across seven media channels, this consistency is not always favorable. The brand values were under-communicated in verbal, written and visual form. There is still much room for improvement, including the 43.4% of units (n= 469) that did not contain the correct name and the more than 50 unique ways of referring to the KSRE brand name. As IMC is a "research-based, audience-focused, result-driven, communication planning processes" (p. 4), these results can be used to make changes to

organizational policies and procedures, which will help employees communicate more

strategically in the future (Ang, 2014).

 Ultimately, KSRE and the land-grant system can use these findings to add clarity and

consistency to the brand, allowing for increased recognition among the general public and

legislature. Implementation of IMC and development of an IMC model for extension

communicators will allow the organization to position itself in relation to other agencies

providing similar services at the local, state, and national level. This implementation must

include regular evaluation and appropriate readjustments to communication strategies.

References

Adkins, R. (1981). Motherhood, apple pie, state legislators and Extension. *Journal of Extension, 19*(2). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1981march/81-2-a1.pdf

Aguilar, C. & Thornsbury, S. (2005). Limited Resources-Growing Needs: Lessons Learned in a Process to Facilitate Program Evaluation. *Journal of Extension, 43*(6). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2005december/a3p.shtml

American Marketing Association (2015). Resource Library. Available at: https://www.ama.org/resources/Pages/Dictionary.aspx?dLetter=A

Ang, L. (2014). *Principles of Integrated Marketing Communications*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Christian, D., *Jacobson*, S. & Minthorn, D. (2013). *Associated Press Stylebook.* New York, NY: The Associated Press.

Babbie, E. R. (2010). *The Practice of Social Research* (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Centage Learning.

Bahnl, H. M. (1991). Institutional Conflict Between Issues-Based and Disciplinary Programming. *Journal of Extension, 29*(4). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1991winter/f1.php

Baker, F. E. & Verma, S. (1993). Evaluating Issues Programming. *Journal of Extension, 31*(3). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1993fall/a5.php

Baker, L. M., Abrams, K., Irani, T., & Meyers, C. (2011). Managing media relations: Determining the reputation of a land grant institution from perspective of media professionals. *Journal of Applied Communications, 95*(2), 60-73. Available at: http://journalofappliedcommunications.org/images/stories/issues/2011/jac_v95_n2_article5.pdf

Baldwin, J. R., Perry, S. D., & Moffitt, M.A. (2004). *Communication Theories for Everyday Life*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Balmer, J. M., Fukukawa, K., & Gray, E. R. (2007). The nature and management of ethical corporate identity: A commentary on corporate identity, corporate social responsibility and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *76*(1), 7-15.

Blalock, T. C. (1964). What legislators think of Extension. *Journal of Extension, 2*(2). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1981march/81-2-a1.pdf

Boldt, W. G. (1988). Image: Creating a Unique and Unified One for Extension. *Journal of Extension, 26*(1). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1988spring/rb3.php

Boone, K., Mesisenbach, T., & Tucker, M. (2000). *Agricultural Communications: Changes and Challenges.* Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Brady, M. K., Bourdeau, B. L., & Heskel, J. (2005). The importance of brand cues in intangible service industries: An application to investment services. *Journal of Services Marketing, 19*(6), 401-410.

Brown, J. L., & Kiernan, N. E. (1998). A model for integrating program development and evaluation. *Journal of Extension, 36*(3), 1-8. Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb5.php

Business Dictionary. (2005). Business dictionary. Available at: http://www.businessdictionary.com/

Business Wire. (2015). *Optimize and reach your audience.* Retrieved from: http://www.businesswire.com/portal/site/home/how-to-write-press-release/

Cousins, C. (2013, May 13). How to build a brand bible & visual style guide. *Design Shack*. Retrieved from: http://designshack.net/articles/graphics/how-to-build-a-brand-bible-visual-style-guide/

Creators. (2012, August 10). YouTube Now: Why we focus on watch time. *Creators: The official YouTube partners & creators blog*. Retrieved from: http://youtubecreator.blogspot.co.uk/2012/08/youtube-now-why-we-focus-on-watch-time.html

Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900.

Culp, K. (2013). Mobilizing Members, Volunteers, and Leaders in Extension: The Call to Action. *Journal of Extension, 51*(4), Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2013august/iw2.php

Culp, K. (2013). Sustaining Members, Volunteers, and Leaders in Community Organizations. *Journal of Extension, 51*(2), Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2013april/tt6.php

Davis, S., & Halligan, C. (2002). Extending your brand by optimizing your customer relationship. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 19*(1), 7-11.

De Swert, K. (2012). *Calculating intercoder reliability in media content analysis using Krippendorff's Alpha.* Retrieved from: http://www.polcomm.org/wp-content/uploads/ICR01022012.pdf

Dillman, D. A. (2000). Mail and Internet surveys (2nd Ed.). NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Donnellan, L. M., & Montgomery, F. S. (2005). Rethinking extension communications: Is issues programming the key. *Journal of Extension, 43*(2). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2005april/a2p.shtml

ECOP. (2013, December 4). Excellence in extension. Retrieved from: http://www.ExcellenceinExtension.org

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology, 2*, 335-362.

Erdem, T., & Swait, J. (1998). Brand equity as a signaling phenomenon. *Journal of consumer Psychology, 7*(2), 131-157.

Eyetrack III. (2004). Observations in advertising. Retrieved from: http://www.poynter.org/extra/eyetrack2004/advertising.htm

Farrell, M., & McDonagh, J. (2012). The Importance of Evaluation–The Case of the 'The Options for Farm Families Programme'in Ireland. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 18*(2), 105-120.

