



American Society of  
Business Publication Editors

MEDILL

at Northwestern University

■

# *Survey on Digital Skills & Strategies*

for editors on business-to-business publications

■

April 2010

*Published by*

**American Society of Business Publication Editors**

214 N. Hale St.

Wheaton, IL 60187

phone: (630) 510-4588

fax: (630) 5110-4501

info@asbpe.org

www.asbpe.org

**Medill School/Media Management Center**

**Northwestern University**

301 Fisk Hall

1845 Sheridan Road

Evanston, IL 60208

phone: (847) 467-1882

www.medill.northwestern.edu/

**Medill School/Media Management Center**

**Northwestern University**

304 Fisk Hall

1845 Sheridan Road

Evanston, IL 60208

phone: (847) 491-4900

www.mediamanagementcenter.org

# Introduction

**We face a conundrum:** Even as media hurtle into their cross-platform future, business-to-business (B2B) editors generally receive a paltry amount of corporate training on the skills they need to benefit their audiences, their brands, and their own development.

This is the key finding in the Survey on Digital Skills and Strategies that 273 B2B editors completed November 2009. The survey was conducted by the American Society of Business Publication Editors and the Medill School/Media Management Center at Northwestern University.

In addition to details about digital skills training, the ASBPE/Medill survey contains 15 tables of rich data on skill sets related to 16 digital activities and 16 digital strategies. The data also drill down into 12 parameters related to the leadership provided by publishers.

In-depth results cover, among other topics, current and most beneficial percentages of workload currently devoted to digital media plus candid appraisals of where editors' digital skill sets stand in relation to their brands' transitions to digital publishing and social media.

To help gauge context, respondent editors provided more than 200 open-ended comments to their answers to five critical survey questions.

## For more information, contact:

**Abe Peck**, director of business-to-business communication for Medill at [a-peck@northwestern.edu](mailto:a-peck@northwestern.edu) or [www.peckconsultants.com/main](http://www.peckconsultants.com/main)

**Robin Sherman**, ASBPE associate director, [info@asbpe.org](mailto:info@asbpe.org)

## About the research team

**Bob LeBailly** is a member of the adjunct faculty for the Medill School of Journalism and the market research faculty member for the Magazine Publishing Project. He has worked part- or full-time at Medill since 1987. You can reach him at [lebailly@northwestern.edu](mailto:lebailly@northwestern.edu).

**Mary Nesbitt** is managing director of the Readership Institute and

associate dean for curriculum and professional excellence at the Medill School of Journalism. Contact her at [m-nesbitt@northwestern.edu](mailto:m-nesbitt@northwestern.edu).

**Abe Peck** is director of business-to-business communication, professor emeritus in service at the Medill School, senior director of the Media Management Center, and a consultant in the B2B space. He can be reached at [a-peck@northwestern.edu](mailto:a-peck@northwestern.edu).

**Robin Sherman** is associate director of American Society of Business Publication Editors, and principal, Editorial & Design Services. Email him at [asbpe@bellsouth.net](mailto:asbpe@bellsouth.net).

## About ASBPE

Founded in 1964, American Society of Business Publication Editors (ASBPE), Wheaton, Ill, ([www.asbpe.org](http://www.asbpe.org)) is the nation's only professional association for full-time, part-time, and freelance business-to-business editors and writers who work for business, trade, association, and professional print magazines and newsletters, and digital/Internet publications.

The Society helps editors develop their editorial and publishing management skills, and enhance their ethical standards and the editorial excellence of their publications. ASBPE also helps prepare members to play larger roles in their publishing organization.

## About the Media Management Center

The Center advances the success of media companies and the professional growth of media executives through its seminars, research, and ongoing work with media companies worldwide.

It is affiliated with the Medill School of Journalism and the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University. It conducts consumer, content, and organizational research with an emphasis on practical application.

# Gaps seen in digital skills training, publisher leadership

## Editors want more digital, business journalism help

Even as their titles plunge into the digital space, B2B editors have been left largely to their own devices to gain the skills necessary to do their jobs across platforms.

So finds this survey of 273 B2B editors by the American Society of Business Publication Editors and the Medill School/Media Management Center at Northwestern University. Eighty-eight percent of editors who identified themselves by job function were at the executive or senior level.

Four out of five editors who answered the ASBPE/Medill Survey on Digital Skills and Strategies participated in one day or less of corporate-sponsored digital training during 2009. The median amount was less than a half-day, and 36% said they had no corporate digital training whatsoever.

Moreover, two-thirds of survey respondents found what training was offered to be very or somewhat inadequate for an array of digital tasks, making training satisfaction the lowest-ranked of a dozen leadership initiatives taken by their publishers.

“The lack of company-sponsored training, let alone adequate training, is a major concern,” said ASBPE associate director Robin Sherman. “Apparently, what skills most senior-level editors do have were learned and paid for on their own.

“Why would organizations place editors and publications at risk as a result of so little training?” Sherman asked. “Or put it another way: How much more revenue might a publisher generate with an editorial labor force better skilled in digital technologies and publishing strategies?”

Conducted during November 2009, the ASBPE/Medill survey cap-

tured the platform shift in editorial work across B2B publishing. Thirty-eight percent of responding editors currently spend at least half their time with digital content, while 62% think that spending at least half their time with digital content would most benefit their organization. Respondents split almost evenly over whether the focus on digital issues was having a positive or negative effect on the quality of their print editorial content.

### Necessity of digital strategies

Editors were asked how they would rank various strategies if they were in charge of planning for the near future.

Improving digital content and digital training were rated as “very necessary,” followed by researching readers/advertisers, resisting any loosening of editorial ethics, leveraging content between brands, and redefining the skills necessary for editorial and art staff.

### Digital behavior, skills, and job success

From a list of 16 digital activities, those that were very or extremely important for editors’ job success in 2010, writing and editing Web content, managing workflow/workload between Web and print, and writing and editing e-newsletters ranked highest.

Those deemed least important for personal success over 2010 were (from lowest): developing virtual trade shows/conferences; coding; creating online slideshows or photo galleries; recording, shooting, or editing audio and/or video; and mining online databases.

Editors candidly reported shortfalls in their personal digital portfolio. Twenty-seven percent of respondents put their individual digital skill levels “behind” or “way behind” their brands’ transition to digital.

Moreover, a large number of editors never engaged in activities that are taking on increasing importance within B2B:

- Virtual trade shows (82% never engaged)
- Online slideshows (58%) and audio-video (54%)

- Webinars (55%)
- Coding (51%)
- Database mining (50%).

One out of three respondents never blogged and more than one in five never worked with social media.

Forty-nine percent of responding editors said that the need for more training in the skills of business journalism over the next 12 months was at least “necessary.”

### Quality of publishers’ leadership

Business-side leadership also came in for criticism. Many responding editors were pessimistic about their publishers’ “knowledge and skill” for moving forward in today’s dynamic B2B environment. Among the 12 publisher-level activities surveyed – digital and otherwise – all had an average rating less than “good” (less than three on a one-to-four scale).

Senior-level editors felt that publishers fared best at being “open to new ways of doing things; not being afraid to take some risks,” placing that ability at just under “good.” “Stays current on trends about your market” and “has a clear vision of the future of your brand and its content” were rated next highest.

On the low end, “provides adequate amounts of training” had an average rating of less than “fair,” with “really understands what it takes for editors to run our digital media” and “provides adequate support and resources for editorial staff” rating just above that level.

