

**Winter
1969-70**



**Journal of
Broadcasting**

ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of Alabama University of Alaska American University Arizona State University University of Arizona Arkansas State University Ball State University Barton County Community College Baylor University Beloit College Blue Mountain Community College Boston University Bowling Green State University Bradley University Brigham Young University Brooklyn College Butler University California State College at Fullerton California State College at Long Beach California State College at Los Angeles California State Polytechnic College University of California at Los Angeles Capital University Central Michigan University Central Missouri State College Central Washington State College Chico State College University of Colorado Columbia University Community College of Baltimore Cornell University Creighton University University of Dayton University of Delaware University of Denver University of Detroit Duke University Duquesne University East Tennessee State University East Texas State University Eastern Illinois University Eastern Michigan University Emerson College Endicott Junior College Florida State University Florida Technological University University of Florida Fordham University Ft. Hays Kansas State College University of Georgia University of Hawaii Herbert H. Lehman College Hofstra University University of Houston Humboldt State College Idaho State University University of Idaho University of Illinois University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Indiana State University Indiana University Iowa State University University of Iowa Ithaca College John Brown University Kansas State University University of Kansas Kent State University University of Kentucky Lindenwood College Loma Linda University Los Angeles City College Louisiana Polytechnic Institute Louisiana State University University of Maine Marquette University University of Maryland Memphis State University Miami University University of Miami Michigan State University | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of Michigan Millikin University University of Minnesota University of Minnesota at Duluth University of Mississippi University of Missouri Montana State University University of Montana University of Nebraska New Mexico State University New York University University of North Carolina University of North Dakota Northern Illinois University Northern Michigan University North Texas State University Northwestern University Northwood Institute University of Notre Dame Ohio State University Ohio University Oklahoma State University University of Oklahoma Oregon State University University of Oregon Pennsylvania State University Queens College University of Rhode Island Rochester Institute of Technology Sacramento State College St. John's University (Minnesota) St. Lawrence University St. Louis University St. Petersburg Jr. College San Antonio College San Diego State College San Fernando Valley State College City College of San Francisco San Francisco State College San Jose State College Seton Hall University University of South Carolina South Dakota State University University of South Dakota University of Southern California Southern Illinois University Southern Methodist University Southern Missionary College University of Southern Mississippi Stanford University State University College (Brockport) State Univ. College at Fredonia, N. Y. State Univ. of New York (Plattsburgh) Stephens College Syracuse University Temple University Texas A & I University Texas Christian University Texas Technological College University of Texas University of Texas at El Paso Texas Woman's University University of Tulsa Utah State University University of Utah University of Vermont Villanova University Wabash Valley College Washburn University of Topeka Washington and Lee University Washington State University University of Washington Wayne State University Western Illinois University Western Michigan University University of West Florida College of William and Mary University of Wisconsin University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee Wisconsin State University—La Crosse Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh University of Wyoming |
|--|---|

The broadcasting stations of the United States through their membership
in the National Association of Broadcasters
and individuals interested in fostering the aims of the Association

JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING

Published Quarterly by the
Association for Professional Broadcasting Education

VOL. XIV, No. 1

WINTER 1969-70

CONTENTS

ISSUES IN BROADCASTING

- Sources of Most News: Evidence and Inference,
Vernon A. Stone 1
- On Economic Productivity in Broadcasting, *Kenneth Harwood* 5
- New Zealand Broadcasting: A Monopoly in Action,
Alex Toogood 13

RESEARCH IN BROADCASTING

- Three Television Critics: Stated vs. Manifest Functions,
Peter E. Mayeux 25
- Television in the Lives of Our Parents, *Ruth Young* 37
- News Elements and Selection by Television News Editors,
James K. Buckalew 47
- Viewer Needs and Desires in Television Newscasters,
William L. Cathcart 55
- Effect of Irrelevant Visual Cues on Recall of Television
Messages, *Robert Schlater* 63
- Programmer's Choice: Eight Factors in Program Decision-
Making, *J. David Lewis* 71

Part II

Separately Bound and Distributed

LITERATURE/LAW OF BROADCASTING

- A Bibliography of Articles about Broadcasting in Law
Periodicals, 1956-1968, *Kenneth Gompertz* 83
- An Annotated Bibliography of Articles on Broadcasting Law
and Regulation in Law Periodicals, 1920-1955,
Stuart Cooney 133
- An Annotated Bibliography on Broadcast Rights, 1920-1955,
Richard Tuber 147

Subscription price \$8.00 per year. Special student rate \$4.00 per year. Annual dues of \$12.00 charged APBE Individual Members include a subscription to the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING. Checks should be made payable to the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, except that Individual Membership dues checks should be payable to the APBE and sent to the Executive Secretary, 1771 N St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

All other correspondence should be addressed to John M. Kittross, Editor, JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122. Second-class postage paid at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Copyright, 1970, by the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education.

EDITOR

John M. Kittross Temple University
Business Manager Mary M. McClelland
Editorial Assistant Josephine M. Carmosky
Factotum Californium Wallace A. Smith
Coadjutor Emeritus Donel W. Price

CONSULTING EDITORS

Walter B. Emery, Ohio State University Law
Lawrence W. Lichty, University of Wisconsin Research
Harold Niven, National Association of Broadcasters Education
Bruce Robertson, Hollywood, California Industry Issues

THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

OFFICERS:

Marianne Campbell, Avco Broadcasting Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio, *President*
Owen S. Rich, Brigham Young University, *Vice-President*
Thomas Bolger, WMTV, Madison, Wisconsin, *Secretary-Treasurer*

DIRECTORS:

Eldon Campbell, WFBM, Indianapolis, Indiana
Walter B. Emery, Ohio State University
Arthur Hungerford, Pennsylvania State University
Ray Johnson, KMED, Medford, Oregon
Sherman P. Lawton, University of Oklahoma
Leo A. Martin, Michigan State University
Clark Pollock, Nationwide Communications, Inc., Columbus, Ohio
Harold Niven, NAB, Washington, D. C., *Executive Secretary*

APBE COMMITTEE ON THE JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING:

Kenneth Harwood, Temple University, *Chairman*
Leo A. Martin, Michigan State University
Robert Norris, Lutheran Church in America
Donel W. Price, California State College at Los Angeles
W. C. Swartley, WBZ, Boston, Massachusetts
R. C. Williams, S.J., Creighton University
Edgar Willis, University of Michigan

THE JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING welcomes the submission of articles and reviews from all sources. Attention is called to the suggestions for the preparation of manuscripts appearing on the last two pages of Vol. X, No. 2, Spring, 1966.

Manuscripts, books for review, and editorial and business correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

VERNON A. STONE

Sources of Most News: Evidence and Inference

Vernon A. Stone, a former radio-television newsman at WHAS AM & TV in Louisville, earned his Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin, where he is now associate professor in the School of Journalism.

AN inferential gap lies between the data reported by Roper Research Associates regarding the public's news sources and a widespread interpretation of those data.¹ Since the 1963 Roper figures were released by the Television Information Office, we have been met at every turn by the claim that most Americans get most of their news from television. A broadcaster seldom gets through a speech without asserting that television has long since taken the lead from newspapers as the public's primary source of news. Perhaps it has, but such cannot appropriately be inferred from the Roper evidence.

What is the evidence? The Roper question reads: "First, I'd like to ask you where you usually get most of your news about what's going on in the world today—from the newspapers or radio or television or magazines or talking to people or where?" The figures for 1968 were: television 59%, newspapers 49%, radio 25%, magazines 7%, people 5%, and don't know or no answer 3%.² These percentages are based on responses from an adequately large national sample of about 2,000 adults, who were scientifically selected and interviewed by an experienced and highly reputable organization. There is no reason to doubt the reliability of the Roper figures themselves.

The problem arises when single-answer inferences are made from the multiple-answer evidence. Writer after writer has interpreted the Roper figures as showing that the majority of Americans get most

of their news from television.³ The impression given is that 59% say they get more of their news from television than from any other source, in which case newspapers, radio, magazines, and other people could not be the primary sources for more than the remaining 41% of the sample. Yet 49% say that they get most of their news from newspapers, 25% from radio, etc. A crucial fact which is widely overlooked, though the Roper reports clearly call attention to it, is that multiple answers were accepted and the totals therefore exceed 100%. The 1968 total was 145%. Multiple answers may be properly interpreted only as multiple answers, not as essentially exclusive first choices. It is correct to infer from the Roper data that 59% believe they rely on television as *one of* their major sources of news but incorrect to make the common inference that television is *the* major source for 59%.

The latest Roper report maintains that "it is at least as realistic to permit multiple answers as to force a single answer from people who rely on two or more media."⁴ This is correct but of little relevance to the problem at hand. Certainly, multiple answers are often appropriate in this kind of research, but only as the basis for multiple-answer inferences. Indeed, multiple answers are necessary for valid inferences as to how many and which media people rely on for news. But the Roper question is addressed not to how many different news sources a person may rely on, but to which he relies on for *most* of his news. These different research objectives require different assumptions. Exclusiveness is assumed in responses as to one's source of most news; exhaustiveness is assumed when the question at hand is total news media usage.

Actually, the assumption of exhaustiveness is as inappropriate as that of exclusiveness in the Roper responses. In this connection, as a result of a new analysis in the 1969 Roper report, we may be in for a flood of misinterpretations of the data as being exhaustive which will compare to the years of incorrect assumptions in the opposite direction. The new Roper report has classified respondents according to those who named television only (29%), newspapers only (19%), both television and newspapers (25%), and other responses (27%).⁵ A *TV Guide* editorial interprets this to show that about 3 out of 10 Americans "obtain their news *only* from TV."⁶ There is no basis for this inference. Nothing in the Roper question told the respondents to name *all* media relied on for "most of" their news, and we can't know how many, if any, so responded.

The wording of the Roper question is so ambiguous that responses to it are difficult to interpret. Does it mean which *one* source of most news? Which *two* or *three*? Or even *all* sources of news? A respondent could interpret it in any of these ways. R. H. Brushkin Associates used the question and reported that so many respondents (4 of every 10) refused to name only one source of most news that this question "does not appear very meaningful."⁷ But did they really refuse? It appears equally likely that they simply did not understand that such was intended by the question.

A basic rule of survey research is that a question ask specifically what the investigator wants to know. If he wants to know *all* of a given type of things a person may use, he should ask for all. If his interest is in which *one* is used most, he should ask for which one. Or if he wants them ranked, he should ask for the order of usage. This is not forcing answers, but merely being specific and thus avoiding the uninterpretable responses yielded by questions which lend themselves to various interpretations. Among those who have stated precisely what they wanted to know, Carter and Greenberg reported no difficulty in obtaining single responses in a San Jose survey for which the Roper question was altered to specify which *one* of the news sources.⁸ Neither did Westley and Severin report difficulties in obtaining responses from a Wisconsin sample asked: "As between television, radio, and newspapers, which one would you say is most important to you in finding out what is going on?"⁹ For that matter, Roper has reported no difficulty in eliciting single answers when asking people which *one* of the media they find most believable and which *one* they would most want to keep.¹⁰ (Television leads in both instances.)

Aside from the inferential problems, the Roper question is open to criticism as biased for television to the extent to which its "world" wording leads to responses in terms of non-local news. A Wisconsin survey has found television the primary source of non-local news for most people (TV 47%, newspapers 31%, radio 16%) but newspapers first for local news (newspapers 40%, TV 30%, radio 20%).¹¹ Similarly, Roper (again accepting multiple answers but this time in an unambiguous manner) has found newspapers mentioned most often as a source of information about candidates for local offices, with television drawing the most responses regarding information about candidates for state and national offices.¹²

There are indications that, if the Roper sample had been asked which *one* source they relied on for most of their world news, the resulting evidence would support the inference that television is the leading source for the greatest number of Americans. When only respondents giving a single answer to the Roper question in 1968 are considered, television leads newspapers by 10 percentage points, and this represents a steady increase over the past several surveys. It is unlikely that first choices of those giving more than one answer would be so different as to reverse the order of news sources, but this cannot be known from existing data. The matter of the public's primary news source can only be conjectured, not inferred, from the Roper data. Multiple-answer evidence is inappropriate for single-answer inference.

Footnotes

¹ The author wishes to thank Burns W. Roper, Lionel C. Barrow, Jr., Richard F. Carter, Steven H. Chaffee, Bradley S. Greenberg, and Bruce H. Westley for their helpful comments on the earlier version of this article.

² Burns W. Roper, *A Ten-Year View of Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media 1959-68*. New York: Television Information Office, 1969, p. 2.

³ For examples of essentially this interpretation of the Roper data, see: Neil Hickey, "The Headline Syndrome," *TV Guide*, March 16, 1968, p. 30; Elmer Lower, "Editing for the Nation," *World Business*, 1967, p. 31; Robert MacNeil, on "Public Broadcast Laboratory," telecast on National Educational Television, Dec. 22, 1968; Sig Mickelson, "Television News: A Prospectus," *RTNDA Bulletin*, Dec., 1967, p. 7; "Newscasting: Filling the Front Page," *Time*, Oct. 27, 1967, p. 80; John Tebbel, "Who Owns Television?" *Saturday Review*, May 10, 1969, p. 75; and Leonard Zeidenberg, "The 21-Inch View of Vietnam: Big Enough Picture?" *Television Magazine*, Jan., 1968.

⁴ Roper, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

⁵ *Ibid.* The corresponding figures for 1967 are: television only (26%), newspapers only (18%) and both television and newspapers (30%). (Letter from Burns W. Roper to the author, February 6, 1969.)

⁶ "As We See It," *TV Guide*, May 24, 1969, p. 2.

⁷ See "New Research Backs Radio's Reach," *Broadcasting*, Oct. 11, 1965, pp. 27-29.

⁸ Richard F. Carter and Bradley Greenberg, "Newspapers or Television: Which Do You Believe?" *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 42 (Winter, 1965), pp. 29-34.

⁹ Bruce H. Westley and Werner J. Severin, "Some Correlates of Media Credibility," *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 41 (Summer, 1964), pp. 325-335.

¹⁰ Roper, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-6.

¹¹ James A. Fosdick, "Media Preferences and Radio Listening Habits in Two Wisconsin Communities," paper presented at Association for Education in Journalism, Lawrence, Kansas, August, 1968.

¹² Roper, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10.

KENNETH HARWOOD

On Economic Productivity in Broadcasting

This is the fifth in a series on the economics of broadcasting written by Kenneth Harwood. Articles on the "ecology" of broadcasters (Vol. 6, No. 3), distribution of payrolls (7:4), "On Earning a Non-Profit" (11:1), and "On Public Broadcasting for Private Profit" (11:3) already have appeared in the JOURNAL. Dr. Harwood is professor and dean in the School of Communications and Theater of Temple University, chairman of the board of Broadcast Foundation of California, and an active member of numerous professional associations. For a dozen years he served as an officer or director of the APBE.

QUESTION: By what criteria shall broadcast licensees and managers of broadcasting stations be rewarded? **Answer:** Their economic rewards might be related to their economic productivity.

An immediate difficulty is in defining economic productivity so as to provide for achieving the social goals of broadcasting and offering the broadcasters sufficient economic incentive at the same time. The productivity under consideration is neither that of land nor that of capital but that of human effort: that of the economic factors of labor and enterprise. The problem is to identify the simplest definition of productivity through which (a) human effort to broadcast is minimized while (b) the social purposes of broadcasting are maximized and (c) the firm of broadcasters is able to exist or to grow.

A main purpose of minimizing human effort is to provide for alternative uses of time that are better than time spent in attention to production and distribution of broadcasts, assuming that the amounts and kinds of broadcasting might be equalled or bettered while human effort is lessened. A main social purpose of broadcasting is to provide the amounts and kinds of broadcasts that best support the highest aims and policies of society. One among many of the

purposes of a firm of broadcasters is to gather and to allocate the resources for broadcasting so as to maximize the social worth of the broadcasts while minimizing the human costs of broadcasting. Questions relating to strategies of the firm in its quest to exist and to grow are left to another discussion.

As illustrated in the next paragraphs, selecting a proper unit of production or output is essential to solution of the problem because each definition implies special social consequences. The unit should be as nearly "real" and therefore universal in its applicability as one is able to make it; that is, the unit should apply to broadcasting as conducted under most political systems and under most systems of financial accounting. Such universality permits comparison of results between quite different kinds of societies and between periods that are separated in time.