Freelon, D. (2010). ReCal: Intercoder reliability calculation as a web service. *International Journal of Internet Science, 5*(1), 20-33.

Freelon, D. (2013). ReCal OIR: Ordinal, interval, and ratio intercoder reliability as a web service. *International Journal of Internet Science,* 8(1), 10-16.

Freelon, D. (2011). ReCal: reliability calculation for the masses. Available at http://dfreelon.org/utils/recalfront/

Galindo-Gonzalez, S & Israel, G. D. (2010). The Influence of Type of Contact With Extension on Client Satisfaction. *Journal of Extension, 48*(1). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2010february/a4.php

Gillespie, A. H., & Yarbrough, P. (1984). A conceptual model for communicating nutrition. *Journal of Nutrition Education, 16(*4), 168-172.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American sociological review*, 161-178.

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis. Social Problems, 12(4), 436–445. doi:10.2307/798843

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). *Models of public relations and communication.* In J. E. Grunig, Excellence in public relations and communication management (pp. 285-325). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guido, G. (1998). The dichotic theory of salience: A framework for assessing attention and memory. *European Advances in Consumer Research, 3*(3), 114-119.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of marketing, 31*(5/6), 356-365.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human relations*, *55*(8), 989-1018.

Hayes, A. F., & Krippendorf, K. (2007). Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication Method and Measures, 1*(1), 77-89.

Hoover, T. & Connor, N. (2001). Preferred Learning Styles of Florida Association for Family and Consumer Education Volunteers: Implications for Professional Development. *Journal of Extension, 39*(3). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2001june/a3.php

Irani, T., Ruth, A., Telg, R., & Lundy, L. (2006). The Ability to Relate: Assessing the Influence of a Relationship Marketing Strategy and Message Stimuli on Consumer Perceptions of Extension. *Journal of Extension, 44*(6), Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2006december/a7.shtml

Israel, G. D. (1991). Reaching Extension's clientele: Exploring patterns of preferred information channels among small farm operators. *Southern Rural Sociology, 8*, 15-32.

Jones, B. M. (1992). Addressing Societal Needs, *Journal of Extension, 30(4).* Available online at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1992winter/tp1.php

K-State Radio Network. (March 15, 2015) *K-State Radio Network.* Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/News/p.aspx?tabid=57

K-State Research and Extension. (2011). *How to Develop an Effective Impact Statement*. Available at: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=207

K-State Research and Extension. (2015). *Final Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.k-state.edu/p.aspx?tabid=17

K-State Research and Extension. (2015). *About Us*. Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=25

K-State Research and Extension. (2015). *K-State Research and Extension Branding Guide*. Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=200

K-State Research and Extension. (2010). *K-State Research and Extension Style Guide*. Retrieved from: http://www.communications.k-state.edu/doc/publishing/StyleGuide.pdf

K-State Research and Extension News and Media Marketing. (2015). *Communicating Impact and Public Value*. Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=207

K-State Research and Extension News and Media Marketing. (2015) *Contact Us.* Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/News/p.aspx?tabid=39

K-State Research and Extension. (2014). *Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.* Retrieved from: http://www.ksre.k-state.edu/p.aspx?tabid=17

K-State Research and Extension. (2014). *KSRE Legislative Report.* Available at: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/bookstore/Item.aspx?catId=981&pubId=16799

Kaid, L. L., & Wadsworth, A. J. (1989). Content analysis. In. Emmert & L. L. Barker (Eds.) *Measurement of communication behavior* (pp. 197-217) New York: Longman.

Kansas State University. (2013, November 22). *K-State Sesquicentennial*. Retrieved from http://www.k-state.edu/150/

Kansas State University Division of Communications and Marketing. (2013, March). *Brand Guide*. Retrieved from: http://www.k-state.edu/vpcm/branding/KansasStateUniversity_BrandGuide_2013.pdf

Kansas State University Division of Communications and Marketing. (2015). *University Style Guide*. Retrieved from: http://www.k-state.edu/vpcm/styleguide/

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land grant Universities. (1999, February). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Retrieved January 30, 2014, from: http://www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=183

Kelly, J. S., & Jones, S. K. (2005). *Readings and cases in integrated marketing communications*. Evanston, IL: Racom Communications.

Kim, Y. (2001). The Impact of Brand Equity and the Company's Reputation on Revenues. *Journal of Promotion Management, 6*(1-2), 89-111.

Krishnan, B. C., & Hartline, M. D. (2001). Brand equity: is it more important in services?. *Journal of Services Marketing, 15*(5), 328-342.

Lamn, A. J., Israel, G. D., & Diehl, D. (2013). A National Perspective on the Current Evaluation Activities in Extension. *Journal of Extension, 51*(1). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2013february/a1.php

Lin, C. A. & Jeffers, L. W. (2001). Comparing distinctions and similarities across websites of newspapers, radio stations, and television stations. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 78*(3), 555-573.

Lindner, J. (1998). Understanding Employee Motivation. *Journal of Extension, 36*(3). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb3.php

Lohse, J. L. & Stotts, B. (2006). Extension Education About Healthy Weight: A Case Study Emphasizes Need to Find the Target Audience. *Journal of Extension, 44*(5). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2006october/comm1p.shtml

Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human communication research*, *28*(4), 587-604.

LSU AgCenter. (2014, March 8). *Cooperative Extension: Celebrating 100 Years.* Retrieved from: http://www.extension100years.net/

Luckerson, V. (2014, March 22). The free-marketing gravy train is over on Facebook. *Time.* Retrieved from: http://time.com/34025/the-free-marketing-gravy-train-is-over-on-facebook/

Maddy, D. J. & Kealy L. J. M. (1998). Integrating a Marketing Mindset: Building Extension's Future in the Information Marketplace. *Journal of Extension, 36*(4). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1998august/comm1.php

Mazzarol, T. (1998). Critical success factors for international education marketing. *International Journal of Education Management, 12*(4), 163-175.