### Moving forward

“Many of these findings represent major disconnects for B2B even as the role of a B2B content person is rapidly evolving,” said Abe Peck, director of business-to-business communication for Medill and an ASBPE Lifetime Achievement honoree.

“As the editor’s job sheds pro forma tasks in favor of cross-platform leadership, it is crucial for content leaders and publishers alike to maximize new skills alongside their traditional ones.”

## Methodology

**Invitations were emailed** to 4,847 people on a list of ASBPE members and non-member business-to-business (B2B) editors. Between November 2 and December 10, 2009, 338 people answered the survey for a response rate of 7%.

An initial screening question eliminated 48 people who said they were not staff editors or writers for a business-to-business print or digital publications. Among the 290 who indicated they were B2B staff editors or writers, 17 stopped answering the survey after the initial screening question. The results are based on the 273 remaining B2B staff editors and writers.

The 95% confidence level was used in this study. Results labeled as statistically significant have a 5% or less chance that they could be attributed to sampling error (drawing a oddball sample).

The survey questions received between 203 and 269 non-missing responses (e.g. people who answered “don’t know” or left a question blank are missing responses).

Percentages from these questions have a margin of sampling error from  $\pm 6.0\%$  (for questions with 269 responses) to  $\pm 6.9\%$  (for questions with 203 responses). So using a  $\pm 7\%$  margin of sampling error is safe for all questions.

This means that sampling error should cause no more than a 7% difference between the results in our study and the true value in the universe in 95% of samples.

For example, our finding that 81% of B2B editors received a day or less of digital training in the past year has a 95% chance of falling in the interval between 74% (81% – 7%) and 88% (81% + 7%) in the universe from which the sample was drawn.

**Table 1** What percentage of your work is currently devoted to digital?

	Responses	Valid %
0% digital	4	1.6
10% digital	47	18.7
20% digital	39	15.5
30% digital	40	15.9
40% digital	27	10.7
50% digital	27	10.7
60% digital	21	8.3
70% digital	10	4.0
80% digital	7	2.8
90% digital	11	4.4
100% digital	19	7.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 2** What percentage of your work should be digital to benefit your organization the most?

	Responses	Valid %
0% digital	3	1.2
10% digital	6	2.5
20% digital	27	11.1
30% digital	29	11.9
40% digital	27	11.1
50% digital	64	26.2
60% digital	25	10.2
70% digital	18	7.4
80% digital	13	5.3
90% digital	12	4.9
100% digital	20	8.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 3** In general, is your individual digital skill level running behind, equal to, or ahead of your brand's transition to digital?

	Responses	Valid %
Running way ahead	17	6.3
Running ahead	71	26.4
Running about the same	109	40.5
Running behind	62	23.0
Running way behind	10	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 3** Respondents' comments

A Medill education (even one that is 8 years past graduation) prepared me to be thinking digitally all the time.

At our publications, the editors (me and others) merely provide materials; others do the actual converting to digital formats.

Being the editor-in-chief and almost 60 years old, I find myself in the middle of the pack, trying to convince my older colleagues (and some younger ones) of the need to add digital skills and constantly learning from the digitally savvy younger ones. Having everyone watch some sessions of the *Folio*: Show this year helped.

Editorial has incredibly good ideas to move to . . . a digital platform but both internal Web resources and sales organization lag behind.

Fairly new to position; moved here to gain digital skills that were not available at previous position.

Hard to keep up with every wave of new stuff like Twitter.

I edit content, regardless of where the content is used, and thus do not focus on digital issues.

I feel un-trained and flying by the seat of my pants. But then, my publication's management is way worse than me.

I have the skills I need to do everything required of me for our print and online products. As they evolve, so will my skills.

I haven't bought into Twitter yet. Something about tweeting that I find a bit much, right now anyway. Otherwise, I'm proficient in providing digital info.

I know nothing about Twitter, tweet, videos, etc. I see things on other publication's Web sites that I have no idea how to do.

I know WHAT to do, can follow instructions for getting items onto Web site, but don't know enough to do it all on my own.

I let our production department take care of getting content up online and post stories myself only occasionally.

I manage the business aspects of online and give day-to-day responsibilities largely to my (small) staff, plus some shared support staff.

I post Web news. That's about it. I don't post or edit online video or audio. I don't blog. But I am aware of these online strategies and comfortable with them — so I don't feel that "I'm way behind."

*Continued on page 7*

**Table 3 Respondents' comments, continued**

I'm constantly researching how to improve our digital products, but the company has no money or incentive to do so, unfortunately.

I'm continually identifying digital ideas and best practices that cannot get implemented due to manpower or resource issues.

I'm pushing hard for digital products, but am meeting significant resistance from the sales side. If the sales guys can't/won't sell digital, then it's difficult to justify moving forward with digital projects.

If only I had the time to do our slow developers' job for us or to grow money on trees to purchase new systems.

In addition to writing for our monthly magazine, I manage nearly 75 Web sites related to our association, its affiliates/chapters, and members. I'm itching to get this group moved into some Web 2.0 stuff.

In general, most of our work processes, incentives, training and skills are still print-centric, from editorial to sales to marketing to circulation. Editorial is ahead of the others, but digital competency is not universal.

Junior editors often are first adopters of some of our Web and 'net innovations while senior editors continuing to manage content and future planning (and will continue to do so).

Leadership provides no support (in terms of resources) for digital publications. As a result, the magazine's Web site sports a digital edition of the magazine plus 1-2 news postings/week. The news postings are merely headlines and links, no original reporting.

Most training is in-house. Outside experts could be helpful.

My assistant is handling a lot of the digital so

I am not up to speed.

My skills are great but my organization has decided to create separate print/online staffs. Welcome to 1998? I am relegated to "print. . . ."

Need more multimedia training but the company has no budget to pay for it. . . .

No choice . . . writing and posting is the editor's job here at Reed Business Information.

No opportunity to learn digital skills.

Not very experienced with video editing, HTML, etc. Although we have a Web Editor who usually takes care of these things, I would like to have the skill sets.

Our CMS is garbage, and I've worked with better, more intuitive CMS programs in the past. Also, we've had ideas shot down because they're not doable, says the IT department.

Our company is making a huge Web-first push, but the things we want to do in our office aren't possible with the technology we're using and the budget we have. In addition, the ideas they've given us are ideas we've been planning and wanting to do for at least a year.

Our company's plan to "transition to digital" is unclear.

Our digital work is primarily in the association newsletter. The association magazine remains 100% print.

Our tools suck; our software platform sucks; we are ruled, not fueled, by our IT department. Meanwhile, we're so lean, that doing anything out of the ordinary takes so much time, we don't bother.

Poor employee training and preparation for moving to digital.

Reasons: shifting priorities, lack of needed software and training, time constraints.

Small staff (me), which doesn't leave a lot of time to gather the news, write the news, and then also get it up on the site, edit podcasts, etc. individually. I know my skills are lacking but feel my first duty is actually to getting the news and getting it correct.

There are capabilities from the digital edition (that I'm aware of and have been advocating) that others don't seem to appreciate or understand.

We don't have a content management system in place, so it's just a matter of understanding the back end of our Web site. Not too complicated.

We have big plans for more podcasts, video segments, etc., but never enough staff or time (not enough resources given by senior management — in fact, we have fewer people (layoffs) and less time (furloughs) with more work to do, in print and online.

We see what we want to do, but are stuck on availability of a shared Web services dept. to keep up with competing demands.