Perhaps the simplest crude measure of real productivity could be achieved through comparing the labor force in broadcasting with the number of transmitters operated. Reduction in the number of staff members per operating transmitter would thereby increase the productivity of broadcasting. However, one thinks immediately of the fact that some transmitters are operated only a few hours a day or a few days a month, while others are operated 24 hours daily. A somewhat refined measure of productivity thus could be achieved by comparing the number of persons in a transmitting unit with the number of seconds or minutes or hours of operation during a day, a week, a month, or a year. On this kind of measure a staff of 10 operating a transmitter 12 hours a day would be as productive as a staff of 20 operating the same transmitter for 24 hours a day.

As quickly as one thinks of detailing the number of hours of transmitter operation, one also thinks of detailing the number of hours of service provided by each member of the staff, on the proposition that some may work six or eight hours a day while others work 10 or 12. The measure of productivity then becomes the number of person-hours of staff service per hour of transmitter operation.

Of course a major purpose of broadcasting is to serve audiences. If one assumes a transmitter to radiate in a circular pattern through a plane in which the members of the audience are distributed with constant number of persons per unit of area, then greater transmitter

power should serve more members of the audience because it serves greater areas.¹ Productivity could be measured by person-hours of staff service per kilowatt-hour of transmitter power output.

Not all of the persons who are within range of a signal attend to it. One might attempt to relate productivity to people who are in fact served by broadcasting, instead of assuming that all persons in an area are served. Then a measure of productivity would be number of person-hours of staff effort to serve a thousand members of the audience during some unit of time such as an hour or a day. Perhaps a convenient measure would be person-hours of staff service per thousand person-hours of audience attention, combining size of audience with amount of time spent by each member of the audience in attending to a broadcast.

One advantage of the person-hour of service as a unit of output is that through it one is able to compare radio and television with each other and with films, newspapers, books, and other media of mass communications, assuming that data on hourly use of each medium are available. Indeed it could be argued that all kinds of services might be compared with one another through relating person-hours of effort by practitioners to person-hours of service taken by recipients.²

Differing social worths of different kinds of service could be taken into account. If dentistry is held by a society to be ten times as valuable as barbering then the number of person-hours of service taken by the patients of dentists might be multiplied by a social weight of ten when dentistry and barbering are compared. To put this in another way, a barber would serve ten hours for every hour served by a dentist in order to be called as productive as a dentist.

In broadcasting service the most productive activity would be that of a single person whose output during a minute of effort or an hour would occupy the attention of all persons 24 hours a day every day endlessly. Such activity implies an ever-growing almost-sleepless population devoting itself entirely to one broadcasting station, the signal of which would be unavoidable everywhere on, above, and below the earth and the sea. The attraction of the broadcasting would compel full attention except for the minimal activity required to sustain life at the level of permitting maximum

attention to the broadcast. Such a world might be happier or sadder than the present one, and it might be wiser or more foolish, but almost surely it would be less mobile physically, less verbal individually, and nearly devoid of wide exercise of personal will.

Some lessons are plain. When broadcasting diminishes the number of persons who are able to attend to it as members of audiences, or when it diminishes their abilities to attend, it reduces its own possible productivity. Repulsive programs or boring ones are not in the interest of increased productivity; neither, for example, is advertising that leads to lessened alertness through encouraging excessive consumption of depressants or stimulants. Programs and announcements tending to increase or prolong human life and awareness contribute to potential productivity of broadcasting up to limits such as that at which need for added supply of food results in reduced opportunity to receive broadcasts.

Moreover a chief human purpose of broadcasting is not to detract from one's ability to originate personal action but to enhance that ability. Broadcasters should seek to serve the widest practicable variety of human interests at any instant and ought not to attempt to compel anyone to attend to broadcasts beyond the limits of health.

From considerations such as these emerge some apparent imperatives of productivity in broadcasting. The number of persons available to attend to broadcasts, and thus the productivity of broadcasting, is limited not only by unavailability of signals to potential recipients, but also by elements of age, sex, health, religion, education, occupation, income, and so on. If a signal is present, equipment to receive it is available, and a person is able to attend to a broadcast, he may choose to do otherwise, preferring some other use of his time; thus the productivity of broadcasting is limited by will as well as by ability.

Because it is not possible to serve everyone all of the time, one might reward broadcasters according to their minimal use of manpower in serving as many different individuals as often as practicable; or one might reward according to the proportion of potential audience served on average during a span of time, or one might reward according to proportion of potential audience served at all during some standard period.

To any of these measures of productivity one might attach estimators of quality. One may judge the quality of the output of a broadcasting station and convert the judgment to a number with which to modify estimators of size of audience or frequency of service to individuals. Similarly one might estimate the worth of the human effects of receiving a broadcast and create a number to represent that value in productivity.

The various kinds of constraints upon attending to broadcasts, and thus upon economic productivity of broadcasting, may be classified as physical, biological, social, and individual. Attacks upon physical constraints and biological ones as means of improving productivity are generally easier to effect than attacks upon social constraints or individual ones. For example it is easier to provide a strong signal or to determine and advocate just that amount of rest that will maximize individual ability to perceive than it is to advocate "more television viewing" instead of "more service to the sick" or "more radio listening" in place of "more attention to exercise out of doors."

It stands to reason, then, that rapid probable gains in productivity will follow development, distribution, and use of equipment that will minimize the number of broadcasters per broadcasting firm and maximize the opportunities of audiences to attend to broadcasts either wholly or during their occupation with other activities, recognizing that continuing constraints prevent acceptance of broadcasts by any individuals during 24 hours of each day.

Improvement of productivity probably will be slow through attempts to replace a large number of weak transmitters with a few strong ones because religious, political, and economic differentiation probably would be cramped.³ Similarly productivity probably will gain slowly, if at all, through exhortations to attend to a few serious presentations instead of a wide range of light and serious presentations, for strong emphasis upon serious presentations tends to direct attention to other media of mass communication or to activities other than reception of mass communications.

Costs of obtaining information on productivity in broadcasting are related to the benefits of using the information in making decisions

on broadcasting. The counting of human service is easy if we count individuals who work for standard periods; it is less easy if we count person-hours of service in a day, a week, or a month; and it is least easy if we attempt to count hours or minutes of different kinds and degrees of attention to task.

When one attempts to count human benefits resulting from a broadcast or from a sequence of broadcasts, the difficulties are larger than those in attempting to count human production of the broadcasting service. The cost of counting recipients is great; instead the counting may be of transmitters operated, hours of operation, power or water used in association with the presentation of programs or announcements, spontaneous comment from members of audiences or others, pieces of correspondence elicited from audiences, or the commonly used sampling of the audience by the rating services.

Systematic study of recipients produces, with increasing costs, information on whether or not attendance occurred, how much occurred, when it occurred, and what kinds occurred in a particular period. Information on personal, social, and other characteristics of audiences may be collected with information on attendance.

Because information on audiences is not produced in every country, world-wide comparisons are limited to counts of transmitters, transmitter power output and hours of operation; and because information on employment in broadcasting is limited in many countries, world comparisons of human input are limited to rough estimates of employees per transmitter or of even rougher estimates of person-hours of employment per transmitter. The simplest and crudest measure is number of employees per transmitter, estimates of employees and transmitters being made as necessary. Employee hours per kilowatt hour of transmitter power output might be estimated quite grossly from published data such as those in *World Radio TV Handbook*.⁴

Macroeconomic comparisons of nations with each other or with suitable groups of nations should suggest to makers of national policy the extents to which national economic productivity might be changed as well as the probable gross costs and benefits of change.

Comparisons of a nation with itself through time should give policy-makers a sense of directions in which productivity of broad-

casting has moved and a suggestion of the costs and benefits of those changes. Where national audience surveys are made regularly it is usually possible to estimate fairly well the person-hours of employment in broadcasting per person-hours of takings by audience and the hours of service by various kinds of broadcasting specialists per hours of takings by different kinds of audience. Need for educating and training various kinds of specialists might be related to trends in productivity and to national policy on amounts and kinds of broadcasts for various audiences, both domestic and foreign.

Microeconomic comparisons of a firm with itself or with other similar firms might be undertaken with simple estimates of employees or employee-hours per kilowatt hour of transmitter output, the object being to provide more and better service with decreasing human effort. Increase of population, power, hours of service, or estimated quality of service would improve performance, as would decrease in person-hours of employment. If person-hours of takings of audiences could be estimated fairly, increase in productivity could be related to increase in persons, hours, and person-hours of service taken, as well as to estimated changes in quality of offerings. Those who plan for operations of a broadcasting unit or for a group of units should be able to measure human costs of increased productivity against human benefits with a view of maximizing benefits per unit of cost.

At some indefinite time it might be feasible to compare various cognitive, psychomotor, and affective human inputs with cognitive, psychomotor, and affective changes in audiences at costs of information that are not prohibitive of gathering the data. Then it would be possible to plan for change to selected details of individuals' interactions with the broadcasts and to estimate fairly the human costs and benefits of each such change. Because of the high costs of such estimates it is most likely that they will be applied in a few microeconomic environments long before macroeconomic applications appear.

Cost of information considered, it is easiest to reward for increase in transmitter power per man-hour of employment in broadcasting, quality of output being estimated to remain unchanged or to improve. Constraints upon increase of transmitter power being greater than those upon reduction of manpower or increase in operating hours or inflow of population to the service area, one would expect operators

of broadcasting units to be avid promoters of their localities, creative users of the broadcasting channels to the limits of authorized operating hours, and eager adopters of automatic equipment. The society, the firm, and the individual broadcasters can benefit singly and jointly through definition of productivity in broadcasting as human employment per kilowatt-hour of transmitter output. This measure of productivity is simple, inexpensive, and culturally general enough to serve national and international purposes as well as local ones.

Footnotes

¹ It is recognized that (a) populations often are not uniformly distributed, and (b) the propagation characteristics of various wavelengths (e.g., the VHF frequencies used for FM and TV broadcasting) are such that an increase in power does not lead to a proportionate increase in population or area served.

² For the purposes of this discussion, "recipients" are defined as members of the actual audience to the broadcast.

³ Since the time of the Federal Radio Commission, local service has been considered more important than economic savings in broadcasting in the United States.

⁴ *World Radio TV Handbook*. Hellerup, Denmark: World Radio-Television Handbook Co., Ltd.

The JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING depends upon the cooperation of broadcasters, teachers of professional broadcasting, and researchers in continuing and strengthening its service. The stature of the JOURNAL depends upon the quality and quantity of both the readership and the manuscripts offered for publication.

We welcome the submission of articles and reviews from all sources. In particular, the JOURNAL desires to report the results of orderly and publicly verifiable research of importance to broadcasters and broadcasting. Contributions from commercial broadcasters as well as from authors affiliated with educational institutions are especially welcomed.

If you are interested in submitting a manuscript to the JOURNAL, you may wish to consult the Editor or the "Suggestions for Preparation of Manuscripts" published on pp. 187-188 of the Spring, 1966, issue of the JOURNAL.

ALEX TOOGOOD

New Zealand Broadcasting: A Monopoly in Action

A native of New Zealand and former television producer/director there, Alex Toogood earned graduate degrees at the University of North Carolina and the Ohio State University. Dr. Toogood presently is assistant professor in the Department of Radio/Television/Film of the University of Texas.

History

ISOLATED from the rest of the world, New Zealand was quick to welcome the marvel of radio. By the end of 1922, there were seven amateur stations offering a limited broadcasting service.¹ At first, the government withheld regulatory legislation, but by 1926 the resulting unsatisfactory situation caused various pressure groups to pressure for government action. A private company, the Radio Broadcasting Company of New Zealand Limited, was formed and was given monopolistic rights. Being non-commercial, it was financed by 80% of the receiver license fees (US \$4) collected by the post office, plus a government grant (US \$37,500) for capital expenditure. This initial flirtation with private enterprise proved successful, but New Zealand was greatly impressed by the example of Great Britain's establishment of the government-controlled British Broadcasting Corporation.² At the expiration of the government's agreement with the Company, and under the fruitful lobbying of the Radio Dealers Association, an attempt was made to establish a broadcasting system on the model of the B.B.C. with the creation of the New Zealand Broadcasting Board (N.Z.B.B.) in 1932. However this proved a failure largely as a result of the administrative difficulties of inex-

perienced personnel.³ To this was added the depression which, in 1935, ushered in a Labour Government.

Amongst the onslaught of the resulting socialistic legislation was the *Broadcasting Act 1936*. The N.Z.B.B. was replaced by the New Zealand Broadcasting Service (N.Z.B.S.), a government department with ultimate power vested in a cabinet minister. Private enterprise was thereby excluded from the future development of broadcasting in New Zealand.⁴ The N.Z.B.S. soon proved successful despite its many inadequacies, not the least being its role as a government tool for the promulgation of party politics. After the Service had been functioning one year, commercial broadcasting was introduced to the country when commercial stations took their place within the government-controlled broadcasting system through the 1937 *Broadcasting Amendment Act*. Thus was established a duality of function which was to characterize broadcasting in New Zealand: the co-existence of commercial and non-commercial services, both controlled by government. For many years they were separate entities within the one department, linked together only in their responsibility to the same Minister of Broadcasting. However, during the Second World War, they were amalgamated to form the present one body.

The Minister relied on the Director of Broadcasting, a public servant, to handle the administrative operations of broadcasting. The differing personalities of successive Directors resulted in a fluctuating emphasis between outright commercialism and "the servant of the people" philosophy. During the ascendancy of the latter, certain non-broadcasting functions fell into the realm of the N.Z.B.S., aided by the not-too-subtle prodding of parliamentary legislation.⁵ One result has been the publication of a weekly journal, the *New Zealand Listener*. By maintaining a copyright monopoly of all program information, it releases full details of all forthcoming radio and television entertainment, while also being a major regular cultural outlet for the country's poets, short story writers, critics, and innumerable letter writers. Broadcasting also supports the nation's only professional symphony orchestra, a smaller orchestra, a youth orchestra; it acts as an entrepreneur, bringing to the country a variety of distinguished artists, groups and orchestras. Neither the journal nor the concert activities shows a profit. But it is worthwhile to consider their value in a culturally-starved country, not only in the offering

of otherwise unobtainable enrichment, but also in the fostering of New Zealanders in artistic fields.⁶

Towards the end of the 1950s, public pressure bolstered manufacturers' demands for television. Although private interests expressed their desire to operate the new medium, and there had been some impressive experimental transmission from one private station,⁷ the Labour Government decided that television should be included under the N.Z.B.S.'s protective umbrella. The 625-line system already had been endorsed. Regular television transmission began in the largest city, Auckland, on June 1, 1960.

Towards the close of the same year, the National Party was voted into office. Some people thought that broadcasting might now be opened to private investors⁸ for the party had implied as much in its pre-election policy statement.⁹ This did not prove to be the case. As a compromise of its election promise, the new government introduced the *Broadcasting Corporation Act 1961*. On April 1, 1962, the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation took over the functions previously given to the New Zealand Broadcasting Service. The change in name implied a divorcement of government and broadcasting. Indeed, the National Party frequently makes claims that this has been the case.¹⁰ However, as James and Margaret Rowe have recently pointed out: the Broadcasting Corporation is supposed to be "an autonomous successor to the old Broadcasting Service . . . although few people can detect any significant difference."¹¹ The 1961 act established a triumvirate to govern broadcasting's operations: a Minister of Broadcasting; a Director-General, who, with his more mellifluous title, replaces the old Director of Broadcasting as the chief executive officer; and the "Corporation," a governing body deemed independent of the government, although appointed by the cabinet.¹² It is headed by a Chairman and has up to six other part-time members.¹³ Apart from having a minister and the right to appoint the members of the Corporation, the government has additional avenues for influence. This results in but a nominal independence for the Corporation.¹⁴

Unlike many other similarly conceived broadcasting bodies, the N.Z.B.C. is expected to operate completely without the government's financial benevolence. Even the immense initial financing of television

came out of past profits and a small government loan of US \$1,000,000 which has been fully repaid. To support its broadcasting operations the Corporation relies on licensing fees paid annually by each householder (Radio: US \$4; Television: US \$17), and advertising revenue. Its commercial activities are subject to taxation, and in the past 10 years this has totalled more than US \$5,000,000.¹⁵ The Corporation is in a healthy financial position. Over the past six years, each year has seen a surplus; that for the 1967 financial year alone totalled US \$3,800,000 from an overall operational budget of US \$25,350,000. Approximately half of this total comes from the receiver licensing fees, the other half from sale of advertising time. That television has made a vast difference to broadcasting's budget can be seen from the fact that 1967 advertising revenue is three times that of 1962. Although television supplies almost twice as much of the current income as does radio, both make equal claims on it. As much is spent on radio as on the vast financial demands of television.¹⁶ This means that apart from having to cope with its own impressive, if somewhat pampered, development, television's income also has had to meet the fringe costs of paying for broadcasting's large bureaucracy, for the continued loss from the concert and publication activities, for improving already existing services and facilities, and, in the past three years, for covering the difference between radio's increasing costs and its diminishing revenue.