Merriam-Webster (2014). Dictionary. Available at http://www.merriam-webster.com/

Miller, J. (1988). What's their perception. *Journal of Extension, 26*(1). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1988spring/a1.php

Miller, M. E. (1995). AAACE Changed Our Lives: NPAC and Agricultural Communication in the '50s. *Journal of Applied Communication, 79*(3). 1-9.

Molm, L. D., Takahashi, N., & Peterson, G. (2000). Risk and trust in social exchange: An experimental test of a classical proposition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1396-1427.

National 4-H Council. (2014). *About 4-H.* Retrieved from: http://www.4-h.org/about/

Paine, K. (2011). Measure What Matters: Online Tools for Understanding Customers, Social Media, Engagement, and Key Relationships. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Percy, L. (2008). *Strategic Integrated Marketing Communications.* Burtlington, MA: Elesvier.

Persuit, J. M. (2013). *Social Media and Integrated Marketing Communications*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

PRESSfeed. (2012, August 6). *PRESSfeed 2012 Online Newsroom and Digital Media Relations Survey.* Retrieved from: http://news.press-feed.com/news.php?include=143846

Punjaisri, K., & Wilson, A. (2007). The role of internal branding in the delivery of employee brand promise. *Journal of Brand Management, 15*(1), 57-70.

Punjaisri, K., Evanschitzky, H., & Wilson, A. (2009). Internal branding: an enabler of employees' brand-supporting behaviors. *Journal of Service Management, 20*(2), 209-226.

Raggio, R. D., & Leone, R. P. (2007). The theoretical separation of brand equity and brand value: Managerial implications for strategic planning. *The Journal of Brand Management, 14*(5), 380-395.

Ray, J., Baker, L. M., & Smith, C. (2014, May 2). *Building a brand: A mixed methods assessment of internal perceptions and media use.* Kansas State University, K-State Research and Extension and Division of Communications and Marketing meeting.

Rhoades, E. & Ellis, J. (2010). Food tube: Coverage of food safety issues through video. *Journal of Food Safety, 30*,162-176.

Rhoades, E., Thomas, J. R., & Davis, A. (2009). Social Networking Among Youth: How Is 4-H Represented?. *Journal of Extension, 47*(5). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2009october/a6.php

Richardson, J. G., Staton, J., Bateman, K., & Hutcheson, C. E. (2000). Adroit accountability or keeping a step ahead. *Journal of Applied Communications, 84*(3), 20-29.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2005). *Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analysis in Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Robideau, K. & Santlt, K. (2011). Strengthening 4-H Program Communication Through Technology. *Journal of Extension, 49*(6). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2011december/tt2.php

Roloff, M. E. (1981). *Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sanderson, D. R. (1988). *Working with our publics, Module 1: Understanding Cooperative Extension: Our origins, our opportunities*. Raleigh, N.C.: North Carolina Extension Service and the Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University.

Schultz, D. E., Patti, C. H., & Kitchen, P. J. (2011). *The Evolution of Integrated Marketing Communications*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Skerit, S. (2011, May 2). Multimedia content drives better press release results. *PR Newswire*. Retrieved from: http://www.prnewswire.com/blog/multimedia-content-drives-better-press-release-results-1380.html

Shooter, W. (2009). Suggestions for Data collection at Outdoor Recreation Sites. *Journal of Extension, 47*(5). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2009october/tt1.php

Smith, M. F. (1983). Tools of the Trade: Conducting Surveys. *Journal of Extension, 21*(5), 77-78. Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1983september/83-5-tt10.pdf

Smith, S. S. & Finley, J. C. (2004). Targeted Recruitment of 4-H Volunteers Involves Understanding Who Currently Volunteers and Why. *Journal of Extension, 42*(4). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2004august/a6.php

Stanaland, A. J. S., Lwin, M. O. & Murphy, P. E., (2011). Consumer Perceptions of the Antecedents and Consequences of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*, 47-55.

Stewart, K. L. (1991). Applying a marketing orientation to a higher education setting. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 7*(2), 117-124.

Sullivan, D. (2014, July 11). Just like Facebook, Twitter's new impression stats suggest few followers see what's tweeted. *Marketing Land,* Retrieved from: http://marketingland.com/facebook-twitter-impressions-90878

Taylor-Powell, E. & Richardson, B. (1990). Issues programming changes extension. *Journal of Extension, 28*(2). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1990summer/a4.html

Trammell, K. D. & Keshelashvili, A. (2005). Examining the new influencers: A self presentation study of a-list blogs. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 82*(4), 968-982.

USDA. (2013, January 30). *Cooperative Extension System Offices.* Retrieved from http://www.csrees.usda.gov/Extension/

Wimmer, R. D., & Domminick, J. R. (2011). *Mass Media Research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Workman, J. D. & Scheer, S. D. (2012). Evidence of Impact: Examination of Evaluation Studies Published in the Journal of Extension. *Journal of Extension, 50*(2). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/2012april/a1.php

Yang, R. K., Fetsch, R. J., Jenson, G. O., & Weigel, R. R. (1995). Overcoming resistance to issues-based programming. *Journal of Extension, 33*(3). Available at: http://www.joe.org/joe/1995june/a2.html

Young, A. (2014). *Brand Media Strategy: Integrated Communications Planning in the Digital Era*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Appendix A - Study Codebook

<div style="border:1px solid black;">

KSRE Communications Audit Codebook

Purpose: Gathering information about the following variables will help determine how KSRE's brand, public value, and impact are being communicated to target audience members.