We started early and invested in digital upgrades.

We're way behind in converting to digital formats, but my writing skills for digital media are also way behind.

We've begun working with a California firm to take our sluggish digital network to a new level — one I probably will not reach before retiring!

We've just launched a digital option for selected readers, so we have yet to scratch the surface when it comes to other things we can do with digital versus print.

Work for a big company, which is sometimes slow to change. While we were among the leaders early on, and probably still are, there's a lot more we can do.

**Table 4** How adequate is the digital skills training provided by your company?

	Responses	Valid %
Very inadequate	90	36.3
Somewhat inadequate	79	31.9
Somewhat adequate	67	27.0
Very adequate	12	4.8
<b>Total</b>	248	100.0

**Table 5** Adequacy of digital skill training relative to your brand’s transition to digital

	Individual skill level relative to your brand’s transition to digital		
	Running ahead	Running about the same	Running behind
Inadequate training	65.1%	62.6%	81.7%
Adequate training	34.9%	37.4%	18.3%
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 5** Cross-tabulation of:

**Table 4** How adequate is the digital skills training provided by your company?

**Table 3** In general, is your individual digital skill level running behind, equal to, or ahead of your brand’s transition to digital?

To do a valid chi-square test, these questions above were collapsed.

From Table 3, “running way ahead” and “running ahead” were combined into a single category, and “running behind” and “running way behind” were combined.

From Table 4, “very” and “somewhat adequate” were collapsed into a single category as were “very” and “somewhat inadequate.”

Just under 82% of those who said their digital skill levels were running behind or way behind believed their corporate training was inadequate (very or somewhat). About 65% of those who said their digital skill level was running ahead or way ahead thought their corporate training was inadequate.

There is only a 3.3% chance this difference could be attributed to sampling error.



**Table 6** In the last 12 months, approximately how much digital skills training have you received from your company?

	Responses	Valid %
None	97	36.2
Less than one half-day	76	28.4
1 day total (8 hours)	44	16.4
2-3 days total (16-24 hours)	31	11.6
4-5 days total (25-40 hours)	15	5.6
Up to 2 weeks total (80 hours)	3	1.1
Up to 1 month total (81-160 hours)	2	.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7** At your title/brand, is focus on digital issues affecting the quality of your print editorial content positively or negatively?

	Responses	Valid %
Very negatively	2	0.8
Negatively	62	24.7
No effect	108	43.0
Positively	68	27.1
Very positively	11	4.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7** Respondents' comments

"Lead with the Web" is a stupid method of business journalism.

All resources are aimed at online traffic, which means reduced copy editing, no more fact-checking, more errors. You could argue this is a result of the recession rather than purely about digital focus.

Articles in print get additional exposure online, and vice-versa.

As company pushes digital, our print ads have suffered, . . . severely cut back our page count in 2009 and frequency in 2010.

By adding links to or mentions of Web-related content to the print content, I feel we have enhanced the breadth of our content overall. Readers now are told how they can go to the Web to see related past articles, special Web-only content, etc.

Compels tighter scheduling, narrower editing windows.

Currently, our digital efforts are not affecting print quality, but if we increase our digital activity to the level that I think it should reach, I anticipate that it will take attention away from print and thus probably reduce print quality somewhat.

Digital and print are kept separate, although the digital writers do propose story ideas gained from working on our online blog. Print would benefit from more involvement of the digital team.

Positively because as we report/write more Web first, we can turn a bit more attention to photography/graphics for print.

I see the digital side of our brand being more of the up-to-the-minute news side of our brand – getting info to our audience more promptly (and with more reads/variety) than a monthly print publication.

We definitely have more interaction with readers because of digital.

It is helping me to focus more on what is better for print and what is better for online.

It opens avenues we didn't have before, such as adding audio and video enhancements to the print stories when they are loaded online.

It's both. It is improving the timeliness and relevance of the print product, but sucking resource away from traditional long-form investigative pieces.

Less time devoted to print content; fewer staff-written pieces that haven't already appeared online

Losing subscriptions to print products.

Magazines are seen almost as an afterthought.

Making us more nimble and forcing us to define clearly the intent of print content, which is making it more relevant.

Maybe a little negatively, as it takes some of our limited time away from print.

More work with no extra investment in editorial staff.

Much more exposure and many more eyeballs on our print stories because of the Web.

Much time devoted to producing new digital products; feels like less time to focus on bringing in quality content for print.

The effect on print has to primarily be seen as a drain of research and writing time that now goes to digital efforts.

The quest to post news items as soon as possible has turned us into part-news wire, part-new analysis organization. However, the spot news tends to tie up our now-diminished resources and we risk losing track of the bigger picture. My time is so split, the quality of my work suffers.

*Continued on page 10*

**Table 7 Respondents' comments, continued**

Not enough proofing is getting done in the effort to maintain Web sites and learn new apps.

Not enough staff to do both.

Our company has been too slow to recognize the importance of digital content.

Pressure to do the new digital work with no relief from deadlines for the traditional print work.

Print space is devoted to promoting online content.

Right now we've been able to manage, but as more of our initiatives come to fruition, there will be even less time to generate quality print content. Our company has already said they won't be hiring an online editor to help the existing editors meet the initiatives they're mandating we carry out.

Time issues are a problem. Better access to reader thoughts on various issues is a plus.

Too much time is spent solving Web production fixes because of a clunky CMS. Staffing has been reduced while expectations for digital content on top of print content are high.

The attitude at our company is that print is worth nothing; all attention is given to digital projects, even though they make no money. But yet, anyone working on digital is considered a king.

The daily nature of digital keeps me better informed of industry trends that translate to print story ideas.

The digital version, at the moment, looks exactly like the print version, only you can read it on your computer screen.

The immediacy of online news publishing has positively impacted our news gathering, and gives our publication wider exposure beyond our print audience. Over time, we are realizing online also gives us a platform to package and present our market analyses (e.g., special report PDFs) better than afforded in a shrinking print news hole.

The push from the online side says it is for quality, but they have no idea how much effort it takes to create quality content.

Quality of print has not been affected. However, more print product has to be distributed to effectively to reach our market.

Too many resources being put into digital when print product is tanking.

Too much time spent on non-revenue digital products so the revenue product (magazine) suffers in quality, rushed writing.

Twice the content, half the time to edit, add in time spent "repurposing" and "chunking" of print info for Web, leaves less time to thoroughly edit print material.

Currently understaffed, and I think the amount of time devoted to digital content takes away from the quality of print.

We are generating new kinds of content for print from our digital engagement. We also don't have to worry about cutting parts out of a print story because we can have online extras and be more multidimensional.

We can no longer support lengthy features, which were a huge benefit to our audience.

We do not do anything extra with our digital issues, so they're not a factor. It's a wasted opportunity. We're too lean to try anything different.

We have a slightly different audience on digital, adding to our readership.

We have less time for print production, so editing quality suffers. Also, we are still unsure the best lineup of stories to put in print — is it articles we already have run online, or not?

Have less time to do long-form, in-depth features and investigative reporting due to the emphasis for more news online, as well as the time it takes to administer our Web sites and content management systems.

We leverage off both venues. We deliver information however our readers want to receive it.

While work and development of our digital side takes time away from print, I believe we are maintaining the quality of print, so the net result is positive.

With the demand for up-to-the-minute digital content, the time needed to get in-depth information for more quality print is usually compromised or it becomes a secondary priority.