As broadcasting is such an economic success, it is not surprising that private interests have expressed a desire to participate. The 1961 act made provisions for the involvement of outside commercial investors, but the decision as to the need for, and the initial authorizing of private broadcasting stations rested firmly in the hands of the Corporation. To remedy this somewhat anomalous position of the Corporation, the 1968 parliament passed the *Broadcasting Authority Act* establishing a three-man independent authority to oversee all of the country's broadcasting activities. It has wide controls over programming, advertising practices, and the licensing of stations. Provision is made for the possibility of private broadcasting.

Radio Services

All radio is AM, except for New Zealand's shortwave contribution to its international prestige, Radio New Zealand. This overseas broadcasting is far more limited than is neighboring Australia's im-

pressive service largely because of weak transmitters and lack of an international commitment.¹⁷ Today's domestic radio listener chooses from three networks: a fully commercial network; a "national" network which is non-commercial; and the YC (the call sign) network which is a non-commercial cultural station with limited broadcasting hours. In addition, each of the three most populated areas has a commercial station which is independent of any network.

Radio and television are seen as complementary services.¹⁸ The latter has not adversely affected radio's growth, although there has been the expected change in loyalty of both audience and advertiser. There has been the steady promotion of radio with the improvement of existing facilities, the boosting of transmission power, and the opening of new stations. From 1960, when television began, to 1967, the number of radio stations steadily increased from 33 to 47.¹⁹ New Zealand has not seen the decline in radio programming that America suffered when television challenged radio's role as an entertainment medium. Despite the loss of audience, the Corporation has expanded its production of radio drama, partially to compensate for a decline in the availability of suitable overseas material. In the year ended March 1966 "the NZBC drama studios sustained a substantial output with 130 new plays, 12 serials, 162 schools' and children's features, 65 short stories (47 by NZ writers), and 29 miscellaneous works."²⁰

The commercial network of 25 stations offers what is termed "popular programming." On most stations the day starts at 5 a.m. and ends at 12 midnight. During this time there are 14 newscasts and nine weather reports. The rest of the programming is largely light music. This is broken by panel discussions, service programs, shopping reports, and the still persistent soap opera. As might be expected, such fare is criticized as being too outdated and regimented. Even the so-called popular music is usually limited to tired show tunes, worn crooners, and cocktail-hour tranquility. Writing on international television, Wilson Dizard states that the presence of advertising automatically means that "a large measure of program control rests with men who instinctively understand the middle class aspirations of their audience and who cater to their desires in programming as well as in advertising."²¹ In countries such as New Zealand there are few signs of such an understanding. Although well meaning, its officers are not essentially commercially minded. The

resulting unsatisfactory commercial radio coverage came to a head in 1967 when a pirate radio station commenced operations outside New Zealand's territorial waters. These air-wave pirates offered popular music presented in the previously unknown all-American disc-jockey style. The station received wide public support, and continues to operate (late-1969).

The N.Z.B.C.'s commercial stations are linked as a network for news bulletins and for nationally sponsored shows, but the larger proportion of the day is taken up with programs originating from their local studios. Therefore, the commercial stations are the community stations. All finances for these activities, including those of the non-profitable Sundays when no commercials may be aired, come from advertising revenue. The advertiser may purchase spot advertising or may sponsor a program. Despite the presence of advertisements, the commercial stations attract almost 80% of the New Zealand radio audience.²²

Until four years ago the non-commercial, or "national" stations also had a local flavor with many programs originating in regional studios; but in 1965 all national stations, now numbering 14, were linked to offer the same networked program. At the same time, the Corporation introduced around-the-clock broadcasting on these stations. Financing for the national service comes from the annual radio receiver license fee. For this fee, the listener is daily offered 17 newscasts (six taken directly from the B.B.C. Overseas Service), nine weather forecasts, and a wide variety of programs to cater primarily to diverse minority tastes. These include programs for women; children; schools; churches; sports bodies; farmers; the native Maori; book readers; music lovers; and those wishing to be informed or entertained by documentaries, consumer reports, news analyses, serials, or dramas. This is supported by light musical programming. In addition, the national stations carry all parliamentary proceedings. While Parliament is in session, regular national network programs are available on a different network established for the purpose.

The other two services offered by the N.Z.B.C.'s radio operations are at opposite poles. The YC network, operating from four stations which cover the country for approximately five-and-a-half hours each

evening, offers a small minority of less than 1%²³ exclusive highbrow programming in both music and spoken word. For contrast, the non-networked commercial stations in the three largest cities have lately tried to counter the presence of the pirate radio station by offering a style of presentation close to that available on commercial radio in America. Over the past more than two years they have extended their hours, and a private company has been given a contract to supply programs, the first time that private enterprise has been involved in commercial broadcasting in New Zealand.

Television Service

June 1, 1960 saw the introduction of regular television transmission. In nine years there has been marked progress, despite inordinate difficulties. There is a small population of only two-and-a-half million people scattered throughout the country's two largest islands (each approximately the size of North Carolina); awesome technical problems stem from the rolling countryside and towering mountain ranges (many over 10,000 feet); New Zealand is isolated from the rest of the world (Australia is 1,200 miles away, the distance from Canada to Mexico); and the country's reliance on its fluctuating rural economy gives it the problem of securing adequate overseas funds, which adds to the financial difficulties of purchasing and shipping all necessary equipment from the other side of the world.

By 1967, 95% of the population could receive a television signal,²⁴ and 74% of New Zealand homes had television receivers. In 1964, R. A. Usmar wrote that "television is pushed hard by its manufacturing and retail interests, but it still has made little real impact on the entertainment field."²⁶ However, the public soon proved eager to substitute television for their other forms of entertainment. In the five years prior to 1967, the number of motion picture theaters in operation fell from 591 to 348.²⁷ The demand for television sets ran 91% ahead of the industry's estimates despite the comparatively high cost of US \$600 for the average set. Import controls assured that only domestically produced receivers were available. Initially, this was a 23 inch receiver, and shortly afterwards a 21 inch was made available. Today there is a wide variety, all New Zealand-assembled by the large number of manufacturers who were quick to climb on the band wagon. In 1964, New Zealand, with 16 companies making

television sets, had the greatest number of set manufacturers per capita in the world.²⁸

Unlike private enterprise, the avowed policy of the Corporation has been to offer television to every person in the country as soon as possible rather than to saturate only the more populated areas.²⁹ To do this, it was decided to offer only one service. Since there is no alternate programming, the New Zealander has one single channel. As there is not yet a network, national coverage is achieved from four centers: Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin; two microwave links; a series of relay stations; and 45 privately owned translators. The four cities are the geographical and cultural centers of New Zealand; they do not reflect the most densely populated areas. The result is that one station, AKTV-2 of Auckland, reaches half of the country's population, while one in Dunedin serves only one-tenth.³⁰ The policy of national coverage has meant the duplication of staff and facilities in all four centers, for each is concerned not only with transmission, but also with production. The four have their own scenic design, film, remote, studio, and videotape services. While the most modern technical equipment has been imported, this has not resulted in the best of production facilities. Each studio is a hastily converted radio studio. The resulting unprofessional environment can be seen at WNTV-1 of Wellington. It enjoys the distinction of having two minute upstairs studios with the only access by a six-foot wide winding staircase; its scenic workshop is three miles away on the other side of the busy capital city; and the station's staff is scattered throughout numerous buildings far distant from the studio. The Corporation wishes to improve such an unsatisfactory situation, and has elaborate plans for an extensive studio complex at Avalon, a few miles from Wellington. But the government, exercising its restrictive influence permitted in the Act,³¹ prohibits what it considers non-essential development.

Since April 1, 1967, transmissions have started at 2 p.m. and ended at 11 p.m. except on Friday and Saturday nights when there is an additional hour's entertainment. As might be expected, the Corporation offers a balanced diet; cultural and informative programs are presented alongside those merely entertaining. On his one channel the New Zealander regularly views features on music and ballet; service programs on gardening and cooking; series made from literary works; and both television and classical drama. There is

correspondingly less of the light musical entertainment, situation comedies, westerns, and name-star shows with which American audiences are familiar. An analysis of television programs for a week in September 1967 showed: 24% of air time was devoted to news, talks, information and religion; 21% to drama; 13% to comedy; 13% to adventures and westerns; 11% to children's programs; 9% to variety; 5% to mystery and crime; and 4% to sports.³² The resulting mixed bag is more popular than might be supposed. A mid-1967 audience survey revealed that while the top three favorites were entertainment programs; four of the top ten were in the news and information category.³³

New Zealand has no legal directives as to how much programming must be locally produced. At present 25% of the viewing originates in the Corporation's studios, and in 1967 "an average of approximately 200 programs per month were produced, embracing a wide range of subjects and interests."³⁴ This information tends to be misleading, since such statistics would include the four daily newscasts. N.Z.B.C.'s production is devoted mainly to service programs and others designed to complement rather than compete with the imported material.

When most New Zealanders refer to television, they are thinking of the canned import which occupies 75% of the transmission time. The American influence is strong. Some 60% of imported material comes from the United States, with the remaining imports largely British. Although the New Zealander's view of American life is centered on the commercial gloss of the situation comedy, there also are a considerable number of documentaries. Just as there is no directive as to how much imported programming is permitted, there are no regulations stipulating its source. The prevailing policy of the Corporation's program selection committee—which argues well for the American product—is that quality alone decides the proportion.³⁵ Apart from the advantages of choosing programming from the best of the English-speaking world, the Corporation clearly is also in a buyer's market. As a monopoly, it can pay extremely low prices for what it wants.

Television is an expensive luxury to a country with such a small population and a rural economy. To supplement the licensing fee, New Zealand television devised a unique characteristic. The Corpo-

ration has duplicated radio's commercial/non-commercial form with its one television outlet. Half of television's total viewing hours contains commercials, and 50% does not. There is no advertising on Monday, Friday, and Sunday. The other days are fully commercial, except for the hour reserved each day for children's programs. The commercials themselves come from advertising agencies which are quite different from the medium they serve. These agencies are highly competitive private enterprises enjoying a large degree of professionalism from well-paid staffs. The resulting expression of New Zealand creativity is better in both quality and quantity than the Corporation's efforts in local production. Although some use is made of commercials produced overseas, more than 70% of the filmed commercials are entirely produced in New Zealand³⁶ to standards which match the imported product. This has opened up an outlet for the country's miniscule film industry.

All programs are purchased and scheduled by the N.Z.B.C. Unlike the choice offered on radio between sponsorship or spot advertising, on television the advertiser merely buys a spot of so many seconds, ranging from five to 120. He may not select the time at which his spot will come, nor with what program it will be associated. The only provision is that it will fall somewhere within the selected time band. These are broad bands; that for peak viewing runs from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. But the advertiser does reap one great benefit: he is advertising on the only television outlet. The N.Z.B.C. maintains its advantage: it retains complete program control while handsomely supplementing its income. Television advertising is now worth US \$8,000,000 annually, almost a third of the total broadcasting budget. The viewer, in his turn, does not unduly suffer. There is no commercial television on three days of the week, and on the remaining four days there are only three commercial breaks each hour, and these must not total more than six minutes in each hour.

Despite the rapid advancements, the television service is far from being fully developed. Unlike most countries initiating television, New Zealand has made no provision for instructional television; there is still no interconnecting network; and color is awaiting the second channel. The decision for a second service rests with the government. The Corporation has for some time been prepared to offer an alternate service,³⁷ and private interests have expressed their desire to enter the television arena.³⁸ Present indications are that

the Corporation will be entrusted with this responsibility.³⁹ A decision is imminent, and there are plans to start a second channel in 1970.⁴⁰ New Zealand's broadcasting will certainly change rapidly in ensuing years. Not only will television's continued development have its effect, but also the new Broadcasting Authority might radically alter the present pattern by challenging the monopolistic position of the N.Z.B.C. If this happens, it is to be hoped that the Corporation will not be weakened. At present, there is strength and diversity in programming; consideration of minority and cultural interests; and a competently managed financial enterprise. For a country small in size, isolated, and scant in population, such a government monopoly has been a worthwhile investment.

Footnotes

¹ Cooper Marshall, "Broadcasting and Television," *An Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, A. H. McLintock, ed. (Wellington: Government Printer, 1966), p. 247.

² *Ibid.*

³ Ian Mackay, *Broadcasting in New Zealand* (Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed, 1953), p. 24.

⁴ When the 1936 *Broadcasting Act* came into existence, the country was being served by privately owned non-commercial stations. These were permitted to remain in operation, but competition from the better financed government operation meant that they were gradually absorbed into the national service. One private station, of an amateur radio association, is still in operation, but its activities are heavily subsidized by the broadcasting body.

⁵ *Statutes Amendment Act 1945*, Section 8 (2) outlined broadcasting's responsibility for broad social and cultural activities. Similar provisions are in *Broadcasting Corporation Act 1961*, Section 12.

⁶ E. C. Simpson, *A Survey of the Arts in New Zealand* (Wellington: New Zealand Chamber Music Society, 1961), p. 113.

⁷ In 1958, the Bell Corporation of Auckland was offering approximately three hours for three nights a week. Programming included interviews, local and imported films, live musical items, and even live drama. More than 1000 receivers were purchased in the area, many from Mr. Bell's electrical manufacturing company.

⁸ Charles S. Aaronson, ed., *International Television Almanac 1961* (New York: Quigley Publications, 1962), p. 756.

⁹ New Zealand National Party, "1960 Policy Announcement," p. 20.

¹⁰ New Zealand National Party, "Radio—TV—Communications," November 1, 1966, p. 2; New Zealand, Parliament, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, CCCXXX (1962), p. 996; and in personal correspondence (June 27, 1967) the Prime Minister of New Zealand wrote: "The National Party has, since its election to office in 1960, removed radio and television from direct political control."

¹¹ James W. Rowe and Margaret A. Rowe, *New Zealand* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), p. 105.

¹² *Broadcasting Corporation Act 1961*, Sections 3 and 4.

¹³ *Broadcasting Corporation Amendment Act 1965*, Section 2.

¹⁴ Alex Toogood, "How Independent Is New Zealand's Broadcasting Corporation?" *Journalism Quarterly*, XLVI:1:105 (Spring, 1969).

¹⁵ New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation, "Address on Television Commercials by the Director-General of Broadcasting, Mr G. H. Stringer, 17 June 1965." (Mimeographed), p. 2.

¹⁶ These financial statements are derived from *Report of the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation for the Year ended 31 March 1966* [hereafter cited as *1966 Report*], p. 26 and *1967 Report*, p. 29.

¹⁷ Transmission is limited to 15½ hours a day to the Pacific Islands and 12½ hours a day to Australia. Department of Statistics, *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1967* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1967), p. 364.

¹⁸ New Zealand National Party, "New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation," Paper, Ref. 1551 A, 19 August 1966, p. 3.

¹⁹ *1960 Report through 1967 Report*.

²⁰ *1966 Report*, p. 31.

²¹ Wilson P. Dizard, *Television, a World View* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1966), p. 13.

²² Figure quoted in "Address on Television Commercials by the Director-General of Broadcasting, Mr G. H. Stringer, 17 June 1965," p. 9. (Mimeographed).

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Personal correspondence from the Minister of Broadcasting 3 April 1968.

²⁵ Department of Statistics, *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1968* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1968), p. 371.

²⁶ R. A. Usmar in Charles S. Aaronson, ed., *International Television Almanac 1964* (New York: Quigley Publications, 1965), p. 732.

²⁷ Figures supplied by the Department of Statistics, Wellington, in private correspondence, May 30, 1967.

²⁸ All figures on television receivers are from research notes compiled for a television program on the first five years of television in New Zealand. They were supplied by the N.Z.B.C. Library and the production personnel involved.

²⁹ *1963 Report*, p. 5; and New Zealand, Parliament, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, CCCXLII (1965), p. 707.

³⁰ *1966 Report*, p. 10.

³¹ *Broadcasting Corporation Act 1961*, Section 12 (3).

³² Department of Statistics, *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1968* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1968), p. 371.

³³ Reported in the *New Zealand Herald* (Auckland), July 6, 1967, p. 8.

³⁴ *1967 Report*, p. 9.

³⁵ In the mid-1967 survey (n. 33 above) *The Dick Van Dyke Show* was the most popular. Previously, *Bonanza* had been the favorite.