Instructions: Answer all questions for all types of units (video, radio, press releases, Facebook weeks, Twitter weeks, publications, and webpages) unless the coding sheet has been marked to skip certain questions. Questions are arranged in three columns. If the answer to the question on the right is 'no,' skip to the next question below.

For ALL website, Facebook and Twitter count only the elements found on the page without clicking or hovering a mouse. For all Facebook and Twitter units, count only the elements within the identified portion of the newsfeed. For all questions about the KSRE Name, DO NOT count appearances in web addresses. DO count appearances in hashtags.

</div>

Coding Sheets will be marked with a Unit Identification Number (Case Number), and Coder Name.

Section 1: Name/Affiliations

v1. Type
- 1. Press Release
- 2. Facebook
- 3. Twitter
- 4. Publication
- 5. Video
- 6. Radio
- 7. Website page

Note: For the Names and Affiliations section, both written and verbal mentions should be included. Appearances within official graphics should only be included in the Graphics section.

v2. Does the name "**K-State Research and Extension**" appear in that exact form anywhere within the unit? (Excluding the appearance of the name within the official wordmark)-1.Yes/2.No

v3. How many times does it appear?

v4. Does "**K-State Research and Extension**" appear with an **ampersand sign (&)** in place of the word "and"? -1.Yes/2.No

v5. How many times does it appear?

v6. Does the name "**Kansas State Research and Extension**" appear within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v7. How many times does it appear?

v8. Does this version of the name appear with an amperstamp in place of the word "and"?

v9. How many times does it appear??

v10. Is the "**KSRE**" acronym present anywhere within the unit? (Excluding appearances in web addresses) -1.Yes/2.No

v11. How many times does it appear?

Codebook Page- 1

201

v12. Does the "**K-State Radio Network**" name appear within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v13. How many times does it appear?

v14. Does the name "**Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service**" appear within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v15. Is the name mentioned within a statement? -1.Yes/2.No

v16. Does the name appear in one of these official statements?-1.Yes/2.No

Statement 1:
Kansas State University is committed to making its services, activities and programs accessible to all participants. If you have special requirements due to a physical, vision, or hearing disability, contact LOCAL NAME, PHONE NUMBER or Michelle White-Godinet, Assistant Director of Affirmative Action, Kansas State University, (TDD) 785-532-4807.

Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service
K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension Work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, as amended. Kansas State University, County Extension Councils, Extension Districts, and United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating, John D. Floros, Director.

Statement 2 (Shorter version):
Kansas State University is committed to making its services, activities and programs accessible to all participants. If you have special requirements due to a physical, vision, or hearing disability, contact LOCAL NAME, PHONE NUMBER.

Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service
K-State Research and Extension is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Codebook Page- 2

v17. Does the name "**K-State Extension**" appear within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v18. How many times does it appear?

v19. Does the name "**Extension**" appear within the unit as an offiical, capiltalized title, referring to KSRE? -1.Yes/2.No

v20. How many times does it appear?

v21. Does the K-State Research and Extension name appear in **any other form not previously mentioned** in the codebook? -1.Yes/2.No

v22. How does it appear?

v23. If the K-State Research and Extension name IS listed (v2. is recoreded as 1), mark 999.

If **the K-State Research and Extension name is NOT listed (v2. is recoreded as 2), answer this question.**

Is a specific county KSRE office, district office, or research station identified anywhere within the unit? (Excluding Kansas State University)-1.Yes/2.No
Please list.

v24. Does the "**K-State**" name appear within the unit? (Including #KState. Also including K-State within names not affiliated with KSRE such as "All-University Campaign for K-State") -1.Yes/2.No

v25. How many times does it appear?

v26. Does the "**Kansas State University**" name appear within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v27. How many times does it appear?

v28. Does the Kansas State University name appear in **any other form not previously mentioned** in the codebook? -1.Yes/2.No

v29. How does it appear?

University Name

Note: For the Graphics section, graphics not fully displayed (i.e.: in the background of a radio station) should not be counted unless the entire graphic can be viewed and/or the graphic type (i.e.: K-State Research and Extension wordmark with Powercat) and be clearly identif ed. Graphics on clothing should NOT be included. All graphics on webpages should be included, even if they appear in the header or footer area.

v30. Does the K-State Research and Extension wordmark appear with a Powercat? -1.Yes/2.No

 or

v31. How many times does it appear?

v32. Where is the Powercat located in relation to the text?
    1.On Top (as in examples)
    2.Below
    3.To T e Lef
    4.To T e Right

v33. Is the wordmark another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v34. What color is the wordmark?

v35. Does the powercat appear without any other wordmark? -1.Yes/.2No

v36. How many times does it appear?

v37. Is the powercat another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v38. What color is the powercat?

v39. Does the K-State Research and Extension wordmark appear without a Powercat? -1.Yes/.2No

 or

v40. How many times does it appear?

v41. Is the wordmark another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v42. What color is the wordmark?

Codebook Page- 4

204

v43. Does the of cial Kansas State University wordmark appear? -1.Yes/2.No

KANSAS STATE
U N I V E R S I T Y ®

v44. How many times does it appear?

v45. Is the wordmark another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v46. What color is the wordmark?

v47. Does the of cial University Seal appear? -1.Yes/2.No

v48. How many times does it appear?

v49. Is the seal another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v50. What color is seal?

v51. Does the of cial President's Seal appear? -1.Yes/2.No

v52. How many times does it appear?

v53. Is the seal another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v54. What color is seal?

(T e President's Seal reads Kansas State University of Agirculture and Applied Sciences.)