**Table 8a** If you were in charge of planning for the near future (next 12 months) of your organization, how necessary are the following strategies? Items rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being unnecessary and 5 being extremely necessary; ranked by “rating average.”

	Unnecessary	Somewhat unnecessary	Necessary	Very necessary	Extremely necessary	Rating average	Responses*	Not sure†
Improving digital content, organization, design	0.8% (2)	9.1% (23)	21.8% (55)	30.2% (76)	38.1% (96)	3.96	252	3
Training in digital technologies and online skills	1.2% (3)	8.5% (21)	24.2% (60)	27.8% (69)	38.3% (95)	3.94	248	6
Researching readers/advertisers	1.2% (3)	9.2% (23)	27.9% (70)	31.9% (80)	29.9% (75)	3.80	251	2
Resisting any loosening of editorial ethics to maintain or increase revenue	17.1% (42)	9.4% (23)	18.0% (44)	18.4% (45)	37.1% (91)	3.49	245	9
Leveraging content between brands/titles	7.2% (17)	16.2% (38)	23.8% (56)	29.8% (70)	23.0% (54)	3.45	235	18
Redefining the skills necessary for current and new reporters, editors, artists	7.6% (19)	14.5% (36)	28.9% (72)	26.5% (66)	22.5% (56)	3.42	249	4
Being platform agnostic	8.0% (15)	16.5% (31)	34.6% (65)	17.6% (33)	23.4% (44)	3.32	188	67
Looking for new markets for content	8.3% (20)	20.0% (48)	26.7% (64)	24.2% (58)	20.8% (50)	3.29	240	14
Increasing editorial staff	15.4% (37)	12.9% (31)	28.2% (68)	21.6% (52)	22.0% (53)	3.22	241	12
Editorial responsibility for content marketing	14.8% (34)	22.2% (51)	30.0% (69)	18.3% (42)	14.8% (34)	2.96	230	23
Improving print content, organization, design	17.1% (43)	22.2% (56)	31.3% (79)	20.6% (52)	8.7% (22)	2.82	252	4
Training in business journalism skills	20.4% (51)	30.8% (77)	20.0% (50)	17.2% (43)	11.6% (29)	2.69	250	4
Moving from a largely print-first to a largely digital-first orientation	27.6% (67)	25.5% (62)	19.3% (47)	14.0% (34)	13.6% (33)	2.60	243	11
Reorganizing or maintaining staffs within broad, centralized content groups rather than individual markets	45.0% (94)	20.6% (43)	19.1% (40)	8.1% (17)	7.2% (15)	2.12	209	41
Moving to digital-only	79.4% (197)	10.9% (27)	4.0% (10)	2.8% (7)	2.8% (7)	1.39	248	8
Downsizing editorial staff	90.3% (223)	6.9% (17)	1.2% (3)	0.8% (2)	0.8% (2)	1.15	247	6

\* Percentages are shown as “valid percentages,” which are defined as that percentage of the “responses” minus the “not sure” responses. “Not sure” responses are not included in the “responses” column.

† “Not sure” responses are not taken into account to calculate the rating average. However, large numbers of “not sure” responses may be instructional. For example, some respondents may not know enough to answer the question or can’t decide on the relative necessity of different strategies. Other speculation is left to the reader.

**Table 8b** If you were in charge of planning for the near future (next 12 months) of your organization, how necessary are the following strategies? Items rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being unnecessary and 5 being extremely necessary; ranked by “unnecessary.”

	Unnecessary	Somewhat unnecessary	Necessary	Very necessary	Extremely necessary	Rating average	Responses*	Not sure†
Downsizing editorial staff	90.3% (223)	6.9% (17)	1.2% (3)	0.8% (2)	0.8% (2)	1.15	247	6
Moving to digital-only	79.4% (197)	10.9% (27)	4.0% (10)	2.8% (7)	2.8% (7)	1.39	248	8
Reorganizing or maintaining staffs within broad, centralized content groups rather than individual markets	45.0% (94)	20.6% (43)	19.1% (40)	8.1% (17)	7.2% (15)	2.12	209	41
Moving from a largely print-first to a largely digital-first orientation	27.6% (67)	25.5% (62)	19.3% (47)	14.0% (34)	13.6% (33)	2.60	254	11
Training in business journalism skills	20.4% (51)	30.8% (77)	20.0% (50)	17.2% (43)	11.6% (29)	2.69	250	4
Improving print content, organization, design	17.1% (43)	22.2% (56)	31.3% (79)	20.6% (52)	8.7% (22)	2.82	252	4
Resisting any loosening of editorial ethics to maintain or increase revenue	17.1% (42)	9.4% (23)	18.0% (44)	18.4% (45)	37.1% (91)	3.49	245	9
Increasing editorial staff	15.4% (37)	12.9% (31)	28.2% (68)	21.6% (52)	22.0% (53)	3.22	241	12
Editorial responsibility for content marketing	14.8% (34)	22.2% (51)	30.0% (69)	18.3% (42)	14.8% (34)	2.96	230	23
Looking for new markets for content	8.3% (20)	20.0% (48)	26.7% (64)	24.2% (58)	20.8% (50)	3.29	240	14
Being platform agnostic	8.0% (15)	16.5% (31)	34.6% (65)	17.6% (33)	23.4% (44)	3.32	188	67
Redefining the skills necessary for current and new reporters, editors, artists	7.6% (19)	14.5% (36)	28.9% (72)	26.5% (66)	22.5% (56)	3.42	249	4
Leveraging content between brands/titles	7.2% (17)	16.2% (38)	23.8% (56)	29.8% (70)	23.0% (54)	3.45	235	18
Training in digital technologies and online skills	1.2% (3)	8.5% (21)	24.2% (60)	27.8% (69)	38.3% (95)	3.94	248	6
Researching readers/advertisers	1.2% (3)	9.2% (23)	27.9% (70)	31.9% (80)	29.9% (75)	3.80	251	2
Improving digital content, organization, design	0.8% (2)	9.1% (23)	21.8% (55)	30.2% (76)	38.1% (96)	3.96	252	3

\* Percentages are shown as “valid percentages,” which are defined as that percentage of the “responses” minus the “not sure” responses. “Not sure” responses are not included in the “responses” column.

† “Not sure” responses are not taken into account to calculate the rating average. However, large numbers of “not sure” responses may be instructional. For example, some respondents may not know enough to answer the question or can’t decide on the relative necessity of different strategies. Other speculation is left to the reader.

## Table 8 Respondents' comments

Leveraging content between titles is not the issue. Leveraging TOOLS is. Downsizing & reorganizing is more an economic issue than a digital issue.

Transition from print to digital [requires] re-orienting the thinking and skills of editors. Most of our editorial staff members do not have journalism training, which hinders our ability to write good news stories and think about information in a time-sensitive journalistic fashion, which I believe is necessary for digital formats.

Although the questionnaire is focused on editorial, I would add that sales training in selling digital products is needed. Editorial staff, especially younger ones, are very comfortable with the platform.

Editorial ethics are not a barrier to maintaining or increasing revenue. Without them, the brand erodes. Better alignment of editorial products, circulation, and advertisers' goals creates a healthy editorial brand.

Everyone claims their editorial standards aren't diminished because of the growth of digital media. That's just B.S.

I believe print helps to bolster an online community and provides incentive for people to contribute; without print, digital will falter eventually.