³⁶ Personal correspondence with Goldberg Advertising (Auckland) Limited, June 6, 1967.

³⁷ New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation, "Address on Television Commercials by the Director-General of Broadcasting, Mr G. H. Stringer, 17 June 1965," pp. 8-9.

³⁸ New Zealand, Parliament, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, CCCXLIII (1965), p. 1316.

³⁹ James W. Rowe and Margaret A. Rowe, *New Zealand* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), p. 106; and New Zealand, Parliament, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, CCCXLII (1965), p. 707.

⁴⁰ Personal correspondence with the Minister of Broadcasting, April 3, 1968.

PETER E. MAYEUX

Three Television Critics: Stated vs. Manifest Functions

What people say they do and what they actually do may be two different things. Peter E. Mayeux explores the functions of three television critics, both as stated by them and as manifest in their writings over a period of time. This article, a companion to the author's "Stated Functions of Television Critics" (JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, Vol. 13, No. 1), originally was prepared as a portion of an M.A. thesis completed under the direction of Dr. Sam Becker at the University of Iowa. Mr. Mayeux has taught recently at the University of Southwestern Louisiana.

THE functions of the television critic have been the subject of controversy virtually since the birth of the medium. This controversy has revolved about two major questions: (1) What should be the functions of the critic? (2) What functions are critics actually fulfilling in their columns? The purpose of the present study is to examine the writings of critics in order to provide at least partial answers to these questions. Specifically, it is designed to determine the relationship between what three television critics *say* their functions are and the functions *reflected* in these critics' columns. A secondary purpose is to examine the changes in these functions between two quite distinct periods in the development of the television medium.

A motivating force behind this study is the author's conviction that since the future development of the medium depends in part on a critical audience, the kind of criticism presented to the reading public

is important. Also, a comparison of the stated and manifest functions of the same critics hopefully will provide valuable insight into the functions of the television critic.

Procedure

Research for this study was divided into two parts: (1) discovery and study of statements made by three major television critics in the United States about the functions of the television critic; (2) study of the columns by these same three critics in the calendar years 1953 and 1963.¹

The three critics selected were: Jack Gould of the *New York Times*, Hal Humphrey of the *Los Angeles Times*,² and Larry Wolters of the *Chicago Tribune*. These three were selected because all were newspaper columnists, represented newspapers in various parts of the country, wrote for newspapers with a large circulation, generally were syndicated nationally, wrote on a regular basis, and were located in major centers of television production or syndication.

The years 1953 and 1963 were selected as representative of two distinct periods in television's technological and programming development—the so-called “golden era” of live programming before the wide-scale use of color and videotape, and the early stage of the “modern era.” These two years also were representative of stages of the American public's acceptance of television. Research by the National Broadcasting Company indicates that there were approximately 21,200,000 television sets in use in the 45,640,000 American homes occupied in 1953; thus, at that time television was available to about 45% of the American population. In contrast, total television sets in use in 1963 (61,200,000) was nearly triple the 1953 figure; television saturation in the United States had more than doubled to approximately 91.3%.³

The following category system was devised to describe the content of the critics' columns in 1953 and 1963:⁴

I. PROGRAM PREVIEWS: All items referring to the conception, development, and promotion of programs. Included were previews of programs, scheduling changes, and other information appearing either as a separate item or as part of a selected schedule. Excluded were critical reviews of programs.

II. PROGRAM REVIEWS: All items evaluating programs *ex post facto*.

III. CENSORSHIP AND DISCRIMINATION: All items referring either to the deletion or substitution of broadcast material, or discrimination against personalities.

IV. PERSONALITIES: All items about people, whether performers, production specialists, businessmen, government officials, broadcasting technicians or officials.

V. ECONOMICS: All items about costs of broadcasting activities and investments, advertising, commercials, production costs, salaries, licensing fees, market research, and sponsorship of broadcast time.

VI. GOVERNMENT: All items about the development, function, and operation of government in relation to broadcasting.

VII. AUDIENCE: All items about the various reactions of the audience to broadcasting and the effects of broadcasting on the audience.

VIII. TECHNICAL: All items about producing, transmitting, and receiving equipment and technical developments in broadcasting.

IX. INDUSTRY BUSINESS: All items about the activities of broadcasting associations, relations among broadcasters, and relations between broadcasters and the public or other business interests. Included were administrative practices and needs of the broadcasting industry.

X. EDUCATIONAL: All items about the educational values or practices of broadcasting. Included were items about both educational radio and television.

XI. INTERNATIONAL: All items about international broadcasting. Included were all broadcasting news from foreign countries and broadcasting activities overseas.

XII. HUMOR: All items containing jokes, quips, or anecdotes. Included were comments on humor as an art or entertainment form.

XIII. PROGRAMMING: All items about programming practices, policies, or needs of broadcasting outlets, comments on trends and developments in programming, discussions of programming categories or periods of the broadcast day or year.

XIV. MISCELLANEOUS: Any item that did not conform to the requirements of any heading or subheading in this list of categories.

It should be noted that some items have been placed in more than one category. For the purposes of this study, an "item" could be

either a complete column or only a part of one column depending on the number of topics discussed in a single column. Each item was placed in the category in which the main portion of the item and its context indicated was most appropriate. When examining the critics' columns, the number of lines given to each item was counted. A line was counted if over half of the column width was filled with print. Any item less than four lines was not counted. No count was made of sub-headings in columns, datelines, by-lines, or pictures. All columns published in the two sample years were examined. A sample of the word-count for each critic's columns was made every three months in the material examined. An average of this word-count was used to compute the approximate words per line for each critic's columns. The manifest opinion pro or con of each critic toward specific subjects also was noted, but the tabulations are not used in this paper.

Jack Gould

Gould has commented in various publications that the functions of the television critic are: (1) to serve as a reporter for the medium, (2) to act as a mediator between the viewer and the industry, and between the viewer and television programs, (3) to be concerned about the evolution of the television medium, (4) to review all types of programs, (5) to determine what programs are trying to accomplish and how well they succeeded, and (6) to determine how programs fit into contemporary life.⁵

The reader is referred to Tables I and II for the data used in the following analysis of Gould's 1953 and 1963 columns. In both years, his columns appeared in the *New York Times* usually four times each week (Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday). The typical column length in both 1953 and 1963 was between 550 and 650 words.

In his columns, Gould seemed to be trying to fulfill a number of functions as a critic. One of his principal functions seems to have been to talk directly to the industry to improve the television medium; this was evident from his remarks about "blacklisting" and censorship of program material, his call for the industry to improve the type of commercials televised as well as comments on the trend to over-commercialization, the need for quality programming, and the

TABLE I
Proportion of Total Space Given by Critics to Specific
Categories, 1953 and 1963

Category	Gould		Humphrey		Wolters	
	1953	1963	1953	1963	1953	1963
Censorship and discrimination	.7	.9	.7	3.3	.2	.7
Personalities	3.0	3.0	29.3	39.5	27.9	22.7
Economics	4.1	4.3	5.0	1.9	1.9	.6
Government	3.2	13.7	.3	1.5	1.0	2.1
Audience	5.3	4.1	20.4	6.1	10.9	4.6
Technical	7.1	1.8	5.1	.8	3.4	.6
Industry business	6.7	1.5	7.1	8.1	6.8	3.4
Educational	3.6	8.6	—	.9	.9	.7
International	12.0	1.9	.6	3.1	1.8	.3
Humor	—	—	.6	2.9	2.3	.5
Programming	.5	7.8	8.5	11.9	6.6	12.4
Program previews	.1	1.7	7.7	8.4	10.3	30.6
Program reviews	53.8	50.1	12.1	10.9	22.1	18.9
Miscellaneous	—	.5	2.6	.7	3.7	2.2
TOTAL*	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.3

* Totals may not equal 100% because the percentage for each category was rounded off to one decimal point.

need to develop color television. In many of his remarks, one gets the impression that Gould was almost "screening" the actions and policies of the networks. Gould also informed his readers about technical developments in broadcasting, the results of audience surveys, and the system of broadcasting in a number of countries. Gould also tended to build support in the audience and the industry for things he felt were "good" and significant in the development of broadcasting; one thinks especially of his crusading for ETV in both 1953 and 1963. Gould's columns clearly showed his attempts to elevate public taste; this was indicated by the large proportion of space he devoted to program reviews, his clear specification of the criteria for his judgments, and the kinds of programs he reviewed—

TABLE II
Proportion of Space Given by Critics to Specific Types of Programs in Program Previews and Reviews, 1953 and 1963

Category	Gould		Humphrey		Wolters	
	1953	1963	1953	1963	1953	1963
Educational	2.0	10.4	2.1	—	2.0	8.3
Children's	3.8	3.1	.6	.5	2.1	6.0
Popular music	3.1	1.2	—	—	4.1	1.7
Variety	9.9	8.2	4.6	4.9	11.3	18.8
Women's	.2	—	—	—	2.1	—
Documentary	7.6	23.2	5.4	15.6	11.1	20.0
Fine arts	8.4	4.8	—	—	8.0	7.8
News	3.1	10.8	12.0	13.7	5.3	6.4
Public affairs	4.6	11.5	.7	2.4	2.3	7.3
Quiz and panel	2.9	.9	8.8	4.8	8.9	1.5
Religious	.7	—	—	—	1.4	.9
Sports	.8	.8	—	3.9	5.4	2.9
Comedy	14.8	5.8	38.3	22.2	12.7	2.5
Specials	7.3	8.1	11.2	13.4	11.1	9.1
Drama	30.4	10.9	16.1	18.6	12.2	7.0
TOTAL*	99.6	99.7	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.2

* Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding error.

especially in 1953. Gould also seemed to try to educate the audience about the processes and functions of governmental regulation of broadcasting—especially in his columns of 1963. In his comments about the government, Gould seemed to be trying to get the industry to abide by what he considered to be the spirit as well as the letter of government regulation and to get government officials and agencies to use broadcasting more imaginatively. Thus, over the 10-year period, Gould seems to have concentrated on his function as a spokesman to the industry, an elevator of public taste, a “reporter” who informed and educated his readers, and a catalyst for new developments (ETV).

Generally, Gould's stated functions were manifested in his columns. To draw this conclusion, the reader needs to interpret, and perhaps "read into," the stated functions of Gould. Gould was a "reporter" to the extent that he informed his readers about the industry and its programs and problems. He was a "mediator" in that he talked directly to the industry about programs and issues that he felt deserved attention and immediate solution. He was "concerned about the evolution of the television medium" when he built public support for positions on issues he felt important—e.g. ETV, reduction of over-commercialization, proper government regulation, and ratings. Gould did not "review all types of programs"; there were several program types which received little or no attention (see Table II). Gould did try to elevate public taste in television programming by critiquing programs in such a way as to establish program standards for the audience and the industry. His last two stated functions (to determine what programs were trying to accomplish and how well they succeeded, and to determine how programs fit into contemporary life) were implicit in his program comments about plot, theme, and program structure. Thus, Gould seemed to be fulfilling his stated functions, in some manner, in his 1953 and 1963 columns.

Hal Humphrey

The late Hal Humphrey commented that the functions of the television critic are: (1) to keep the viewer awake to the "slickness" of network offerings, (2) to "rile" the public into pressuring the networks to allow television to reach its potential, and (3) to "rile" government officials in Washington, D. C., into pressuring the networks to allow television to reach its potential.⁶

While he wrote five columns each week for the *Los Angeles Mirror-News* in 1953, his columns appeared only three to four times each week in the *Los Angeles Times* in 1963. His columns typically were about 500 words in 1953, and about 525 words in 1963. Several functions may be discerned from Humphrey's columns in 1953 and 1963 (see Tables I and II). In the earlier period, most of his columns dealt with personalities, the broadcast audience, and program reviews. In 1963, most of his columns dealt with personalities, programming, and program previews. One of Humphrey's principal manifest functions was to entertain his readers by reporting

on the activities and plans of broadcast personalities, printing readers' letters, and offering humorous quips and anecdotes. Humphrey also informed his readers about international broadcasting and the programs available on television. Another function was to try to affect the industry directly through criticism of broadcasters' policies on commercials, programming, and censorship and discrimination. Humphrey tended to inform the reader more in 1953 than in 1963, but he tended to entertain the reader and criticize the industry directly more in the later year. Thus, the three major functions manifested in Humphrey's columns were: to entertain, to speak directly to the broadcasting industry in hopes of improving the medium, and to inform the reader.

Generally, Humphrey's stated functions were not evident in his 1953 and 1963 columns. Instead of "riling" the audience, he entertained and informed them. He gave only passing attention to governmental issues which were related to one of his stated functions. His only attempt to keep the audience awake to the "'slickness' of the network offerings" came in his attention to programming, which was less than 12% in either year. Even his program reviews and previews were information pieces rather than critical reviews and previews. Humphrey's stated functions were more evident in 1953 than in 1963; in the later period he tended to stress the entertainment feature of his columns which was not one of his stated functions.

Larry Wolters

Larry Wolters commented that the functions of the television critic are: (1) to inform, (2) to "illuminate," (3) to entertain, (4) to "evaluate," (5) to serve as a "mediator" between the viewer and the industry, and (6) to act as a "watchdog" for standards.⁷ The terms "illuminate," "evaluate," "mediator," and "watchdog" are probably just as vague and confusing to the reader as they first were to this researcher. However, after careful study of Wolters' comments and his columns of 1953 and 1963, some interpretation of these terms is possible. Wolters seems to reflect the overall viewpoint of Gould that the television critic is the middleman or interpreter between the viewing public and those who present the programs. He seems to agree with Humphrey that the critic should "expose" the shoddy, the insincere, the stereotyped programs now on the air. In other words,

Wolters apparently hoped to become the people's representative (in the true sense of the word) to the broadcasting industry.

Wolters' column appeared six times each week during 1953 and 1963 in the *Chicago Tribune*. His columns typically were 500 words in 1953, and about 450 words in 1963. Several functions may be discerned from Wolters' 1953 and 1963 columns (see Tables I and II). In the earlier year, Wolters gave the most attention to personalities, program reviews, and the broadcast audience. In 1963, he continued to emphasize personalities but shifted his attention to program previews and reviews as well as programming in general. One of the principal functions evident in Wolters' columns is that of an entertainer; he amused his readers with his personality sketches, humorous quips and features, and the readers' letters which he printed. He also informed his readers about program preference surveys, systems of broadcasting around the world, and programming types and trends; even his program comments were informative pieces. Wolters tried to affect the industry directly by criticizing broadcasters' policies on commercials, the use of ratings, awards presentations, and programming. Wolters was also a spokesman of the audience to the industry when he printed letters from his readers. He also attempted to build support for ETV in Chicago, although he did not devote a great deal of space to this project (less than 1% of his space each year). Thus, the principal functions which may be discerned from Wolters' 1953 and 1963 columns are: to entertain, to inform, and to speak directly to the industry (networks and sponsors) to improve the television medium.

Generally, all of Wolters' stated functions seemed to be evident in his 1953 columns. In the later period, he tended to concentrate more on his functions as an entertainer and an informer.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine some relationships between what three major television critics say the critic's functions are and the functions reflected in the columns of these same critics in 1953 and 1963. The critics selected for this study were Jack Gould of the *New York Times*, Larry Wolters of the *Chicago Tribune*, and Hal Humphrey of the *Los Angeles Times* and *Los Angeles Mirror-*

News. A 14-category system was devised to classify each item in the columns of these three critics. The relative amount of space given to each of these categories was determined. From these data and the nature of the treatment given to material in each category by each critic, the manifest functions of each critic was determined. The functions manifested in each of the critics' columns were then compared with their stated functions.

The principal conclusions which may be drawn from this study are:

(1) Each of the three critics selected indicated in various publications that the primary functions of the television critic should be: to inform the reader about the events of broadcasting, to act as a "mediator" between the viewing public and the television industry, and to serve as a catalyst for better programming and the full use of the potential of the television medium.

(2) The principal functions which may be discerned from the 1953 and 1963 columns of these three major critics are: to talk directly to the industry to improve television, and to inform and entertain the reading public.

(3) A comparison of the stated and manifest functions of the television critic indicates that the principal functions of the critic seem to be to provide general information to the reader about the industry, to entertain the reader, and to speak directly to the industry in order to improve the medium of television. Gould and Wolters, but not Humphrey, seemed to manifest, in a general way, the functions which they outlined in their writings. However, there was great heterogeneity among these three critics in the functions they both stated and manifested. Each had a somewhat different approach to his role as critic. It should be pointed out that the changes noticed between 1953 and 1963 may have been due wholly or at least partly to the decade of aging on the part of the three critics as well as to developments and trends in broadcasting. This factor is difficult, if not impossible, to measure in a study of this nature.