Codebook Page- 5

205

v55. Does the official K-State wordmark appear? -1.Yes/2.No

K·STATE   or   **K·STATE**

v56. How many times does it appear?

v57. Is the wordmark another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v58. What color is the wordmark?

v59. Does the official K-State Radio network logo appear? -1.Yes/2. No

K-STATE
Radio Network

v60. How many times does it appear?

v61. Does the "Knowledge for Life" official wordmark appear? -1.Yes/2.No

Knowledge *for Life*   or   *Knowledge* *for Life*

v62. How many times does it appear?

v63. Is the wordmark another color besides purple or black and white? -1.Yes/2.No

v64. What color is the wordmark?

v65. Does the wordmark contain quotation marks? -1.Yes/2.No

v66. Do any of the previously mentioned graphics appear to be be compressed, stretched, or otherwise manipulated? -1.Yes/2. No
If NO GRAPHICS APPEAR, mark 999.

v67. Are there any other graphics /logos included within the unit besides the ones previously mentioned (not including general social media logos)? -1.Yes/2. No

v68. Is the slogan "Knowledge for Life" present, excluding appearances in the offical workmark (mentioned above)? -1.Yes/2.No

v69. How many times does it appear?
v70. Does the slogan contain quotation marks? -1.Yes/2.No

Codebook Page- 6

206

v71. Is there a website address or hyperlink present within the unit, **excluding links to any KSRE social media pages**? -1.Yes/2.No

Note: A web address or link must be appear verbally or visually. Screenshots alone do not count.

v72. Is there a website address or hyperlink to the main home page? (http://www.ksre.k-state.edu/ or http://www. ksre.edu) -1.Yes/2.No

v73. Is there a website address or hyperlink to a KSRE web page besides the main home page, including links to KSRE documents? (NOT including http://www.ksre.k-state.edu/) -1.Yes/2.No

v74. Is there a website address or hyperlink to a web page not affiliated with KSRE and not hosted on the KSRE website? -1.Yes/2.No

List the name of the external website the link leads to.

v75. Does the unit contain a link, page name, or handle for a **KRSE social media site** (such as YouTube, Pinterest, Facebook, or Twitter)? -1.Yes/2.No
For Facebook: This excludes hashtags, but includes any other hyperlinks to social media site destinations.
For webpages: This included links in the footer.

v76. Does the unit contain a link, page name, or handle for:
1. Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/KStateRE)
2. Twitter (@KStateResExt)
3. YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/user/KSREVideos)
4. Pinterest (http://www.pinterest.com/ksuresearchext/)
5. Flickr
6. Other KSRE Social Media page. (Please list.)

v77. Is there a **phone number** for K-State Research and Extension present within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v78. Is there an **email address** for K-State Research and Extension present within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v79. Is there a **mailing address** for K-State Research and Extension present within the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v80. Does the item contain a QR code? -1.Yes/2.No

v81. Does the QR code lead to the correct, functioning page or destination intended? -1.Yes/2.No

v82. Does the QR code lead to a:
1. KSRE Webpage
2. KSRE YouTube page
3. KSRE Social Media page
4. Non-KSRE page (Please list.)

v83. Is another organization and/or company mentioned within the unit (besides Kansas State University, K-State Research and Extension, K-State Radio, or any other form of the of cial KSRE and KSU names)? -1.Yes/2.No
(Exclude sof ware companies listed on websites, such as Adobe).

Organizations/programs within K-State Research and Extension DO count. Examples include: Kansas Center for Agricultural Resources and the Environment (KCARE), Ag Manager, 4-H Youth Development, and Kansas Healthy Yards.

Other departments within K-State such as the Agronomy or Economics DO COUNT.
All KSRE radio program names (Agriculture Today, Milk Lines, Tree Tales, Weather Wonders, etc.) DO count as other organizations/programs. DO Mark these here for v83. DO NOT mark these as other forms of the KSRE name (v21).

v84. Is another organization and/or company **logo** present in the unit? -1.Yes/2.No

v85. Is proper proportion maintained between elements? -1.Yes/2.No

Guidelines for Proper Proportion and Examples:

Keep separation between elements, on the same level. It is preferred that K-State Research and Extension's wordmark be located far lef of other groups' logos.

When K-State Research and Extension is the primary sponsor, its logo may be enlarged.

When K-State Research is a secondary sponsor, the primary sponsor's logo may be enlarged, if desired. Maintain equal size on other sponsors, if possible.

Codebook Page- 8

Effectiveness of an Impact Statement: To what degree does the item portray an impact statement by answering the question, "Why is this issue important to the state of Kansas?" (Not at all, Low, Medium, or High) A statement can be one or more sentences long. The sentences do not need to be in any particular order and they do not need to be near one other. Components of a statement may be spread throughout the unit.

(An impact statement is a brief summary, in ordinary language, of the economic, environmental, or social benefits of KSRE efforts. It states accomplishments and their payoff to society. An impact statement answers benefits of our efforts. An impact statement answers the questions: So what? Who cares? Impact is the difference KSRE programs make in people's lives.)

 Degree of impact statement portrayal is measured by counting the number of Components of an Effective Impact Statement included within the statement. There are three components.