Older staff continue to resist encouragement to improve digital skills. Proof of digital adaptability will be almost the most important hiring criterion for new hires.

I own the business, and am the sole editor. The pub is small, extremely focused on a technical area I know well. We need more online presence, and I have someone working toward that already. It would be good if I knew more about the process, but we're OK for now, especially considering the current economic conditions.

And my Web person is gradually teaching me as we go along, so outside training is unnecessary. By the way, I appreciate your question about resisting the lessening of editorial ethics in order to make more money — I see that in other pubs; it's obvious! But I'm holding the line myself, despite being on the receiving end of some advertiser pressure: years of practice are standing me in good stead!

Most of revenue still comes from print version, yet we are being told to reallocate more resources to digital. They don't want to change editorial format of magazine, yet the stories just don't always work as well online.

Most online training at this point is "learn as you go."

Moving to digital-only — I put extremely necessary not for the print products we already have, but to cover new emerging segments of the markets we serve . . . digital products for specific, specialized segments of the broader markets we cover.

My staff has undergone the move from print first to platform agnostic. But that's not the end of the evolution. Content creators need to be platform-aware, and shape their content for EACH medium in which the content will occur. Platform agnosticism is an intermediary step.

Outside training is available but it's up to the person to identify what he or she needs and propose it to the organization.

The biggest problem is that while readers and publishers are demanding more online content, there is no business model to support it. Print advertising is far more lucrative than anything being generated on the Web.

This survey shows a bias for print or hybrid models; doesn't account for those of us already entrenched or solely online. Thus it doesn't ask the right questions. For example, what are "digital technologies and online skills"? I can tell

you the practice of journalism remains the same, albeit with more of a "how to" slant, and the "technologies" you need to know are Microsoft Word and maybe a content management system, plus search engine optimization techniques. You also might need to know how to record and edit podcasts and video. It's not rocket science or a brave new world.

We are under constant pressure from marketing dept. (ad sales) to use advertisers as sources and writers of articles in our management journal.

We get practically nothing for online advertising as do any of the magazines I am familiar with. For that reason "going digital" doesn't seem to be a viable business strategy for publications with limited audiences. Most of our readers have also told us they prefer the print version of the magazine to anything digital.

We're a tiny, entrepreneurial organization heavy up on freelancers. Print still works great for us, and is extremely, extremely (!) profitable, while e-efforts we've seen by competitors have produced little revenue and diverted their attention from a quality print product. We're happy to watch, as we actually take share from them. I'm the editor and half-owner, with 40 years in the trenches.

We've downsized in 2009 yet have expanded the number of products editors are involved with, including supplements, webinars, on site conferences, media marketing partnerships with other publications, etc. We expect 2010 to be even worse and are demanding even more work with fewer people. While it may be necessary to continue to downsize, I'm not sure how we'll get it all done. We really need to add staff, but that's not going to happen.

You've given me more ideas and strategies here. Can you give me the bodies to execute on them? :)

**Table 9** How often you do the activities below as part of your job currently? (ranked by “never”)

	Several times a day	About once a day	2–3 times a week	Weekly	About every 2 weeks	About Monthly	A few times a year	Never	Responses
Developing and implementing virtual trade shows/conferences	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	17.2%	82.4%	227
Creating online slideshows or photo galleries	0.0%	0.4%	3.3%	6.2%	4.5%	9.9%	17.3%	58.4%	243
Developing, operating, moderating, marketing webinars	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.8%	3.1%	13.3%	26.5%	54.9%	226
Recording, shooting, or editing audio and/or video	0.0%	0.4%	0.9%	2.6%	4.4%	8.4%	29.1%	54.2%	227
Coding HTML, CSS, XML	11.9%	4.5%	5.3%	5.8%	2.9%	6.2%	11.9%	51.4%	243
Mining online databases	8.7%	2.9%	7.0%	5.8%	1.7%	6.2%	17.8%	50.0%	242
Blogging (writing, posting, managing, marketing)	10.3%	6.6%	14.8%	12.8%	6.2%	6.2%	9.9%	33.3%	243
Preparing quality images for the Internet	8.6%	5.8%	12.8%	11.1%	4.5%	11.5%	12.3%	33.3%	243
Using a content management system	36.3%	10.5%	7.6%	6.3%	3.0%	7.2%	4.2%	24.9%	237
Engaging/interacting with readers online	15.4%	7.0%	7.5%	13.2%	8.4%	9.7%	14.5%	24.2%	227
Using, marketing, managing social media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, forums)	22.6%	14.8%	12.3%	11.5%	4.9%	6.2%	5.3%	22.2%	243
Using Web analytics for editorial purposes; knowing what stats are useful to editors, how to use and interpret them to inform editorial content decisions	5.3%	6.2%	9.3%	14.7%	4.0%	17.3%	23.6%	19.6%	225
Writing and editing e-newsletters (e.g. subject lines, headlines, articles, lists, category labels, keywords, navigation/links language, calls for action)	10.6%	10.6%	16.7%	16.7%	9.3%	11.9%	6.2%	18.1%	227
Developing Internet and other digital content (and marketing) strategies	9.5%	6.6%	8.7%	14.9%	8.3%	16.6%	22.4%	12.9%	241
Managing workflow/workload between Web and print	37.4%	12.8%	8.4%	11.5%	3.5%	10.1%	6.2%	10.1%	227
Writing and editing Web content (e.g. headlines, articles, lists, category labels, use of keywords for search, navigation/links language, calls for action, instructions)	37.4%	15.0%	15.9%	5.3%	6.6%	9.7%	4.4%	5.7%	227

**Table 10** Generally, what is your digital skill level for the activities below? (ranked by “no skills in this area”)

	No skills in this area	Minimal skills	Basic skills but would need help	Sufficient skills to do without help	Expert skills	Responses
Developing and implementing virtual trade shows/conferences	68.8%	15.8%	7.2%	6.8%	1.4%	221
Developing, operating, moderating, marketing webinars	39.8%	19.0%	20.4%	16.3%	4.5%	221
Recording, shooting, or editing audio and/or video	36.2%	27.2%	21.9%	12.1%	2.7%	224
Coding HTML, CSS, XML	34.6%	27.1%	15.8%	19.2%	3.3%	240
Creating online slideshows or photo galleries	34.2%	21.9%	16.9%	20.3%	6.8%	237
Mining online databases	34.0%	18.7%	17.9%	23.4%	6.0%	235
Preparing quality images for the Internet	21.8%	20.6%	14.7%	33.6%	9.2%	238
Using a content management system	18.0%	11.6%	12.9%	39.9%	17.6%	233
Using Web analytics for editorial purposes; knowing what stats are useful to editors, how to use and interpret them to inform editorial content decisions	17.5%	23.3%	26.5%	25.6%	7.2%	223
Engaging/interacting with readers online	8.9%	13.8%	17.8%	44.9%	14.7%	225
Developing Internet and other digital content (and marketing) strategies	6.0%	14.5%	36.2%	36.2%	7.2%	235
Blogging (writing, posting, managing, marketing)	5.5%	12.7%	18.6%	46.6%	16.5%	236
Using, marketing, managing social media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, forums)	4.6%	19.7%	16.4%	44.1%	15.1%	238
Writing and editing e-newsletters (e.g. subject lines, headlines, articles, lists, category labels, keywords, navigation/links language, calls for action)	4.4%	6.2%	14.2%	46.2%	28.9%	225
Managing workflow/workload between Web and print	4.4%	4.0%	16.4%	52.7%	22.6%	226
Writing and editing Web content (e.g. headlines, articles, lists, category labels, use of keywords for search, navigation/links language, calls for action, instructions)	0.9%	8.4%	17.3%	41.8%	31.6%	225