(4) In comparing the content of the columns of the three major critics in 1953 and 1963, one finds that items about personalities and program reviews appeared most often.⁸ There was a noticeable increase in the space the critics gave to items about programming and program previews in 1963.

There were many factors which seemed to influence the manifest functions of these three major critics. Although each wrote from a large, metropolitan area, their emphases seem to have been different. Gould tended to devote a larger proportion of his space to programming, while Humphrey concentrated on personalities, and Wolters on the whole spectrum of critical comment. An important factor was what the critic had available to comment upon in his locale. Gould seemed to concentrate on programming and the broad issues in broadcasting because this is what was readily available in New York City; Humphrey was surrounded by the Hollywood film-makers and television producers and, thus, tended to accent the personalities of the industry; in 1953, Wolters was in a center of creative programming (Chicago), but by 1963 he was limited to contacts with television personalities going either to New York City or Hollywood and program comments on shows originating from other production centers. Another factor which seemed to affect the manifest functions of the critics was the programs, issues, and events available for comment; in 1953, for example, color television was a much bigger issue than in 1963. The frequency of publication and the limitations of column length on the critic also seemed to affect his functions; the fact that Gould displayed a more serious and intellectual approach to his job than Humphrey and Wolters may have been due to the fact that Gould was responsible for only three or four columns each week. Humphrey and Wolters tended to "fill" in their columns by using information from network hand-outs, emphasizing personalities or audience surveys, or beginning a regular feature of readers' letters. Another factor, which is almost impossible to determine from the data used in this study, is the effect of the philosophy of the newspaper for which the critic writes on the critic's freedom of comment; research concentrating upon this question may add significantly to our knowledge of broadcast criticism in this country.

Footnotes

¹ For an excellent discussion of these two aspects of broadcast criticism see Elizabeth L. Young, "One Medium: Two Critics, Two Views," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, XI (Winter 1966-67), pp. 41-55 and Maurice E. Shelby, Jr., "Patterns in Thirty Years of Broadcast Criticism," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, XI (Winter 1966-67), pp. 27-39.

² Hal Humphrey became a radio-TV columnist with the *Los Angeles Times* after the *Los Angeles Mirror-News* stopped publication in 1962. Thus, Humphrey's 1953 columns appeared in the *Mirror-News* while his 1963 columns were in the *Times*. Mr. Humphrey died in Los Angeles in January, 1969. It

should be mentioned also that Larry Wolters left the *Chicago Tribune* shortly after 1963 to work in another profession.

³ *Television Factbook*, 1965 Ed., vol. 35, p. 44a.

⁴ This category system was adapted from Melvin A. Harris' "A Content Analysis of the Radio-Television Pages of the Sunday Edition of the *New York Times* During Selected Periods Between 1934 and 1965" (Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio University, 1965). Changes were made as judged appropriate.

⁵ It was necessary to summarize Gould's stated functions because of the length of this paper. The reader will find a more detailed statement of Gould's functions as a television critic in: *The New York Times*, May 26, 1957, sec. II, p. 13 and Feb. 1, 1959, sec. II, p. 13; "Big Men on the Papers," *Newsweek*, April 15, 1957, p. 107; Leon Morse, "Inside Jack Gould," *Television*, XV (November 1958), p. 51; "Measuring the Giant," *Time*, November 9, 1959, pp. 77-78. The reader should note that many of the stated functions of Gould, Humphrey, and Wolters needed to be analyzed and interpreted before they could be of value in comparing them with the functions manifested in the columns of these critics.

⁶ This summary of Humphrey's stated functions was based on a personal letter from Humphrey dated Oct. 1, 1966.

⁷ This summary of Wolters' stated functions as a television critic was based on: *The Chicago Tribune*, August 16, 1953, sec. III, p. 8; George A. Brandenburg, "TV Critic's Role Is Middleman—Wolters," *Editor & Publisher*, December 23, 1961, p. 39.

⁸ Shelby reached the same conclusion after examining seven metropolitan newspapers to determine patterns of broadcast criticism between 1930 and 1960. See Shelby article cited in footnote 1.

APBE Individual Membership

The Association for Professional Broadcasting Education welcomes anyone with a concern for professional broadcasting education. Many teachers, broadcasters, and others who are affiliated with institutions that also belong to APBE nevertheless find it desirable to join APBE as Individual Members. Benefits include a subscription to the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, the member newsletter, *Feedback*, and being able to attend the APBE annual meeting and open sessions and exhibits of the NAB Annual Convention and regional conferences.

Annual dues are \$12.00 The membership year runs from April 1 through March 31, with applications received after December 1 credited to the following year. An Individual Member receives the four issues of the JOURNAL volume year current during the first nine months of the membership year. Further information and application forms are available from the Executive Secretary of APBE, Dr. Harold Niven, 1771 N Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

RUTH YOUNG

Television in the Lives of Our Parents

Even before it is published, an article such as this is a piece of history. Since it was prepared while Miss Young was earning a master's degree in broadcasting and film at Stanford University, many tens of thousands of dollars and hundreds of man hours have been devoted to additional research in the area of television, children, and violence. Although most of the results of this Federal government-supported research had not been published by press time, it is very doubtful that the conclusion of the following review—that the effects of television can never be generalized to all individuals—will be overturned. Miss Young presently is employed in the television industry in New Orleans.

Introduction

THE individual parent is the person who has the greatest interest and ability to deal with the child's use of television, but it is generally the parent who is least informed of the real issues at stake, and even if informed, is often least capable of coping with the situation. Though the area is receiving much publicized scrutiny of such groups as the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, research continues to lead to the conclusion reached in research dating back more than a decade: effects of television can never be generalized to all individuals.

The most respected research in the field clearly tends to destroy the argument which claims a direct connection between television sex and violence and juvenile delinquency. Where studies do not actually discredit the violence-crime connection, they studiously avoid drawing

direct lines between televised mayhem and its effect on young viewers. Studies by Bandura¹ and others are exceptions, but their generality is limited by a laboratory setting. The first reports made to the Commission indicate that, if anything, televised violence increased between the 1967 and 1968 seasons.² But the more interpretive, as well as the analytical, statements of such researchers as Gary Steiner, Wilbur Schramm, and Hilde Himmelweit suggest some of the reasons why "children and television" has become a popular though false issue in many circles. The purpose of this study is to review some of the basic evidence in the hope that a concerned and knowledgeable public will ask itself and its broadcasters the larger questions.

The pioneer study in the field of children's viewing is *Television and the Child* by Hilde Himmelweit, A. N. Oppenheim, and Pamela Vince. The design of the study involved a system of "individual" matching of 1854 children on the basis of four criteria: age, sex, intelligence, and social class.³ At the time of the study most of the subjects lived in one of four English cities. The opening of a transmitter in a fifth city, however, provided the experimenters with an opportunity for a "before-and-after" study in addition to the type of "viewer-control" study used in the four other cities. The primary tool in assessing viewership was the daily diary of leisure hour activities, although questionnaires, open end questions, and information tests also were used. The findings of the Himmelweit study deal with every major aspect of the child's use of the medium in England: actual time watched, taste, and the various cultural, intellectual, and societal effects of viewing on the child as well as on the family environment. The general conclusion of the Himmelweit study is that:

The final picture of the influence of television on children's leisure, interests, knowledge, outlook and values proves to be far less colourful and dramatic than popular opinion is inclined to suppose. Effects occur in each one of the various fields but not to such a degree that the children would have been fundamentally changed.⁴

However, the relationship between the child and his viewing of the adult program is of primary importance to this paper. Himmelweit found that although intelligence, age, sex, and education were crucial determinants of how much time a child spent watching British television, parental example was another factor. The researchers discovered that since much of Britain received only one channel, many

children followed the example of their parents in the matter of whether to view at all.⁵

Since it was found that children often do watch evening adult programs, a logical next question was: what kinds of values seem to affect the child's outlook in these portrayals? In this area the Norwich before-after study proved invaluable. Himmelweit claims that there is a minimum mental age of 11, below which the capacity for abstraction and psychological interpretation is absent. Similarly, there is an upward limit of 13 or 14 at which the elementary problems of right and wrong will be too simple for the child viewer. With this chronological data in mind, the content of television is the other important basic aspect dealing with values. The Himmelweit study indicates that television has its *least effect in areas of life with which the child is most familiar* (the primary group relationships of the family for instance). Television does have considerable influences over job attitudes, career ideas, and certain types of life styles. Finally, the role of televised values is put in the context of five variables, the extent to which "views presented are stereotyped," the extent to which "they are dressed up in dramatic form," the extent of the viewer's interest in the information being offered, the amount of knowledge from other sources, and the responsiveness of the child to the medium in general.⁶

The Himmelweit findings are so well documented and so effectively assembled that one might well stop here, except that the findings relate to the British scene in many aspects more than they do to the American one. The diversity of channels, for instance, is only one dimension of difference between the American and British television systems. The authoritative American work on the subject of television and children still is the Schramm, Lyle, and Parker volume, *Television in the Lives of Our Children*. As the title of the book suggests, Schramm, *et al.* do not look at the child as a passive figure in his relationship with the television set. "So when we talk about the effect of television, we are really talking about how children use television."⁷ This important premise is implicit in much of the Himmelweit research as well.

The Schramm study is particularly important in the area of the child's use of television, because it relates that use to the adult use of the medium. The authors indicate that it is not enough to enumer-

ate the names of programs disgustedly and have done with the problem. In Ann Arbor, the researchers measured the relative percentages of children and adults viewing particular programs. The highest children's viewership was for the cartoon, science fiction and children's adventure programs. For programs of the popular animal, simple adventure, and elementary situation comedy types, the adult audience grew from 19% or less of the total audience to between 20 and 40%. Programs that were watched by substantially the same number of children as adults included televised movies, situation comedies, and variety programs. The smallest number of children were, not too surprisingly, in audiences for public affairs programs and serious dramas, where adult audiences are relatively small as well.

The findings of the Schramm study are framed in terms of a continuum of programs that children watch, at one end of which the simplest type of programming predominates and at the other end of which the sophistication and serious interpretation given to subject matter is almost out of the range of the child's appreciation:

It is clear that there is no distinct boundary between the adult and children's programs, except at the extreme end of the continuum, and networks which believe that they are producing programs for adults might do well to take another look at the age of their audiences.⁸

Perhaps one research that is needed is an exploration of why an adult audience exposes itself to a televised view of life that is in so many ways completely unrealistic.

Both Himmelweit and Schramm seem to feel such programs as crime shows and situation comedies provided the child with information about adult life not otherwise accessible to him. They imply that much of this information serves quite an important role in socializing the child, though much of what they see overpresents dysfunctional values in the society. With this interpretation in mind, it is not too difficult to imagine why children can look to television for a certain kind of enlightenment, but the question that we must still answer in this society is why do adults look at television of this sort? Escape from reality is a convenient answer, but not the only one.

Though the myth of the completely passive, internally frightened and frustrated child viewer cannot really be exploded without further analysis, the material presented does indicate that much popular

"knowledge" is either incorrect or subject to considerable qualification. As to the second part of the argument—the phenomenon of parental accusation—the Himmelweit volume suggests a view that is taken up more strongly in the Schramm book. In the Himmelweit study, a basic axiom is that "the public's views about television and children tended to be heavily influenced by their own attitude to the medium and often to consist of generalizations based on observing a very small number of children."⁹ As the Himmelweit study indicates, the parental viewing decision often is a crucial factor in determining the pattern of the child. In some homes where television sets are left on for extended periods during the afternoon and evening hours, children view with the same lack of discrimination that allows the set to be used this way in the first place. This dangerous trend is dealt with even more explicitly in Schramm's account of the problem.

Though Schramm's main purpose is to evaluate the child's use of television, he is also concerned with the role of the parent in determining this use as well as doing something about it. He first gives a brief but meaningful estimation of actual parental concern: when questioned in general about the mass media, more than 90% of the respondents showed deep interest in the role of television. There was a marked difference between the concerns of the more highly educated and the blue-collar parents, though they shared a common uneasiness about certain types of programming. In general, it might be said that, at the time this study was conducted, the better educated and higher income parents were more worried about violence, particularly with respect to young children. The Schramm study further revealed occasional complaints against the "cheapness" of the medium, its relatively low intellectual tone, and its time-wasting character. The blue-collar families which showed any interest at all in the matter generally confined their statements to the "sexiness" of certain individual programs rather than to the violence that pervades a number of program types. These same blue-collar, lower middle and lower class families indicated that they often used television as a "baby sitter."¹⁰

While one avenue of the Schramm approach deals with quantitative concern roughly in terms of social classes, his second approach comes in the form of a number of suggestions to parents. A basic

area is the role of the family and home environment of the child. As Schramm indicates in his study and as the Himmelweit study carefully points out too, "no child is likely to be much harmed by television if he has a warm, secure social relationship, and if he has no serious psychological troubles."¹¹ Schramm points out that a parent can really do a great deal to prevent a healthy child from depending too heavily on the external stimulus of the television set. Studies conducted by Fleanor Maccoby indicate a number of interesting corollaries on the parental guidance theory. In an article entitled "Why Do Children Watch Television?" she points out that the child who is least dependent on the media is the healthy upper-middle class youngster. At the other extreme is the frustrated child of the upper-middle class. Dr. Maccoby was able to find little or no relationship between frustration and viewing in upper-lower class subjects where parents, by example, encouraged their children to watch a lot of television.¹²

Depending on individual family relations, a certain amount of family activity is a necessity. Even more parental attention and observation is necessary in cases where a child is overly sensitive or aggressive. Instead of letting the child retreat to the television set for more than 2½ hours daily, the parents should begin to make some sort of an effort to provide a meaningful alternative for the child, in the form of emotional fulfillment in actual interpersonal relationships. The intellectually gifted parent, according to Schramm, is often the one who demonstrates the greatest interest in the intellectual offerings for children, but how can one expect children to have an interest completely independent of what they observe their parents to be interested in? Parental example can work to the benefit of those parents who would like their children to be more interested in reality material on television than they are. Therefore, in the watching of intellectually stimulating programs, as opposed to more pure fantasy treatments, parents of above average intellectual ability have a double duty to their children if they are truly interested in doing something about a situation which they deplore. They must first use their parental examples as potently as possible, and secondly, and perhaps more difficult, they must attempt to guide their children through a viewing process "pointing out some of the reality opportunities" even though they themselves may not be interested in pursuing all of the opportunities they suggest.¹³

Schramm—and more recently such writers as Paul Molloy, television critic for *PTA Magazine*¹⁴ and several groups such as the National Association for Better Broadcasts—suggest another form of direct action parents might take, if they would like to effect changes in the content of television. This action involves informing the television and advertising industries of their opinions. The planners of television policy are, for the most part, men of considerable intelligence and some foresight. Advertisers are even more sensitive to public opinion, as it often directly influences the consumption of products and services. Coupled with an attitude of demonstrative concern through the “feed-back” mechanism of letter writing, Schramm points to educational television as an alternative source of reality programming for children as well as adults. Finally, he suggests the establishment of an organization that:

might be a board of distinguished citizens, with a research staff to collect and report the opinions of parents and children, to observe and report on the nature of children's programs and to keep parents informed of new ventures in this field, to carry out or contract for research which needs doing on television and children.¹⁵

It should be noted that most of this approach to the problem of parents' attitudes toward children's viewing habits is hortatory. The reason for the tone of the writing is that relatively few so-called “concerned” parents seem to have taken initiative in attempting to exert an influence on those responsible for content among children's television programs or the programs that children might watch.

But it is a dangerous thing to accuse people of not really having an interest in a particular area without presenting facts to support the contention. Gary Steiner's volume, *The People Look at Television*, more than incidentally suggests that viewing behavior among adults does not always represent the same standards of taste as verbalized criticisms of the medium might suggest. This observation is particularly well brought out in Steiner's study of parents' attitudes toward their children's viewing behavior. Steiner divides the problem into two segments, the first of which deals with parents' attitudes toward their children who watch television. The second phase of the discussion relates children's and adults' attitudes and behavior into a family pattern. The statistics indicate that most of the people questioned saw television either as an educational instrument for the child, or as a baby sitter. Schramm also pointed out this dual pur-

pose, but the two researchers disagree on the class division of those who use television as a baby sitter and those who do not. Because Steiner's question "What do you think are some of the main advantages of television for children?"¹⁶ is an open-ended one, he thinks that his responses represent substantial under-estimates, as there is a tendency among parents, especially the educated, not to admit their baby-sitting use of television.