Components of an Effective Impact Statement	
Component	**Must:**
Issue- who cares and why? (Why is this issue/topic important)	• Clearly explain why a certain situation is an issue Kansans would be concerned about • OR mention a situation that it is common knowledge for Kansans to recognize as an issue **(can apply to only ididivuals or groups of Kansans; does not need to apply to all Kansans.)**
What Has Been Done? (What KSRE has done regarding the particular issue)	• Explain what KSRE has done to address the issue • States the KRSE name or a KSRE program as responsible for or involved in the action
Impact (How have KSRE efforts impacted Kansans?)	• Quantifies economic, environmental or social change as a result of KSRE actions • Explains how the actions impact Kansans

v86. Does the unit contain an Issue component? -1.Yes/2.No

Look for key phrases such as:
• struggle to keep up with...
• effort to conserve water
• need to make decisions
• climate change/prescribed burns/water

v87. Does the unit contain a What Has Been Done component? -1.Yes/2.No

Look for key phrases such as:
• give tips
• offers ways/solutions to...
• through research at K-State,...

v88. Does the unit contain an Impact component? -1.Yes/2.No

v89. **Effectiveness of an Impact Statement Score:**
0. None- Unit contains zero components
1. Low- Unit contains one component
2. Medium- Unit contains two components
3. High- Unit contains three or four components

Examples of Impact Statements:

Example of a highly effectively Impact Statement:
"*Obesity, poor nutrition, and limited physical activity are significant health concerns in Kansas and the United States* (**Issue**). Nutrition assistants in the Kansas Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) are *providing nutrition education in homes, schools, assisted living sites, clinics and libraries.* (**What's Been Done**). Participants in the Kansas Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP)reported *improved nutrition, food behavior and food safety practices after completing the multi-lesson series* (**Impact**)."

Example of a **medium effective** Impact Statement from a Twitter feed:
A #KState researcher is finding new prevention methods (**What Has Been Done**) *as #malaria cases rise in the U.S.* (**Issue**)... http://fb.me/13viAxLCB
(Contains the Issue and What Has Been Done components. If another Tweet within the week contains an Impact component, the unit would be coded as highly effective.)

Note: "*as #malaria cases rise in the U.S.***"** qualifies as an Issue component because it common knowledge that malaria is a harmful disease and therefore, is an issue to people living within the United States .

Example of a low effective Impact Statement:
OK...48 hours until the big meal. If you haven't begun thawing your #turkey, here's what you need to do:... http://
Thawing Your Thanksgiving Turkey
K-State Research and Extension food safety specialist Karen Blakeslee demonstrates a couple of methods for thawing a frozen turkey (**What Has Been Done**).
(Contains What Has Been Done component. If another Tweet within the week contains an Impact and/or Issue component, the unit would be coded as more highly effective.)

Note: "48 hours until the big meal" does not qualify as an Issue component because it does not explain how thawing a turkey is an issue Kansans should be concerned about.

Example of a low effective Impact Statement:
Alfalfa Study May Help Growers Determine Returns *as Water Resources Dwindle* (**Issue**): In a perfect world, alfalfa might... http://bit.ly/1cqnpzn (**Note: This tweet trails off. Only code the part that appears in the actually tweet.**)

Note: "as Water Resources Dwindle" qualifies as an Issue component because it common knowledge that water is a vital resource and therefore, it's depletion is an issue. "Alfalfa Study May Help Growers Determine Returns" does not qualify as a What Has Been Done component because it does not explain that KSRE is affiliated with the study.

Effectiveness of a Public Value Statement: These statements may be more general than imapct statements. A public value statement says to what degree does the item portray a public value statement by answering the question, "How does KSRE's effort provide value to the people of Kansas?" (None, Low, Medium, High, or Very High) If a unit contains more than one public value statement, record a response for the statement with the highest level of effectiveness.

A public value statement is similar to the impact statement. Its portrayal is measured by counting the number of Components of an Effective Public Value Statement included anywhere within the unit. There are four components.

Components of an Public Value Statement	
Component	Description
K-State Research and Extension	• At least one appearanc e of the correct version of the name
Learn/Do What	• Explains what is being done in the KSRE program, has been done in the program, or what participants will do in the program • May explain what people need to do to support the program, such as provide money • Includes mention of "studying" and/or researching particular areas
Outcomes	• What does the program produce or cause to happen? • What are the results of its efforts?
Public Value	• What do these outcomes do for society? • Why these outcomes are important? • Must explain the importance of those outcomes to Kansans. • (Must also include an Outcome component.)

Together the components may look like:
When you support (Name) participants will (Learn/Do What),
which leads to (Outcomes) that will then benefit others by
(Public Value).

v90. Does the unit contain the KSRE name component? -1.Yes/2.No

v91. Does the unit contain a Learn/Do What component? -1.Yes/2.No

v92. Does the unit contain an Outcomes component? -1.Yes/2. No

v93. Does the unit contain an Public Value component? -1.Yes/2. No

v94. **Effectiveness of an Public Value Statement Score:**
0. None- Unit contains zero components
1. Low- Unit contains one component
2. Medium- Unit contains two components
3. High- Unit contains three components
4. Very High- Unit contains four components

Examples of Public Value Statements:

Example of a 3, highly effectively Public Value Statement:
A national study found that for every dollar invested (**Learn/Do What**) in EFNEP (**Name of a K-State Research and Extension program**), $10.64 is saved in health care costs (**Outcomes**). A regional project that included Kansas data also showed that for every dollar spent on EFNEP (**Learn/Do What**), $8.82 is saved in health care costs (**Outcomes**). (The K-State Research and Extension is also contained in this unit.)

Example of a 2, mediumly effective Public Value Statement:
A #KState researcher (**K-State Research and Extension name,)** is finding new prevention methods (**Learn/Do What**) as #malaria cases rise in the U.S. ... http://fb.me/13viAxLCB

Note: This statement would only be medium in its effectiveness because it does not discuss the results or prevention methods found (**Outcome**) or how those results reduce the risk of malaria (**Public Value**).