**Table 11** How important are the following activities to you doing your job successfully in the next 12 months? (ranked by “unimportant”)

	Unimportant	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important	Responses*	Not sure†
Developing and implementing virtual trade shows/conferences	49.7% (96)	18.1% (35)	14.5% (28)	13.5% (26)	4.1% (8)	193	27
Coding HTML, CSS, XML	45.0% (103)	26.6% (61)	11.8% (27)	8.7% (20)	7.9% (18)	229	11
Developing, operating, moderating, marketing webinars	32.1% (67)	22.5% (47)	18.2% (38)	15.8% (33)	11.5% (24)	209	12
Mining online databases	31.7% (66)	23.6% (49)	23.6% (49)	13.9% (29)	7.2% (15)	208	28
Recording, shooting, or editing audio and/or video	30.2% (64)	28.8% (61)	19.8% (42)	12.3% (26)	9.0% (19)	212	12
Creating online slideshows or photo galleries	29.2% (66)	31.9% (72)	18.1% (41)	12.4% (28)	8.4% (19)	226	12
Preparing quality images for the Internet	22.2% (51)	23.0% (53)	29.6% (68)	16.1% (37)	9.1% (21)	230	7
Blogging (writing, posting, managing, marketing)	14.8% (34)	23.0% (53)	24.3% (56)	20.4% (47)	17.4 (40)	230	8
Using, marketing, managing social media (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, forums)	13.4% (31)	26.4% (61)	22.9% (53)	21.2% (49)	16.0% (37)	231	8
Using a content management system	11.9% (27)	10.2% (23)	20.8% (47)	19.9% (45)	37.2% (84)	226	7
Engaging/interacting with readers online	10.6% (23)	19.4% (42)	25.3% (55)	22.6% (49)	22.1% (48)	217	8
Writing and editing e-newsletters (e.g. subject lines, headlines, articles, lists, category labels, keywords, navigation/links language, calls for action)	9.1% (20)	11.0% (24)	17.8% (39)	28.3% (62)	33.8% (74)	219	6
Using Web analytics for editorial purposes; knowing what stats are useful to editors, how to use and interpret them to inform editorial content decisions	9.0% (19)	11.8% (25)	30.7% (65)	19.8% (42)	28.8% (61)	212	11
Developing Internet and other digital content (and marketing) strategies	7.4% (17)	14.4% (33)	22.7% (52)	31.0% (71)	24.5% (56)	229	6
Managing workflow/workload between Web and print	6.8% (15)	9.9% (22)	17.6% (39)	27.5% (61)	38.3% (85)	222	3
Writing and editing Web content (e.g. headlines, articles, lists, category labels, use of keywords for search, navigation/links language, calls for action, instructions)	2.3% (5)	11.3% (25)	18.1% (40)	21.3% (47)	47.1% (104)	221	4

\* Percentages are shown as “valid percentages,” which are defined as that percentage of the “responses” minus the “not sure” responses. “Not sure” responses are not included in the “responses” column.

† “Not sure” responses are not taken into account to calculate the rating average. However, large numbers of “not sure” responses may be instructional. For example, some respondents may not know enough to answer the question or can’t decide on the relative necessity of different strategies. Other speculation is left to the reader.



**Table 12** How much time do you spend engaging in social media as a part of your job?

	Responses	Valid %
I don't engage in social media	45	19.5
Less than 15 minutes a week	39	16.9
15-29 minutes a week	28	12.1
30-59 minutes a week	34	14.7
1-2 hours a week	38	16.5
3-4 hours a week	22	9.5
5-10 hours a week	16	6.9
> 10 hours a week	9	3.9
<b>Total</b>	231	100.0

**Table 13** In your experience, is time spent engaging in social media helpful or a hindrance to producing quality print or digital content?

	Responses	Valid %
Helpful	91	68.9
Hindrance	41	31.1
<b>Subtotal</b>	132	100.0
Not sure	90	—
<b>Total</b>	222	

**Table 13** Respondents' comments

A waste of time. No money in it.

As much as I try to engage in social media more often, I can't find the time because of other more pressing obligations. I have not done it enough to pass judgment.

Both help and hindrance; it's a giant time suck but you have to do it and occasionally get a real gem out of it.

By reading member/reader posts in a member forum, you can find new trends and story ideas that will likely interest and be more useful to your readers.

Close call. On balance, a positive.

Depends on the market. In my market, social media is not the gold mine that it is in others. So we are venturing into it slowly, to have a presence, but we haven't seen much response yet.

Doesn't make a difference in either print or digital.

Easier to reach potential sources, collect news tips, understand readership moods.

Great for story leads, etc.

However, it does help maintain and grow a network of important business contacts in the market we cover.

I cannot qualify any results from engaging in social media.

I check out social media for news leads. Half of them turn out to be false. It's a pain. I don't contribute to them.

I do it (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, etc.), but it strikes me as a total waste of time. I just don't get it. But I do it, and I do it well.

I don't have the time on my job to spend it chatting online in Facebook or Twitter. My main job is to keep all our Web sites running, write my column and/or feature, write and edit multiple newsletters, as well as answer IT questions from staff and membership.

I don't have time for it and the emails are an annoyance.

I don't know what you mean by social media.

I get how things like Facebook and Twitter can be valuable, but we're often tasked with posting just to post, which is, in my opinion, not very useful.

I have been able to leverage LinkedIn very effectively to make new contacts for stories and have built a business networking site for the industry I cover.

I have tried to push our readers toward social media, but they just aren't interested. However, I find that the few who do use social media to interact with their editor are quality readers with great opinions and suggestions.

I would like to spend more time, but just don't have the staff to spend time on social media right now.

I'm not yet impressed, but have read enough to believe I eventually will be when users learn to use it well.

I've nailed interviews via social media interactions.

It all depends on the balance. I would spend more time on social media if it weren't for a colleague who spends 4-5 hours daily on Twitter, Facebook etc. In turn, he neglects his editorial workload which means more work for me and our other colleagues. If all edit staff could engage in social media but limit themselves to an hour a day or less, that would be ideal.

It can be helpful but there's too much noise out there to really be a wise use of too much time.

Can be useful to help drive audience to existing content, but at the cost of time that might be otherwise used for content development. Have to find a balance.

Not been fully proven whether it will work for our products/industry.

*Continued on page 18*

**Table 13 Respondents' comments, continued**

Both. Helpful in that it provides interesting discussion points and potential leads. A hindrance because it is often a huge time commitment.

Both. It can be useful for engaging with new subsets of readers and establishing your brand, but there is a real concern about the return on investment for something that can end up absorbing tremendous amount of time.

Good from a marketing standpoint but questionable from an editorial standpoint.

It produces no content; it produces an audience.

It takes too much time and effort to follow a multitude of social media feeds/content sources.

Minor help. Sometimes helps me find leads for good content, but in our field, true interaction online (in social media, online forums, etc.) is minimal, because people are concerned about FDA views and sharing proprietary information.

It's always interesting to see (via Hoot) which tweets get clicked-through.

It's becoming central to our coverage.

It's just another way of learning what interests our readers.

It's used to distribute content, not create it.

Keeps contacts fresh, adds a few new ones.