A number of other factors, says Steiner, indicate that a considerable proportion of the well-educated use television for the sole purpose of keeping their children occupied. The questionnaires of more than one-third of the pro-television parents revealed some use of the medium as a baby sitter. Another piece of evidence that is not quite as convincing is Steiner's own evaluation of the meaning of an "educational" answer: the high educational value which some parents find in the medium is a justification for parents' relegation of the young to the television set in the service of their own freedom. This kind of a point is a very difficult one to prove statistically with the kind of questionnaire used in the study, though many of the answers to the question of television's main advantage do reflect the close juxtaposition of education with baby sitting. So Steiner amends Schramm's statements in this way: "The suggestion of some defensiveness among the well-educated TV-dependent parents is strong."¹⁷

In the area of content, the primary objection that most parents voiced was to the amount of violence on the air, particularly in programs that are supposed to be intended for young audiences. The total picture of the parents' views of television for children is a schizophrenic one and a paradoxical one:

So all in all, so far as adult judgments are concerned, television helps to educate the child, but watching it interferes with his education. It helps keep him busy and out of mischief, but it also keeps him too busy to do his chores. It keeps the kids in when you want them in which is good, except for some of the bad things they see. And it keeps them in when you want them out—which is bad even if they see good things. Ideally, then, TV should provide interesting, educational programs that intrigue children when parents don't want to be bothered with them—but not when they ought to be outside or doing something else.¹⁸

It is no surprise then, that Steiner reports a *laissez faire* approach on the part of most parents who oppose television and practically no restrictions by those parents who only show signs of concern.

The fascinating aspect of the whole range of fact and opinion on this complex subject is the speed with which it has become a public anxiety. Deep concern with every phase of the public interest is surely a part of the rapidly expanding consumer-oriented philosophy. The resulting activism is a relatively recent development and may yet encounter serious passivism from the uninvolved and relatively unconcerned parent with whom Steiner's research came in contact. Yet individual members of the public are beginning to bring pressure in very direct ways. Jack Gould's analysis of the qualitative importance of a plan to picket the nation's three commercial networks is significant: "Even if the picketing does not materialize, its mere suggestion is symptomatic of what appears to be a prospective assault on the existing commercial TV establishment."¹⁹

When Steiner combines the viewing habits of adults and the viewing habits that adults, to some extent, say they would like to see in children, the result is not quite the situation of conflict that one might expect. Parents do tend to feel a general uneasiness when, in a family viewing situation, children see programs which deal with the adult world in a way with which they have absolutely no familiarity. Such situations are inherent in the medium at its present state of development and especially in the family setting. The result of the simultaneity of the viewing experience is that the adult's point of view may often be prejudiced by his own desire to view.

The solution to the problems presented by the pervasiveness of television in the lives of children—and their parents—is not simply better programming. Certainly an average of five hours of viewing per day is not something that our society should hope to increase. On the other hand, the argument presented here in no way denies the importance to our society of children's mental health. Rather, the discussion must go deeper than what is good and what is bad for children at large. To those who say the child has no discretionary ability, there is sufficient evidence to refute such dogma on its face. Further, discretion in cultural matters is certainly a facility that reaches the child largely through his environment. This brings us to the real crux of the matter which is reflected in the 50% adult audience of programs such as *Rin Tin Tin*. The problem is one of *adult* cultural levels even more than it is one relating to children. Advertisers and programmers, to some extent, act as if the average audience member were in his early teens. Perhaps they do so with

good reason. The issue that this paper has tried to expose is how and why the fundamental dilemma has been obscured by an issue which is important—but which is only an aspect of a larger problem.

Footnotes

¹ Albert Bandura, Dorothea Ross and Sheila Ross, "Imitation of Film-Mediated Agressive Models," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66:405-412. Numerous studies, with varying conclusions, are cited in John D. Abel, "Television and Children: A Selective Bibliography of Use and Effects," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, 13:1:101-105 (Winter, 1968-69). Partly as a result of the Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy assassinations, a great deal of new research is being conducted at the present time.

² These reports have not yet been formally released. However, for one preliminary report, see "How Much Violence Is There on Television?" *TV Guide*, July 12-19, 1969, p. 30, which describes a content analysis by George Gerbner.

³ Hilde Himmelweit, A. N. Oppenheim and Pamela Vince, *Television and the Child* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵ See, for a discussion of this factor, Don C. Smith, "The Selectors of Television Programs," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, 6:1:35-44 (Winter, 1961-62) and L. Erwin Atwood, *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, 12:4:377-388 (Fall, 1968).

⁶ Himmelweit, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

⁷ Wilbur Schramm, Jack Lyle and Edwin B. Parker, *Television in the Lives of Our Children* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1961).

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

⁹ Himmelweit, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹⁰ Schramm, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-56.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹² Eleanor E. Maccoby, "Why Do Children Watch Television?," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 18:244 (1954).

¹³ See John R. Shepherd and T. M. Scheidel, Jr., "Differences in Demand and Use of TV Programming Variety," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, 6:2:143-148 (Spring, 1962). Recently, the television industry, through the Television Information Office (745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022), has taken an aggressive role in making "reality opportunities" known to parents through advertisements, etc.

¹⁴ Paul Molloy, "Time Out for TV," *PTA Magazine*, May, 1969, p. 29.

¹⁵ Schramm, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

¹⁶ Gary Steiner, *The People Look at Television* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 85.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹⁹ Jack Gould, "TV: Sound of Discontent," *New York Times*, June 30, 1969.

JAMES K. BUCKALEW

News Elements and Selection by Television News Editors

James K. Buckalew, a former broadcast journalist who teaches the subject in the Department of Journalism at San Diego State College, conducted the research described in this article while working on his Ph.D. dissertation in mass communications at the University of Iowa. The research was supported by an NAB research grant.

IN the newsrooms of more than 700 television stations in this country, decisions are made about what material in the total news flow will be selected for inclusion in daily newscasts. These decisions are made by individuals charged with the responsibility of organizing news programs. The normal situation in a television newsroom is that more news items are available than can be used on the air. Most stories are rejected, others are allowed to move along the selection channel toward the final script and then on the air.

Earlier studies investigating the behavior of newspaper editors in accepting or rejecting news material, funneling news sources into the "news hole" and on to the reader, were based on a theory developed by Kurt Lewin about the "gates" which regulate materials passing along channels to a consumer.¹ Wilbur Schramm talks of this construct in describing the essential structural elements of communication as the message and the chain, with the great communication networks and organizations of human society on beyond the message and the chain. According to Schramm, the simplest chain is a sender passing a message to a receiver; but in social communication most of these

chains are longer than two persons and all persons along the chain are gatekeepers, opening or closing the gate to messages that come along.² David Manning White explored this gatekeeper function in his case study of a wire editor,³ and Walter Gieber conducted gatekeeper studies in his look at 16 wire editors⁴ and his intensive study of one city editor.⁵ Other studies have discussed and refined the concept.⁶

In this study, the writer set out to learn what factors influence the decisions made by television news editors in selecting from their input. It was done by observing the retention and rejection of items from the pool of input available to 12 television news editors and by relating the results to the characteristics of editors and their situations.

The author sat through newscast preparation twice with each of the editors, taking notes on the decisions made from the pool of input by recording carefully each story available to the editor and each story selected for the final script. This amounted to a complete record of the stories selected and those rejected for 24 different newscasts. Each was an early evening local newscast. Definitions of news values were arrived at through the editors' responses to the news dimensions used in Ward's study of newspaper city editors,⁷ indications from Schuneman that television news editors have a particular sensitivity to visual communications,⁸ and the responses of two television editors in a pretest of this investigation.⁹ From the most frequently mentioned news values of textbook writers and former newspapermen, Ward chose dimensions of news which seemed important: *normality*, *prominence*, and *significance*. The pilot study indicated that in addition to Ward's facets, two more were important to these editors: *timeliness* and *visual quality*. Another facet, *proximity*, which was held constant by Ward, was used here because this study used actual data gathered in the field and such control could not be exercised. The labels for the levels of each facet actually used in this study were: conflict, timely, proximate, video, high impact and known principal.¹⁰ Even with each editor selecting from a different pool of input, by knowing the relative value to a "gatekeeper" of the news dimensions, certain items can be expected to take precedence over others and, by knowing the size of the "news hole," one can predict which items will "pass through the gate" and which will be discarded.

The "gatekeepers" studied were working in small, medium, and large television markets, with the definition of market size determined

by the investigator, with attention given to figures made available by industry publications on market sizes and ranks. Some of the stations were operating large news department, some small or medium-sized staffs. The distinctions in size of news department again were arbitrary and depended upon the author's experience and on the descriptions of news staffs made by the Radio Television News Directors Association. All stations were located in the midwest. The editors with whom the author sat through two separate newscast preparations were chosen to reflect "gatekeepers" in broadcast newsrooms of stations quite different in size, type of community, and the amount of competition they faced. In addition, information was obtained on the 12 news editors themselves. Interviews were conducted with each editor to see how he perceived himself and the situation in which he was working. An attempt was made to learn from these interviews if there were different types of editors and different kinds of working situations. These types, situations, and the perceptions based on them were evaluated in terms of influences they have for the decisions made by the "gatekeepers."

Following the interviews with the news editors, the investigator had two piles of news items to work with, the stories discarded from the pool of input and those accepted for inclusion in the newscasts. All stories in each of the two piles were categorized according to the facet elements which they represented. This was done by coding each of the 64 possible combinations of news elements and attaching the code number to each story containing that combination. This resulted in a compilation of the number of times a combination was accepted or the number of times a combination was rejected. Some combinations were not represented, that is, had zero frequencies.

There were 980 stories compiled from these 24 visits to 12 broadcast newsrooms. Two hundred seventy-five, or 28%, of these were used. Seven of the combinations of news elements accounted for 65% of the stories in the editors' *input*; 20 of the combinations accounted for 88%; and half of the 64 combinations accounted for 96% of the total stories available.

The most frequently appearing combination was the one containing *conflict* and *timely* facet levels. These *timely-conflict* stories appeared 150 times in the total input of 980 stories. This was not a favorably regarded combination, since the editors used only 9% of the *timely-conflict* stories in their newscasts. The combination of

TABLE I
Frequency of Appearance and Proportion of Acceptance of Each Facet Combination

Combination of Facets	Total Input (Items Available)		Total Output (Items Aired)		Proportion of Input Selected as Output
	N	proportion	N	proportion	
Conflict-Timely	150	(.153)	14	(.015)	.09
Proximate-Timely	95	(.097)	8	(.080)	.08
Timely	83	(.084)	0	(.000)	.00
High Impact-Proximate-Timely	80	(.080)	24	(.024)	.30
High Impact-Proximate-Timely-Video	79	(.079)	49	(.050)	.62
High Impact-Timely	78	(.078)	6	(.006)	.08
Conflict-Proximate-Timely	70	(.070)	22	(.022)	.31
Conflict	26	(.026)	0	(.000)	.00
High Impact-Timely-Video	21	(.021)	8	(.080)	.38
Proximate-Timely-Video	21	(.021)	10	(.010)	.48
Conflict-Proximate-Timely-Video	20	(.020)	19	(.019)	.95
High Impact-Conflict-Proximate-Timely-Video	18	(.018)	14	(.014)	.78
High Impact-Conflict-Timely	18	(.018)	5	(.005)	.28
High Impact-Known Principal-Timely	18	(.018)	7	(.007)	.39
High Impact-Conflict-Known Principal-Timely-Proximate-Video	15	(.015)	14	(.014)	.93
Conflict-Proximate	15	(.015)	2	(.002)	.13
High Impact-Known Principal-Proximate-Timely-Video	14	(.014)	10	(.010)	.71
High Impact-Known Principal-Proximate-Timely	14	(.014)	7	(.007)	.50
High Impact-Proximate	14	(.014)	2	(.002)	.14
High Impact-Conflict-Proximate-Timely	12	(.012)	6	(.006)	.50

proximate and *timely* news elements appeared 95 times, but was not regarded highly by the editors, since only 8% of these *timely-proximate* stories were used. The editors unanimously rejected all of the 83 stories containing only the *timely* facet level. Never did an editor put into his newscast a story that was only new. It is surprising then that so many of them reach his desk. It should also be surprising that so many *timely-conflict* and *timely-proximate* stories were in the input when such small proportions of these get into the final product of the television news editor.

No record was made by this investigator of the source of all the news stories in the editors' input. However, an inspection of the item descriptions, the notes taken during the time spent with each "gate-keeper," and memories of those visits indicate that, in general, the stories in the three most frequently appearing combinations came from wire services and news releases. A wire serving the entire state will on occasion have some items of local interest for each editor in the state, but in many instances, the wire copy is not much good to the local editor. News releases, with some exceptions, went into the editors' wastebaskets as soon as they were read.

The combination with all the favored news elements except *known principal* was used all five times it appeared. The next highest proportion of use was gained by a type of story that appeared 20 times in the input and was included in the editors' newscasts 19 times. This was the combination with *conflict*, *proximity*, *timely*, and *video* facet levels. This same combination, but without the presence of *video*, appeared 70 times in the total input and was selected only 31% of the time. It looks as if *video* can be important to an editor in deciding what to do with news stories containing local *conflict*.

The combination containing all the desired news elements was expected to be highly favored by all the editors. In the 15 times it appeared this combination was rejected only once. That was by an editor who also accepted stories of the same type three other times. The only time he rejected the combination was when the *conflict* was racial. The combination representing all the news elements but *high impact* was selected 14 of the 18 times it appeared. The combination representing all the desired news elements but *conflict* was used ten of the 14 times it appeared. Of the combinations with high fre-

quencies of occurrence, the most highly favored was the one with *known principal, proximate, timely, and video* facet elements. It was used in the editors' newscasts 49 times, a proportion of 62%.

Generally, the more highly valued stories did not appear often enough in the input to get into the newscasts as much as the editors would like. Less valued stories appeared much more often in the input and, if selected, are used only on light news days or as filler material, perhaps then only because they were so readily available. Most of these originated with the wire services. It seemed that wire service stories were used to "pad" newscasts built primarily on copy generated by the news staffs of the stations where these editors worked. The impression was that the larger the station, the less the dependence on the wire service, although all 12 editors used plenty of wire copy, usually rewritten and updated, in every newscast. A replication of this study probably should include as an added news dimension the source of the item.

An initial objective was to determine in what ways and to what extent the television news editors varied in their news judging. The editors were greatly alike in their selection of news stories, in their perceptions of audience and news sources, and in their reading habits, and experience. When there was variety in selection among the editors it was related to the size of the community in which the editor was working. Editors working in small markets tended to prefer *proximate* stories and were not so insistent that their preferred news stories be *timely*. Editors working in larger markets preferred *timely* stories and were not so concerned with *proximity*. Even though there were differences in the use of the same facet levels by the same editors, and by different editors, the differences, for the most part, were not drastic, and the overall impression is that a standard fare is being presented to the television news audience.

There is not much that can be said about the role of age, education, experience, religion, perception of audience, competition, and opinion of news sources. It happened that the 12 editors' responses to the questionnaire were strikingly similar. An effort was made to select editors for this study from a variety of station types and community sizes. This was successful, and the results mentioned in the preceding paragraph indicated that there were meaningful differences across these variables. There also was an attempt to select young editors and mature newsmen, journalism graduates and non-journalism grad-

uates, those with college degrees and those without. The interviews with the 12 editors gave the investigator the feeling that their preparation for this type of work was much the same, whether from study or work experience, and no matter what the major field of study. It seemed that only environmental variables made a difference in editing behavior, but there was some indication that veteran editors, older, with more overall experience and more time in the current job, tended to use more feature stories, more soft news. It could be that they were responding to the same news facets, generally, as the younger editors, but used them differently.

Educators of television journalists should be interested in the marked similarity of behavior and expressed attitudes by these 12 editors from a variety of stations and backgrounds. Are their norms acquired in the classroom? Are they picked up later on the job and do they conflict with what their teachers told them? Do the educators agree with the editors on what makes news?

Footnotes

¹ Kurt Lewin, "Channels of Group Life," *Human Relations*, 1:2:145 (1948).

² Wilbur Schramm, "The Gatekeeper: A Memorandum," in Wilbur Schramm (ed.), *Mass Communications* (2nd ed.) (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), 175.

³ David Manning White, "The Gatekeeper: A Case Study in the Selection of News," *Journalism Quarterly*, 27:4:383-390 (1950).

⁴ Walter Gieber, "Across the Desk: A Study of 16 Telegraph Editors," *Journalism Quarterly*, 33:4:423-432 (1956).

⁵ Walter Gieber, "City Desk: Model of News Decisions." Unpublished paper presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism (August, 1964).