Example of a 2, medium effective Public Value Statement:
OK...48 hours until the big meal. If you haven't begun thawing your #turkey, here's what you need to do:... http://
Thawing Your Thanksgiving Turkey
K-State Research and Extension (**Official Name**) food safety specialist Karen Blakeslee demonstrates a couple of methods for thawing a frozen turkey (**Learn/DoWhat**).

Note: This statement is only medium in its effectiveness because it does not explain how KSRE has caused or helped anyone to actually thaw their turkey properly (**Outcome**) and why that is beneficial to Kansans.

Example of a 2, medium effective Public Value Statement:
Alfalfa Study (**Learn/Do What**) May Help Growers Determine Returns as Water Resources Dwindle (**Outcomes):** In a perfect world, alfalfa might... http://bit.ly/1cqnpzn (**Note: This tweet trails off. Only code the part that appears in the actualy tweet.**)

The "Alfalfa Study" is conducted by K-State Research and Entension, but the official name is not listed in the unit. If the official name appears somewhere else in the week of tweets, it would be a 3.

v95. Does the unit contain one or more images? (Excludes graphics. Includes the thumbnail image of a video that appears. For video, the answer will be Yes).   -1.Yes/2.No

v96. Does the unit contain an image of a teaching moment? -1.Yes/2.No

A teaching moment is depicted in a picture with two or more individuals. One person must appear to be speaking, demonstrating, or supervising one or more individuals as they appear to be learning.

Example:

Audiences/Topics Addressed:

Does the unit...
v97. mention **Agriculture**? -1.Yes/2.No
v98. mention **Gardening**? -1.Yes/2.No
v99. include the word, "**Rural**"? -1.Yes/2.No
v100. include the word, "**Urban**"? -1.Yes/2.No
v101. mention concerns for **Homeowners/Landowners** (anything associated with home finance, maintenance, values, etc.)? -1.Yes/2.No
v102. mention concerns for **Parents** (youth programs, childcare, education, child safety, nutrition, health, etc.)? -1.Yes/2.No
v103. mention concerns for **KSRE Volunteers** (**4-H** or other) including event details, leader guidelines, recruitment, etc.? -1.Yes/2.No

v104. mention concerns for **Youth** (youth programs or anything related to people younger than 18)?-1.Yes/2.No
v105. mention concerns for **Adults** (finance, insurance, health, etc., or issues **an adult of any age may face**)-1.Yes/2.No
v106. mention concerns for **Senior Citizens** (aging or any form of assistance for seniors?-1.Yes/2.No

v107. mention concerns for **KSRE and/or K-State employees (**internal details, insurance/benefits, training, or new employees)?-1.Yes/2.No
v108. mention concerns for **Funding sources including legislators (**funds, budgets, fund use, how KSRE makes an impact)?-1.Yes/2.No
v. 109. mention an issue KSRE believes to be an immediate concern for all **All Kansas Residents** (i.e. Olgalla/water issues, climate change, storm tracking, general safety etc.)?-1.Yes/2.No
v. 110. mention concerns for **Students/Perspective Students** (information about K-State campus events, curriculum/programs? Mention other formal education programs/schools?)-1.Yes/2.No

Appendix B - Updated Coding Instructions

Post-Pre-Test Coding Instructions- UPDATED July 22, 2014

General Advice

- Be sure to double-check answers to avoid simple mistakes.

- Make sure to provide a response for all 110 variables.

- Make sure the answers make sense.

- Do not mark 22 when you mean to mark 2.

- Make sure you placed a 2 before all series of 999's. (If you accidentally marked 1, check it, and make changes.)

- Search for "Blank" cells before moving on to the next unit.

Radio

You may need to listen to radio twice for counting the number of times names like K-State appear.

Make sure to not count anything that occurs after the first two minutes of radio or video units.

Listen careful to hear this because he tends to say names quickly. If the name is cut off in last few seconds, count it anyway.

Counting Accuracy

Use the Control-f (PC) or Command-f (Mac) feature to count how many times names appear in the online version of the publications (link provided at the top of the excel sheet), press releases (copies are in the shared Copy folder), and websites. Be careful when counting anything!

Review of the 999 Responses

There were quite a few mistakes made that we can avoid by reviewing the way we mark this type of variables.

See the examples below to review how to mark the coding sheet.

If the response to v39 is 2, mark v40-v42 with 999.

v39	Wordmark	2	1,2	
v40	WordmarkNum		999	#
v41	WordmarkNotP		999	1,2
v42	WordmarkColor			999	Free

If the response to v39 is 1, answer both v40 and v41.

If the response to v41 is 2, mark v42 with 999. If the response to v41 is 1, answer v42.

v39	Wordmark	1	1,2	
v40	WordmarkNum		1	#
v41	WordmarkNotP		2	1,2
v42	WordmarkColor			999	Free

v39	Wordmark	1	1,2	
v40	WordmarkNum		2	#
v41	WordmarkNotP		1	1,2
v42	WordmarkColor			Purple	Free

*Note: You should never mark 999 in the first column, unless it has been pre-marked because the variable does not apply to that type of variable (i.e. graphics in radio).