Like any other part of job have to be disciplined and focused to not let it consume whole day. Planning is crucial.

My employer blocks social media outlets.

My highly specific audience has minimal interaction on social media.

Need more support to gather more followers to make this worthwhile.

No return on investment for revenue or content (yet). But vital to be engaged. Something might break; when it does, we should be shovel-ready.

Not really necessary or appropriate for us; we're an entirely technical publication.

Not sure I see real value in social media for B2B magazines. Not saying there isn't value, just not entirely obvious to me what it is. With limited time, social media a back burner for me at this point.

Not sure of the effect of what I'm doing.

Only reason we don't do it more is we're so short-staffed — if I had editors on a one-to-one site ratio, we'd be doing it 30 percent of our time.

Our research shows that our audience doesn't do much in social media and, in fact, many of their employers block access to social media sites.

So far, no impact whatsoever on content. Utter waste of time so far.

So far it's just a black hole of time — all these people trying to suck me into their social networks.

Social media can't be separated from print media any more than phone conversations can be.

That's not why we do it. We do it to engage and be seen as thought leaders within our community. I guess that's helpful to producing content, but that's not the intent.

The extent of our use of social media is to post mentions of and links to our updated content. We don't have a Facebook page or LinkedIn group. But our posting of updated content have been successful at driving traffic to our site.

There is less time to edit copy thoroughly, speak with primary news sources, and write articles. While I appreciate the importance of this activity in this environment, I feel I am becoming more and more of a marketing person (as that is what social media is primarily used for, outside of my blog) than an editorial person (just as the amount of time I must spend with my content management system and with Web administration makes me feel more like a production worker than an editorial person). This is a negative trend for journalism, which is becoming secondary to our mission.

There's no way I could communicate with as many readers as I do without social media.

Twitter keeps me apprised of news I might miss through other means, and allows me to build our readership to folks who might not actually have heard of our magazine, but enjoy the topic about which we write — consumers, in a sense, who wouldn't qualify otherwise for a subscription or might not have cared in the past.

We have separate departments for Web design, marketing, and online events; editors are not expected to have (or develop) duplicate skills.

**Table 14** How is amount of time spent on social media associated with social media being helpful or a hindrance?

	Time spent engaging in social media helpful/hindrance to producing quality print/digital content		Total
	Helpful	Hindrance	
How much time do you spend engaging in social media as a part of your job in a typical week?			
None	30.8%	69.2%	100.0
Some, but under 30 minutes	57.1%	42.9%	100.0
30 minutes–3 hours	77.8%	22.2%	100.0
3 hours or more	81.6%	18.4%	100.0

**Table 14** Cross-tabulation for:

**Table 12** How much time do you spend engaging in social media as a part of your job in a typical week?

**Table 13** Based on your experience, is the time spent engaging in social media helpful or a hindrance to producing quality print or digital content?

To do a valid chi-square test, these questions above were collapsed.

The time spent using social media (Table 12) was collapsed into four categories in order to perform a valid chi-square test.

Table 14 shows that the more time you spend using social media the less of a hindrance it is. Almost 70% of those spending no time using social media in a typical week found it a hindrance, 43% spending some time but less than 30 minutes a week found it a hindrance, 22% spending 30 minutes to 3 hours a week found it a hindrance, and only 18% spending 3 or more hours a week found it a hindrance.

The chi-square test shows a statistically significant relationship ( $p=.001$ ). This means there is one chance in a thousand that these differences could be explained by sampling error.

**Table 15a** Please rate the knowledge or skill level of the person who is your publisher (to whom you report) on the following parameters. Items rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being poor and 4 being excellent; ranked by “rating average.”

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Rating average	Responses*	Not sure <sup>†</sup>
Provides adequate amounts of training	48.1% (100)	26.9% (56)	19.7% (41)	5.3% (11)	1.82	208	15
Really understands what it takes for editors to run our digital media	31.4% (66)	36.2% (76)	19.0% (40)	13.3% (28)	2.14	210	13
Provides adequate support and resources for editorial staff	27.3% (59)	35.2% (76)	25.9% (56)	11.6% (25)	2.22	216	7
Stays current on trends about journalism	28.2% (60)	29.1% (62)	27.7% (59)	15.0% (32)	2.30	213	10
Rewards innovation; rewards hard work by editors	29.8% (64)	26.5% (57)	22.8 (49)	20.9 (45)	2.35	215	9
Takes steps to make the operation work well across platforms	22.9% (48)	32.4% (68)	29.0% (61)	15.7% (33)	2.38	210	14
Communicates strategies and decisions well; fosters collaboration among departments	22.1% (47)	32.9% (70)	26.8% (57)	18.3% (39)	2.41	213	10
Attracts and retains the best employees	14.4% (29)	34.7% (70)	33.7% (68)	17.3% (35)	2.54	202	20
Really understands what it takes for editors to run our print media	22.1% (47)	26.3% (56)	25.8% (55)	25.8% (55)	2.55	213	11
Has a clear vision and understanding of the future of your brand and its content	13.6% (29)	31.9% (68)	29.1% (62)	25.4% (54)	2.66	213	9
Stays current on trends about your market and how to market content to it	8.9% (19)	26.6% (57)	38.3% (82)	26.2% (56)	2.82	214	9
Is open to new ways of doing things; is not afraid to take some risks	10.2% (22)	19.4% (42)	32.9% (71)	37.5% (81)	2.98	216	8

\*Percentages are shown as “valid percentages,” which are defined as that percentage of the “responses” minus the “not sure” responses. “Not sure” responses are not included in the “responses” column.

<sup>†</sup>“Not sure” responses are not taken into account to calculate the rating average. However, large numbers of “not sure” responses may be instructional. For example, some respondents may not know enough to answer the question or can’t decide on the relative necessity of different strategies. Other speculation is left to the reader.

**Table 15b Please rate the knowledge or skill level of the person who is your publisher (to whom you report) on the following parameters. Items rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent; ranked by “poor.”**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Rating average	Responses*	Not sure†
Provides adequate amounts of training	48.1% (100)	26.9% (56)	19.7% (41)	5.3% (11)	1.82	208	15
Really understands what it takes for editors to run our digital media	31.4% (66)	36.2% (76)	19.0% (40)	13.3% (28)	2.14	210	13
Stays current on trends about journalism	28.2% (60)	29.1% (62)	27.7% (59)	15.0% (32)	2.30	213	10
Provides adequate support and resources for editorial staff	27.3% (59)	35.2% (76)	25.9% (56)	11.6% (25)	2.22	216	7
Takes steps to make the operation work well across platforms	22.9% (48)	32.4% (68)	29.0% (61)	15.7% (33)	2.38	210	14
Communicates strategies and decisions well; fosters collaboration among departments	22.1% (47)	32.9% (70)	26.8% (57)	18.3% (39)	2.41	213	10
Really understands what it takes for editors to run our print media	22.1% (47)	26.3% (56)	25.8% (55)	25.8% (55)	2.55	213	11
Attracts and retains the best employees	14.4% (29)	34.7% (70)	33.7% (68)	17.3% (35)	2.54	202	20
Has a clear vision and understanding of the future of your brand and its content	13.6% (29)	31.9% (68)	29.1% (62)	25.4% (54)	2.66	213	9
Is open to new ways of doing things; is not afraid to take some risks	10.2% (22)	19.4% (42)	32.9% (71)	37.5% (81)	2.98	216	8
Stays current on trends about your market and how to market content to it	8.9% (19)	26.6% (57)	38.3% (82)	26.2% (56)	2.82	214	9

\*Percentages are shown as “valid percentages,” which are defined as that percentage of the “responses” minus the “not sure” responses. “Not sure” responses are not included in the “responses” column.