⁶ For instance, Abraham Z. Bass, "Refining the 'Gatekeeper' Concept: A UN Radio Case Study," *Journalism Quarterly*, 46:1:69-72 (1969).

⁷ Walter Ward, "News Values, News Situations, and News Selection: An Intensive Study of Ten City Editors." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa (February, 1967).

⁸ R. Smith Schuneman, "Visual Aspects of Television News: Communicator, Message, Equipment," *Journalism Quarterly*, 43:2:281-286 (1966).

⁹ Interviews with Mike Scott, KCRG-TV, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and with Paul Morsch, WKBT-TV, La Crosse, Wisconsin, established the importance of *visual* and *timeliness* variables, which were not pertinent to the Ward study.

¹⁰ The facets and the desired levels used and their definitions were:

SIGNIFICANCE: *High Impact* items were those concerning matters likely to have an effect on many members of the audience.

NORMALITY: *Conflict* items involved verbal or physical open clashes between principals of the story or between the principals and natural forces.

- PROMINENCE:** *Known Principal* items involved persons or institutions, or issues, that were well known through past publicity or position in the society and/or community.
- PROXIMITY:** *Proximate* items were stories about people or events in the station's coverage area.
- TIMELINESS:** *Timely* items were stories about recent happenings, updated stories with new leads, or fresh stories never used by any of the media.
- VISUAL:** *Video* items involved stories with visual materials such as film, videotape, slides, etc.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION
(Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)

1. DATE OF FILING: September 29, 1969
2. TITLE OF PUBLICATION: Journal of Broadcasting
3. FREQUENCY OF ISSUE: Quarterly
4. LOCATION OF KNOWN OFFICE OF PUBLICATION: Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.
5. LOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OR GENERAL BUSINESS OFFICES OF THE PUBLISHERS: 1771 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
6. PUBLISHER: Association for Professional Broadcasting Education, 1771 N. St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
EDITOR: John M. Kittross, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.
MANAGING EDITOR: (none)
7. OWNER (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.) Association for Professional Broadcasting Education, 1771 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
8. KNOWN BONDHOLDERS, MORTGAGEES, AND OTHER SECURITY HOLDERS OWNING OR HOLDING 1 PERCENT OR MORE OF TOTAL AMOUNT OF BONDS, MORTGAGES OR OTHER SECURITIES (If there are none, so state) None
9. FOR COMPLETION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORIZED TO MAIL AT SPECIAL RATES (Section 132.122, Postal Manual)

10. EXTENT AND NATURE OF CIRCULATION	AVERAGE No. COPIES EACH ISSUE DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS	ACTUAL No. COPIES SINGLE ISSUE PUBLISHED NEAREST TO FILING DATE
A. Total no. copies printed (net press run)	1975	2000
B. Paid circulation		
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	3	18
2. Mail subscriptions	1346	1262
C. Total paid circulation	1349	1280
D. Free distribution (including samples) by mail, carrier or other means	82	89
E. Total distribution (sum of C and D)	1431	1369
F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	544	631
G. Total (sum of E and F—should equal A)	1975	2000

I certify that the statements made by me are correct and complete.
/S/ JOHN M. KITROSS, Editor

WILLIAM L. CATHCART

Viewer Needs and Desires in Television Newscasters

What qualities do viewers like and dislike in a television newscaster? The current attacks on broadcast journalism make this question particularly important. Using Q-Methodology, the author identifies seven "types" of newscasters, and concludes that delivery, experience, lack of bias, and knowledge all are among the important qualities desired. Mr. Cathcart conducted this research for his master's thesis under the direction of Dr. Robert Monaghan; he presently is working toward a Ph.D. in radio and television at the Ohio State University.

Introduction

AT present, television newscasters find themselves as focal points of attention in the viewers' attempts to be informed when events become news.¹ It is this national and local television newscaster, and his relation to the viewing audience, that is the subject of this study.

THE TELEVISION NEWSCASTER'S ROLE. It is common knowledge that the television newscaster is a reporter of facts and events with pictures, but the actual role or roles that he assumes during the newscast remain unclear. ABC's Howard K. Smith defines television news as, ". . . pictures, plus words, plus personality."² No longer is the television newscaster a familiar unknown, standing with script in hand, ready to narrate facts and actions behind maps, charts, and still photographs. The television newscaster has been transformed from an on-camera radio script reader to the dominant figure around whom the entire newscast turns. On both the national and local levels, the newscasting "person" has been replaced by today's newscasting "personality."

What then is the television newscaster's role? Elmo Roper has called the newscasting giants the "great disseminators,"³ David Brinkley describes the role of the television newsmen as that of an "all-wise, all-knowing journalistic superman."⁴ Brinkley relates this definition to the "star system" of television newscasting in which one man is placed in the spotlight with the responsibility of relating all that there is to know to a knowledge-hungry and not-so-hungry audience. The role that Brinkley describes is the one which is currently assigned to the majority of television newscasters in the United States at a variety of broadcasting levels. One man or perhaps a team (e.g., Huntley-Brinkley) faces the audience, delivers the news, and maintains an identity.

So, in answer to our role inquiry, the newscaster might generally be said to be filling two roles: one of information and the other of identity or entertainment. He is the principal source for facts and figures pertinent to the day's events for the home viewing audience (the "great disseminator") and, in terms of the entertainment value associated with almost all commercial television programming, he becomes the "star" of his particular newscasting "show."

THE NEWSCASTER'S AUDIENCE. For all practical purposes it is impossible to discuss the television newscaster without discussing his audience. Speaking realistically, the television newscaster could not long exist in that capacity without this audience. In an academic sense, the viewing audience is necessary to make possible the completion and re-initiation of the basic communication cycle. In a realistic, commercial sense, the viewing audience is necessary to maintain the newscaster's ratings and to buy his sponsor's products.

Like the newscaster, the viewer too is an individual, possessing individual needs and desires that affect his daily living patterns. To be sure, the needs and desires of a viewer with reference to television news and the newscaster form a small if not insignificant part of that person's total need-desire structure. But this is the part of that structure which is vitally important to the newscaster if he is to arrive at even a surface understanding of his audience. And it is this knowledge of viewer needs and desires in television newscasters that seems to be so hard for the newscaster to obtain.

Why do people continually watch a certain television newscaster? Very likely to become informed of the day's events. But any news

program will provide at least basic information on events of importance to the specific geographic area in question. So why do viewers faithfully watch a *particular* newscaster? Perhaps they like the various segments of the program or the photographic coverage offered, or, more probably, there is something that attracts them to the newscaster himself. This could be an attraction to the way the newscaster informs, or perhaps to the way he entertains, or to something about his personality, or to a combination of these and other qualities. These attractions, these qualities or characteristics, somehow satisfy the newscasting needs and desires of the viewers and these satisfactions would seem at least partially to explain the reasons for repeated viewing. Although most viewing of this type is purely the result of habit, certain needs must have been satisfied at one time to initiate the habit process. The basic questions to be answered then become: What qualities or characteristics do viewers find most and least desirable in television newscasters, and by what method(s) might these be determined?

Methodology

Those earlier studies that concerned themselves with similar questions used a variety of techniques. Frederick Williams⁵ made use of specifically prepared audio tapes and limited himself to radio news. Williams identified seven strong semantic differential dimensions or factors that were considered important by broadcasting students in the rating of radio newscasters. These factors were: general-evaluation, vocal-confidence, vocal-quality, apparent-character, enthusiasm-receptivity, efficiency-reliability, and bias. Lynch and Sassenrath⁶ conducted a newscaster image study that attempted to define network television newscaster dimensionality. Refined semantic differential scales were used, and five dimensions were identified as being common to the five newscaster concepts used. These were: presentation, appearance, humanism, force, and libertarianism.

The present study, concerned with *what kinds* of viewers (not *how many* viewers) are involved with this specific type of media selection, made use of Stephenson's Q-Methodology.⁷ Q-Methodology is a way of investigating human behavior—in this instance, *what kind* of viewer and the *whys* of viewer selection—in an economical (time and money) manner. Since viewer needs and desires in television newscasting generally lead to individual behavior to satisfy these

needs, it would seem logical to use this technique. Whereas most survey techniques generally ask a large number of people a small number of questions, Q-method involves asking a relatively small number of respondents to make a large number of decisions or choices. These numerous behavioral selections or decisions should reflect the needs and desires, the likes and dislikes that guide that person while actual television newscaster selection is made.

For this study, the specific instrument used was an unstructured Q-sort that consisted of 48 separate statements of qualities or characteristics of television newscasters that had been drawn from a series of local preliminary interviews.⁸ The test population was composed of 32 television viewers from the Columbus, Ohio area and was structured according to age, education, sex and amount of viewing.

The viewer responds to the instrument literally by "sorting" the statement-bearing cards or items into a number of pre-determined piles, according to (in this study) the characteristics of television newscasters that are "most desirable" to the viewer, "least desirable," and those about which he or she is uncertain. Below is an example of the forced choice distribution:

FILE IDENTIFICATION	"LEAST DESIRABLE"				"UNCER- TAIN"			"MOST DESIRABLE"			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
NUMBER OF STATEMENTS TO BE PLACED ON PILE	2	3	4	5	6	8	6	5	4	3	2

Each person chosen was asked to sort or distribute the statements twice, once in describing an existing "favorite" newscaster and once in describing a visionary "ideal" newscaster. This latter sorting was the important one, since it indicated ideally preferred characteristics which may not, but often did, differ from those currently being offered by local and network newscasting favorites.

After the Q-sorts had been administered to the 32 viewers, each person's total responses were correlated with every other person's. This was done under two conditions of instruction, the "favorite" and the "ideal" sortings. The next step was to begin the search for characteristic preference clusters among viewers.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. The method of analysis used was Louis L. McQuitty's "Elementary Linkage Analysis."⁹ The computer pro-

vided the necessary correlations while McQuitty's linkage analysis provided an efficient means of identifying clusters or types of viewers who express highly similar likes and dislikes in television newscasters.

Five clusters or types were found among the "favorite" newscaster correlations, and seven types were identified from the "ideal" correlations. The reciprocal variables (viewer preferences) in each linkage were related very strongly, with the lowest "favorite" correlation being .763 and the lowest "ideal" being .743. Each cluster-type found represented a hypothetical viewer's needs and desires. From this point on, the "ideal" types' data were accorded the most importance since the "favorite" sortings were employed largely for data-eliciting and for comparison. The viewer clusters of "ideal" newscaster-types were labeled A through G. The summary sketches which follow provide a brief look at these seven Ideal Newscaster Types:

Type A: An experienced news authority, with a pleasant appearance, who presents an unbiased, concise, factual newscast and believes in what he says.

Type B: This newscaster is experienced and is a perfectionist in both delivery and news accuracy. He speaks with conviction and does not underplay unpleasant news items, which gives him a reputation as an honest and trusted news source.

Type C: An unbiased, experienced newscaster who knows the news he delivers. He is also able to keep the attention of his audience with a pleasant appearance and manner, subtle humor, and an apparent interest in everyone who is watching.

Type D: A knowledgeable and experienced newscaster who is able to make complicated information understandable for the average viewer. Yet this ideal must also be an entertaining newscaster, one who is witty, personable, and appears to enjoy his work.

Type E: This newscaster is knowledgeable, unbiased, and consistently giving the true facts behind even the most unpleasant news. In addition, he has an audience attention-getting style consisting of a pleasant appearance and manner, a smooth delivery, and good eye-contact with the viewer.

Type F: Other than a desire for the occasional interjection of humor, the interest here is not so much in style as it is in an experi-

enced newscaster's ability to present an honest look at the news and to show a definite moral concern for those viewers who trust his knowledge and judgment.

Type G: Although this ideal must be an experienced newscaster, the emphasis appears to be not on what is said, but how it is presented. He must be well-groomed and neat, sincere, make few grammatical errors, appear to enjoy his work, and seem like a personal friend of the viewer.

Perhaps the most clear and significant expression of ideal standards came from "Ideal Type A." The listing below shows how this cluster of views ranked its "most desire" and "least desire" ideal newscaster characteristics, progressing from one to ten in decreasing strength of importance.

TEN QUALITIES OR CHARACTERISTICS MOST DESCRIBING THE TELEVISION NEWSCASTING PREFERENCES OF IDEAL VIEWER TYPE A:

1. Knowledgeable and experienced news authority.
2. More than a reader, he knows the news he delivers.
3. Speaks with conviction (believes in what he says).
4. An unbiased approach to news items.
5. Honesty and trustworthiness.
6. Presents a factual rather than a commentary report.
7. Makes difficult information understandable for the average viewer.
8. Dedicated to informing and not to entertaining.
9. Smooth, sophisticated manner.
10. Seldom makes errors in grammar or diction.

TEN QUALITIES OR CHARACTERISTICS LEAST DESCRIBING THE TELEVISION NEWSCASTING PREFERENCES OF IDEAL VIEWER TYPE A:

1. Accuracy in reporting may occasionally be questionable.
2. Simply reads the news.
3. Sensationalized delivery.
4. Eyes often glued to the paper from which he is reading.
5. Shows partiality when dealing with certain news items.
6. May not always appear to believe in the news he delivers.
7. Sound of his voice may be irritating at times.
8. Guilty of occasional grammatical errors or mispronunciations.
9. Displays certain physical habits or characteristics which might distract some viewers.
10. Seems rather unenthusiastic while delivering the news.

The neatness of the Type A cluster, linked throughout by strong correlations,¹⁰ caused it to stand above the others as the one major set of guidelines for the satisfying of viewer needs and desires in television newscasters to emerge from this study.

Summary and Conclusion

The basic problem concerned an existent break-down in the newscaster-viewer communication cycle. The newscaster often presents himself and the news in less than optimum ways, because he must make unsupported assumptions, due to lack of information about whether his style and actions are or are not satisfactory to the viewing audience. Ratings may partially answer the viewer satisfaction question but can give little indication as to *why* the pro and con feelings exist. With sole reliance on numbers, the television newscaster consciously or unconsciously discards qualitative criteria that might enable him to learn more about viewer likes and dislikes so that he may alter his style accordingly.

We can assume that a newscaster who meets the needs and desires expressed by Ideal Type-A will be satisfying to this type of viewer (and this type included a majority of those persons sampled). By the same token, if the newscaster fails to meet these standards he will not be offering adequate satisfaction to the viewers' needs and desires and may face rejection by them. Although there still exist individual needs and desires that may deviate from any collective requirements offered, research supports the assumption being made here that social clusters do exist and that they, and thus their needs and desires, are important to anyone concerned with communicating effectively with a viewing or listening audience.

Although many of the preferences previously listed for Ideal Type-A appear to be dominant in varying degrees throughout the remaining identifiable audience clusters, their importance can only be expanded to include the boundaries of this particular sample. The temptation to generalize to a larger population is always present but such is beyond the scope of this study.¹¹

The basic question asked by the study has been given an answer. Viewers, within the scale of the sample, found the following newscaster qualities or characteristics most desirable: knowledge and ex-

perience, personal conviction, an unbiased approach, honesty and trustworthiness, and others previously mentioned. These viewers also noted the qualities or characteristics which they generally found least desirable: questionable accuracy in reporting, simply reading the news, a sensationalized delivery, eyes often glued to the script, and partiality when dealing with certain news items, to mention an important few.

Hopefully, this study has served to make at least the viewers who expressed their preferences and any newscasters who might study them more aware of each others' roles in the communication process. It bears the potential implications for the newscasters of an increased awareness of *who* is watching and *why*, and for the viewers there is the possibility that newscasting satisfactions will be improved.

Footnotes

¹ Paul J. Deutschmann and Wayne A. Danielson, "Diffusion of Knowledge of the Major News Stories," *Journalism Quarterly*, 37:352 (Summer 1960).

² "The Most Intimate Medium," *Time*, October 14, 1966, p. 56.

³ Leslie W. Sargent, "Communicator Image and News Reception," *Journalism Quarterly* 42:35 (Winter 1965).

⁴ David Brinkley, "TV News and the Star System," *Television Quarterly*, V:2:16 (Spring 1966).

⁵ Frederick Williams, "A Factor Analysis of Judgments of Radio Newscasters," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, VII:2:135-143 (Spring 1963).

⁶ Mervin D. Lynch and Leonard H. Sassenrath, "Dimensions of Personality Association of Television Network Newscasters," *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, X:1:33-43 (Winter 1965-66).