Important Notes/Changes to the Codebook

v4 and v8-I will pre-mark 999 for amperstamps on radio.

v14- Be sure to only mark 1 if the full name occurs (Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service).

v15- I changed this one in the codebook. If the name "Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service" appears in any statement (such as the one often listed in press releases) mark 1. **v16** will still ask if the statement is one of two nondiscrimination statements.

v23- Mark as 999 UNLESS the correct name (K-State Research and Extension) DOES NOT appear anywhere in the entire unit (or the first 2 minutes of video/radio).

v28-"Kansas State" is considered a different form of name than Kansas State University.

v66- Mark as 999 if the unit contains NO GRAPHICS at all. Cassie is the only one who marked this question that way before, but it makes sense. (This is pre-marked on radio).

v68- The slogan (not wordmark) can possibly appear in radio podcasts. If it does not appear, mark as 2 rather than 999. This should never be marked as 999 because it could appear in any of the units (verbally or written).

v76- Check all social media links to see where they lead. Only count links that lead to KSRE sites, not KSU. Also, to make it easier to run statistics, separate the numbers by a period (rather than comma) on the coding sheets. (I made a note of this on the sheets to remind you). I also

deleted the options for Four Square and Google Plus as these are KSU sites, not KSRE. If you do see a KSRE version of these or other social media accounts, mark as Other (6), and list the site off to the right.

v80-I will pre-mark 999 for QR codes on radio and video.

v83- Be sure to listen for other organizations on radio podcasts. Never mark this one as 999. Software such as Adobe Acrobat DOES NOT count as another organization.

Organizations/programs within K-State Research and Extension DO count. Examples include: Kansas Center for Agricultural Resources and the Environment (KCARE), Ag Manager, 4-H Youth Development, and Kansas Healthy Yards.

All KSRE radio program names (Agriculture Today, Milk Lines, Tree Tales, Weather Wonders, etc.) DO count as other organizations/programs. DO NOT mark these as other forms of the KSRE name (v21).

Impact Statements

v86-Issue- Be a little more liberal in marking this as 1. All things that could be commonly known as a problem/issue or dangerous/challenging situation should all be marked as issues (i.e. aging and pesticide storage).

Look for key phrases such as:

217

- struggle to keep up with...

- effort to conserve water

- need to make decisions

- climate change/prescribed burns/water

v87- What Has Been Done- Only mark this as 1 if the unit clearly and explicitly states what

KSRE (name included somehow) has done to address the issue. Simply providing information

about the issue should not count UNLESS the unit says something along the lines of "KSRE is

providing information to address this issue." If an expert is providing information, there must be

form of introduction or explanation of who the expert is, (name and title, or name and association

with K-State of KSRE) implying that they credible and part of KSRE.

Look for key phrases such as:

- give tips

- offers ways/solutions to...

- through research at K-State,...

v88- Impact- Mark this as 1 if the unit summarizes why the information or action KSRE

provides is helpful. This could be something along the lines of, "Now, you have the information

to store pesticides safely and avoid accidents." Mark this as 1 if the unit somehow explains why

KSRE is doing something and how it might benefit Kansans.

Public Value Statements

v90- Name- Mark as 1 only if the answer to v2 is 1.

v91- Learn/Do What- Only mark this as 1 if the unit clearly and explicitly states what KSRE staff is doing or what participants or volunteers do when they interact with the organization. "Studying," "finding," or "providing information" can count as this, but only if they are clearly stated. There must be an action word.

v92- Outcomes- Only mark this as 1 if the unit clearly and explicitly states what has resulted from KSRE action/program. This can be as simple as offering new tips, tools, cures, or solutions. However, it must demonstrate that KSRE has accomplished something. Still "finding" solutions does NOT count. Offering new solutions DOES count.

v93- Public Value- Be critical in marking 1 for this, as it is more rarely stated. This needs to be an explicit explanation of why what KSRE does is important to Kansans.

v94- Add up the number of 1's from v90-v93.

Audience

v97- Does the unit …mention agriculture?

v98- mention gardening?

v99- include the word "rural"?

v100- include the word "urban"?

v101- mention anything associated with home finance, maintenance, values, etc.?

v102- mention youth programs, education, child safety or health, etc.?

v103- mention 4-H or Master Gardener event information, leader guidelines, event results, volunteer recruitment, etc.?

v104- mention youth programs (4-H etc.) or anything related to people younger than 18?

v105-mention finance, insurance, health, etc. (issues an adult of any age may face)?

v106- mention aging or assistance for senior citizens?

v107- mention internal details, insurance/benefits, training, or new employees?

v108- mention funds, budgets, how funding is used, how KSRE makes an impact?

v109- mention an issue KSRE believes to be an immediate concern for all Kansas (i.e. Olgalla/water issues, climate change, storm tracking, general safety etc.)

v110- mention information about **K-State campus events**, curriculum/programs? Mention college or adult education programs/schools?

**Note: Pretty pictures of Kansas and documents/notes for historical interest should not be marked for any of the audiences, as it is difficult to determine if someone would actually have an interest in them.

Websites

Code this section.

DO NOT code
this section.

Code this section.

Code this
section.

Code this section.

Code this section.

Appendix C - Clarifications for Public Value and Impact Coding

Public Value Statement Components	Impact Statement Components
	Issue • Any situation that is commonly known as a problem, issue, or challenging/dangerous situation. • Said situation could possibly affect an individual living in Kansas
Learn/Do • MUST have an action verb • DOES NOT need a KSRE name • What is being done, has been done, and/or what will be done by participants and/or staff • May explain what people may need to do to support a program, such as provide funding	**What's Been Done** • <u>MUST include the correct KSRE name somewhere in the unit, other than printed statements at the bottom of publications and press releases.</u> • MUST have an action verb • Explains what KSRE has done to address the issue
Outcomes 1. States what the program produces or causes to happen 2. States the results of efforts 3. Includes offering tips, tools, resources, and solutions produced through research efforts	**Impact** • <u>Quantifies economic, environmental, or social change as a result of KSRE actions</u> • Explains how actions impact Kansans
Public Value 1. MUST include an Outcome component somewhere in the unit 2. Explains what the outcomes do for society and why they are important to Kansans	