†“Not sure” responses are not taken into account to calculate the rating average. However, large numbers of “not sure” responses may be instructional. For example, some respondents may not know enough to answer the question or can’t decide on the relative necessity of different strategies. Other speculation is left to the reader.

### Tables 15 Respondents' comments

Great publisher, but many of these tasks are handled by editor only.

He's limited in what he can do to help the editorial staff. He's also overworked, as we all are.

I think that many higher-ups (at most companies, not just mine) think that putting something online takes a click of the mouse. In reality, it takes a lot more than that, and it's not always quick and it's not always simple. I think executives should shadow an editor when posting articles so they get a feel for what it's really like.

Micromanages. Is controlling. Undermines employee confidence. Excellent at all of those.

My publisher isn't involved in many of these activities so I marked those "not sure."

Needs to help with morale during these tough times.

Nice guy, but doesn't get it as he's so focused on advertising revenue and schmoozing media buyers, missing what our core audience is really about.

No clue what we do on a daily basis. Frightening actually.

Old school wine-and-dine sales guy who is more worried about controlling costs than revolutionizing the medium. Gives me a lot of space, but has no rewards or no plans for using what comes of it.

One can have a clear vision but be looking in the wrong direction.

Organizational appetite for risk is very poor; individual publisher is better.

Our publisher is quite hands-off most of the time, which is a blessing, I know. Our publisher understands the demands put upon us by him/her, but that doesn't stop the workload from growing or him/her from pushing more our way.

Please note: I AM the publisher as well as the editor. So I answered this question based on earlier, more lucrative, and better-staffed times, that is, as if I were the staff member, and based it on things my staff has said to me in the past.

Publisher is too focused on crunching numbers, and does not recognize that solid editorial will ultimately drive the business. Sometimes feel like the publisher is sucking the publication dry without reinvesting in editorial to grow the business going forward.

Publisher not that involved.

Publishers are in panic mode, worried about their own jobs. Could care less about editors or how much workload we're carrying.

The disparity between being open to new things is explained by being someone of good intentions and willing to be steered by subordinates, but not knowledgeable enough himself to lead in any of these other areas.

This is a tough question to answer because of turnover.

We are extremely short-staffed; I'm not sure my publisher even reads my magazine; I am doing the work of two people between digital and print demands.

We are so understaffed I do not have a publisher and only have a fraction of a sales person. Our VP does not know what we do.

We have been working with an editorial staff of two people for the past 12 months, down from four people 18 months ago. The adjustment has been an ongoing struggle. Our company has helped leverage additional content across brands, but not all content is brand-right for our audience. The rest of the work falls on us, with contributor budgets cut in half as well.

Not reporting to anyone.

New publisher whom I don't know very well, so can't answer most of these.

Have a new publisher so I have no idea at this point.

**Table 16 Which category best describes your current job responsibility?**

	Responses	Valid %
Executive-level editor (e.g., V.P. editorial, publishing director, director of content, editorial director, editor/publisher, editor/associate publisher, editor-in-chief, editor, executive editor, Web/online editor-in-chief)	128	57.4%
Senior-level editor (e.g. managing editor, assistant managing editor, senior editor, technical editor, Web/online managing editor)	68	30.5%
Mid-level editor (e.g. features editor, production editor, senior associate editor, associate editor, news editor, copy chief, Web/online copy chief, Web/online associate editor)	17	7.6
Junior-level editor (e.g. editorial assistant, assistant editor, staff editor, copy editor, Web/online copy editor)	2	0.9%
Reporter/Staff writer, primarily	4	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>223</b>	

**Table 17 How many people do you supervise (including self)?**

	Responses	Valid %
1	67	30.9
2	40	18.4
3	29	13.4
4	22	10.1
5	16	7.4
6	11	5.1
7	7	3.2
8	3	1.4
9	3	1.4
10 or more	19	8.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 19 How long have you worked for your current publication(s), digital and print?**

	Responses	Valid %
Less than 1 year	7	3.2
1–2 years	21	9.5
3–4 years	49	22.1
5–9 years	67	30.2
0–14 years	35	15.8
15–19 years	18	8.1
More than 20 years	25	11.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 18 How long have you been a professional journalist?**

	Responses	Valid %
Less than 1 year	0	0
1–2 years	2	0.9
3–4 years	6	2.7
5–9 years	42	18.9
10–14 years	35	15.8
15–19 years	44	19.8
More than 20 years	93	41.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 20 What is your gender?**

	Responses	Valid %
Female	124	55.9
Male	98	44.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## End-of-survey respondents' comments

Difficult questions to answer. It is not clear what our organization's online strategy is or whether our organization wants current editorial teams to be involved in such a strategy.

Digital has made us provide more analysis and less time-sensitive news in print. I still do not see a digital B2B profit model. I still hear a giant sucking sound. We are giving digital to younger people. Our e-newsletter has moderate success.

In my experience, print editors are expected to just pick up digital skills with no training and with no salary incentives, somehow cramming an additional job into the regular day. This economy has made matters worse, what with layoffs and salary cuts. My job has become extremely stressful as a result. There are not enough hours in the day, even when I work overtime. I welcome guidance in the digital arena, but I know that my company will not pay for any, and I can't afford to, either. It makes for an altogether unfortunate situation.

We do not pursue digital media because our membership does not embrace it. I am using the print magazine to nudge them along, including QR codes. I am also involved in a 'digital publishing' effort that is unusual in that it involves publishing diagnostic codes into practice management software. . . . The purpose of this "publication" is not to read, but is a tool to use. I believe the future of publishing will not revolve around merely conveying information but providing tools that cannot be easily commoditized.

Who has time for seminars????

Very useful and spot-on to what my current issues are.

There weren't any questions about business categories served, and I wonder if there will be variation about level of digital skills needed or expected based on type of market served. Also, though it was beyond the scope of the survey, some magazines have a deliberate plan to go all digital. Others (like ours) assume that at some point we'll probably drop the print edition. Others, I guess, are assuming that the two will coexist indefinitely. It'd be interesting to see how those figures break down, and how the responses vary based on those different scenarios.

Thanks for doing this. I am eager to see the results.

Thanks for conducting this important survey.

Thank you so much for conducting this study. Digital technology in the B2B industry is ramping up and we have to stay ahead of the curve. It's important for more seasoned editors to know that if you don't accept new technology/trends, you'll be left behind. Good luck!

Thank you for fielding this study. I appreciate your efforts in trying to make sure that editors have the skills needed to do their jobs in a rapidly-changing world!

Thank you for doing this! As we old-school print editors transition to digital, it is both exciting and exasperating. We need more info and support about managing the transition successfully.

Some of your questions assume that everybody knows the digital jargon. I don't know what "leveraging" is. I don't know what you mean by "social media." It's hard enough keeping the Web site up to date. Editing advice: "currently" is usually redundant.

Our business no longer operates print publications. This survey also might benefit from asking how often participants post new content online, what form that content is, and what the competition is like in their space. That is what determines much of the strategy and the results, as well as how sophisticated their marketing and list management teams are.

Nicely done survey, easy to navigate. Only question I did not understand was the one about being platform agnostic. Interested in see the results.