⁷ William Stephenson, *The Study of Behavior*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

⁸ The 48 statements were derived from two sources. First, 12 viewers in the Columbus area, aged 21 to 80, were interviewed in-depth on local and national newscasters to elicit "like" or "dislike" statements concerning personality and style. These selected phrases, generally left in the words of the interviewee, were supplemented by responses made to a newscaster "like-dislike" questionnaire mailed to a sample of 50 persons in Columbus. The total number of statements was brought up to 48 by personal addition of some statements covering suspected personality-style loopholes.

⁹ Louis L. McQuitty, "Elementary Linkage Analysis for Isolating Orthogonal and Oblique Types and Typal Relevancies," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, XVII:207-228 (Summer 1957).

¹⁰ Please write the author, care of the Department of Speech in the Ohio State University, for additional data.

¹¹ A method for expanding small sample findings to proportions of a larger population is being developed by Dr. Robert R. Monaghan at Ohio State.

ROBERT SCHLATER

Effect of Irrelevant Visual Cues on Recall of Television Messages

A clean, uncluttered background set on a television program may be restful and pleasant—but is it an aid in learning or remembering what is going on? The following report is of one of the rare attempts to objectively test the many production techniques available to the television producer. Dr. Robert Schlater is assistant professor in the Department of Television and Radio of Michigan State University.

THE development of techniques for achieving predictably strong effects of messages on viewers is of continuing concern to broadcasters. The basic problem becomes increasingly acute with the expanded use of commercial, non-commercial and instructional television by large segments of society. Notably lacking are television production techniques developed and verified by rigorous scientific research. Producers and directors follow “rules” of production that have been developed largely through intuition. The time has arrived when these “rules” should be subjected to precise scientific testing if the medium is to improve its ability to make a desired impact upon viewers. This is not to say that many of the “rules” will not pass the test. It is to say that if a grammar of television is to evolve, it must be based on a more solid foundation than that of intuitive insights of individuals, regardless of their experience and degree of expertness.

One of the variables studied in a research project at Michigan State that sought to establish base lines for a variety of television produc-

tion variables was the effect of irrelevant visual cues in television messages. The findings of this study suggest that there is an optimum interference level that viewers can tolerate before recall of the television message is impeded.

A small amount of literature directly applicable to the irrelevant cue investigation is available. McIntyre, for example, has pointed out the need for evaluating visual stimuli. He states:

Questions about appropriateness of cues most often occur with reference to sets and other elements of design which will usually have some general relationship to the subject at hand. However, they may contribute little as stimuli pertaining to the instructional message with respect to the intended response of students. At best, they are frequently non-functional; at worst, they may conflict with other essential cues.¹

Seibert concurs with McIntyre's position:

On cue, or stimulus, in learning, it would appear that television's great strength is also a potential weakness. The stimulus field which television presents to students is immensely rich, yet within the richness, students must somehow be brought to recognize which features of any given scene are relevant to the intended learning Eventually, I suppose, students may learn to discount those parts of an elaborate set which never are central to the instructor's purpose, yet there would be some wisdom in presenting visual scenes which have few distracting or irrelevant cues within them and, thus, that leave the student unencumbered by futile searches or frequent visual excursions.²

Deutschmann, *et al.*, investigated relevant and irrelevant information learned in different communication situations. They compared teaching in a classroom or laboratory with teaching by film or television. They assumed that film or TV would provide proportionately more focusing upon relevant information and less focusing on irrelevant items than would be the situation in a laboratory. The results of the study provided evidence for the hypothesized greater efficiency of mass media over non-mass communication media but did not support the hypothesized difference between film and television.³ Deutschmann and his associates tested for the decoding of both the relevancies and the irrelevancies in the verbal learning tests they administered. Ordinarily, the learning of irrelevancies is discovered *post hoc* when the hypothesized learning of relevant material fails to occur. In their research, the key dependent variable was the relationship between the measures of relevant and irrelevant information. The

data showed considerable variation in the amount of relevant and irrelevant information learned under several testing conditions. The fact that they found learning of irrelevant information did occur supports the proposition investigated in the research reported here.

Kumata tested a relevant-irrelevant hypothesis in an investigation using advertising students as subjects. The question was whether complexity of presentation and a great variety of visual cues may distract a viewer from the main principles being presented. Kumata showed two advertisements, one with visuals in color projected on a large screen, the other with black-and-white visuals presented on a 25-inch television monitor. He found that subjects remembered more *details* from the color version, but remembered *principles* better from the black-and-white TV version.⁴

Roshal, in an educational film study, found that a film that was produced to teach knot tying in which the rope appeared to tie itself proved to be superior to a film in which a pair of hands tied the knot. One interpretation of this is that the hands were irrelevant cues and that they obscured the essential or relevant cues.⁵

Neu investigated the relevance of visuals in a film. He found that irrelevant additions appeared to lower potential learning. His study was based on the use of devices to direct attention to the relevant or critical information as contrasted to the irrelevant information.⁶

Visual presentations designed for concept learning can be presented with *varying* amounts of relevant and irrelevant information. Hunt has summarized the evidence on irrelevant dimensions in concept learning, citing a series of studies conducted by Bourne and his associates. These studies indicated that as the number of irrelevant dimensions increased, the number of errors in concept learning also increased.⁷ The visual presentations in Bourne's investigations consisted of geometric patterns which were varied in size, shape, color, and position in the display. He found that while an increase in the number of irrelevant dimensions, redundant or non-redundant, increased the number of errors, an increase in the number of non-redundant, relevant dimensions also increased the errors. Travers analyzed the Bourne studies and held that the effect was apparently one in which the amount of information represented by the stimulus array was of utmost importance. According to Travers, "The addition of non-redundant dimensions, whether relevant or irrelevant,

increases the amount of information which the subject must process in order to solve the task."⁸

Archer found that when relevant information was obvious the subject had an easier time learning the concept. (Obvious was defined as a stimulus with a high probability that the subject would respond to it.) When the irrelevant information was obvious the task was more difficult. A further finding was that when the relevant information was not obvious, it took significantly more time and errors to learn the concept, but when the irrelevant information was not obvious there was less of an inhibitory effect. The concept identification task in the Archer study used patterns that varied in form and size.⁹

Kittross reported a non-visual study of the retention of interference content used as an index of interest-incentive. Subjects were given reading material of differing presumed interest. The reading matter ranged from dull (instructions for operating a typewriter) to very interesting (excerpts from an article titled "Is Your Bride a Good Sex Partner?"). Reading was interrupted by an official-sounding announcement by the experimenter about the issuing of university building keys. After additional reading, subjects were given a multiple-choice test on key-issuance. The hypothesis was that the more one is interested in a message, the more resistant he will be to an interpolated message that interferes with the initial message, and hence is less likely to retain the content of the interpolated message. The results appeared patternless, and the hypothesis was not supported.¹⁰

From the studies cited above, it is apparent that the variable of irrelevant stimuli can be identified and its effect measured. The experiment conducted at Michigan State and reported in this paper investigated the ratio of irrelevant to relevant visual stimuli in a television message that could be transmitted before recall of the relevant visual information was impeded.

Six different message treatments were developed. Five types of irrelevant stimuli were used: superimposure of words, boom shadow, ornate frame (gobo), letters or numbers on visuals, and shadow of gesturing hand. Ratio of irrelevant to relevant cues was manipulated by increasing the number of irrelevant cues per 30 seconds in the six message treatments. All treatments were presented at the rate of five relevant *visuals* per 30 seconds on the basis of pre-test data. The

ratio was increased by one for each statement, i.e., 0:5, 1:5, 2:5, 3:5, 4:5, and 5:5.

Visual and audio stimuli were recorded on videotape and transmitted by closed-circuit television to 485 subjects who viewed the messages on television receivers in 12 different classrooms. Subjects were randomly assigned to classrooms and treatments. High school students attending a summer conference at Michigan State University constituted the experimental population. The criterion variable was the recall of visual and aural information. Visual recall was tested by two types of multiple-choice questions. *Pictorial video* questions utilized pictorial sketches of visual information. *Verbal video* questions were verbal descriptions of visual information. Recall of audio information also was measured by multiple-choice questions.

The data demonstrated no significant differences among means when testing for video recall using *pictorial video* and *verbal video* questions. When the ratio of irrelevant to relevant video information was tested as to its effect on recall of *audio* information, however, the difference among the treatment means was significant. Because of the random pattern of the means, however, interpretation of the finding (other than by conjecture) may not be possible.

The highest mean was obtained when one irrelevancy was included and the lowest means was obtained with two irrelevancies. As the ratio of irrelevancies increased to 3:5, the mean increased but it fell off again with the 4:5 and 5:5 ratios. The maximum irrelevant-relevant treatment included five irrelevancies with five relevant visuals every 30 seconds. In that version of the program, five superimposures were shown over five relevant visuals, five ornate frames were presented with five visuals, five visuals had numbers or letters on them, five were shown with a boom shadow, and five were shown with the shadow of a gesturing hand.

Interference in the video and audio channels was expected to increase significantly as the ratio of irrelevant cues increased. This appears not to have occurred when recall of visual information was tested. It may be that as the ratio increased, subjects perceived the additional irrelevant visual cues as part of the relevant visual information. Another possible explanation may be that the irrelevant stimuli selected were not extreme enough to distract the viewer. In this study, the five irrelevant stimuli were conditions which the investi-

TABLE I
Obtained Means and Analysis of Variance of Ratio of Irrelevant to Relevant Visual Stimuli
(Measured on Audio Recall)

	Treatment 0 (N = 89)	Treatment 1 (N = 98)	Treatment 2 (N = 63)	Treatment 3 (N = 60)	Treatment 4 (N = 87)	Treatment 5 (N = 88)
Audio recall (mean scores)	3.44	3.76	2.84	3.50	3.11	3.43
Analysis of Variance						
Source	df	s.s.	m.s.	F	P	
Between relevant-irrelevant ratios	5	39.56	7.91	3.66	< .01	
Within relevant-irrelevant ratios	479	1035.89	2.16	—	—	
Total	484	1075.45	—	—	—	

gator considers inexcusable when viewing a television program or critiquing a student performance in a TV directing class. A boom shadow or a poorly placed superimposition is usually anathema to the professional TV producer-director. To the viewer, however, the irrelevancies may have been so minor and so much a part of local television production practices that he scarcely noticed them or if he did, they did not hold his attention. To test the maximum irrelevant-relevant ratio, it is probably necessary to introduce more extreme irrelevancies. Examples might include a dog walking slowly across the green in a televised golf match. Or a weeping child seen over the shoulder of a circus clown.

The data in this study suggest that television viewers may be able to tolerate more irrelevant visual information than professional television producers and directors would intuitively expect. Since the purpose of the investigation was to establish a baseline, future studies in this area should take cognizance of these findings. A taxonomy of irrelevant cues which interfere with message understanding should be developed so that television producers and directors can avoid them.

Footnotes

¹ Charles J. McIntyre, "Applying Learning Theory to Televised Instruction," *NAEB Journal*, 24:6:54-63 (November-December, 1965).

² Warren F. Seibert, "Comments," *NAEB Journal*, 24:6:65-69 (November-December, 1965).

³ Paul J. Deutschmann, Lionel C. Barrow, and Anita McMillan, "The Efficiency of Different Modes of Communication," *AV Communication Review*, 9:6:263-270 (November-December, 1961).

⁴ Hideya Kumata, "Two Studies in Classroom Teaching," in *The Impact of Educational Television*. Edited by Wilbur Schramm. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1960, pp. 151-157.

⁵ S. M. Roshal, *Effects of Learner Representations in Film-mediated Perceptual Motor Learning*. Technical Report SDC 269-7-5, Special Devices Center, Office of Naval Research, Port Washington, N. Y., 1949.

⁶ D. M. Neu, *Effect of Attention-Gaining Devices on Film Mediated Learning*, Technical Report SDC 269-7-9, Special Devices Center, Office of Naval Research, Port Washington, N. Y., 1950.

⁷ E. B. Hunt, *Concept Learning*. New York: Wiley, 1962.

⁸ Robert M. W. Travers (ed.). *Research and Theory Related to Audio-visual Information Transmission*. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Bureau of Educational Research, 1964, p. 4.11.

⁹ E. J. Archer, "Concept Identification as a Function of Obviousness of Relevant and Irrelevant Information," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 63:616-620 (1962).

¹⁰ John M. Kittross, "Some Attempts to Develop an Index of Interest," *Journal of Communication*, 12:4:225-233 (December, 1962).

Due to Circumstances . . .

beyond our immediate control, we were forced to raise subscription prices for the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING last year. This was the first such increase in seven years.

However, much more enthusiastically, we were also able to expand the number of pages in each issue of the JOURNAL. Effective with the Summer 1968 issue, we have been publishing 16 extra pages in each issue. This increase will enable us to publish more articles, as well as lengthy bibliographies and other reference materials and to reduce the lag between acceptance and publication.

The increase in subscription rates was voted reluctantly by the APBE Board of Directors a year ago. In addition to the positive side of the increase, the additional pages, the Board also had to consider the negative side: inflation (up 5% last year), postage (first class mail was only 4¢ back in 1961) and printing bills (our printing budget has doubled over the past seven years). In light of these factors, there was little to do but raise prices. Because of the nearly-prohibitive cost of reprinting back issues that have been going out of stock, it will be necessary to raise their price as well.

The new rates are:	<u>Regular</u>	<u>Student</u>
Annual subscription	\$8.00	\$4.00
Single copies, current issue	2.50	2.00
Back issues, complete volumes (four consecutive issues)	8.00	6.50
Back issues, single copies	2.50	2.00

All back issues either are in stock or in the process of being reprinted. In case you wish only a copy of a particular article, it may be that we have an offprint in stock. These may be had for 2½¢ per page, plus 10¢ for each order (check or stamps to accompany order, please). Copies of the 7-year topic and author index cost 25¢, postpaid. Please write for special prices on multiple copies.

In addition, arrangements have been made to supply a microfilm edition of the JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING to those librarians and others wishing to store the JOURNAL in this form. Please write directly to University Microfilms (Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107) for exact prices, shipping and other information.

J. DAVID LEWIS

Programmer's Choice: Eight Factors in Program Decision-Making

The most important aspects of broadcasting—among them the identification and nurturing of talent, the development of a sense of pace, the ability to make programming decisions—typically are learned, not taught. The various factors involved in each of these areas never have been fully identified. The following article deals with one of these areas, that of programming decision-making. It attempts to identify the factors used by several hundred program directors and other programmers in making their decisions. This article is based on research the author conducted for his Ph.D. dissertation at Michigan State University under the direction of Professors Leo Martin and Hideya Kumata. Dr. J. David Lewis was involved in broadcast production and teaching for many years, and currently is associate professor in the Department of Television and Radio at Michigan State.

EVERY week, millions of copies of *TV Guide* are snapped up from innumerable racks in supermarkets, drug stores and news stands. Saturday and Sunday supplements in newspapers across the country present the new week's programming for their cities. A variety of other television program guides appear as give-aways in various marketing chains. Just to be sure that no one is uninformed, most newspapers also print daily program schedules of their local TV stations. Taken together, these mountains of printed program guides give weighty evidence of the importance in the public mind of one station staff member whom most of them have never seen, and few have even heard of. He's the man that gets the phone calls that start,

"Why did you take off . . ." though the caller usually didn't know who the "you" was when he dialed the station. He is the program director.

Unseen, and seldom sung, the television program director is the power behind the TV set in hundreds of communities. His are the decisions that change the copy in those millions of program guides week after week; he gets the blame, though seldom the praise. And oddly enough, the articles, studies, and books on the business focus on his job no more than the cameras do. Television programming gets a chapter in a text-book or one of the few books on management, while many chapters are devoted to production, direction, and performance.¹ This is paradoxical, considering that these other functions can't be performed at all without the initial decision of the program director!

This investigation of the program decision-making process started out as an attempt to find out how a mass communication organization functioned without the aid of immediate, direct feed-back on the effects of its messages. When the individual communicates, he's usually in a face-to-face relationship with his audience; the mass communicator is not. How, then, *can* decisions be made? How does the mass communicator decide if his message is having the intended effect or not? One logical place to look for the answer to this question was in television program decision-making.

Some might argue here that there are others in addition to the program director who play a part in this decision-making. They'll cite sales and station management and maybe the network, but it's really surprising how often even those "in the know" come up with the same vague clichés about money and ratings used by the average viewer who protests that "they" have taken off a favorite program. When all the chips are down; the opinions of management, sales, and production heard; ratings, costs, and competition considered; it's usually the P.D. who has to come to that decision in the solitude of his own office. That's where this study began; in the offices of a number of programmers in a variety of television stations.

Informal discussions initially were held with three program directors in small and large markets to find out their approaches to the decision-making process. As would be expected, such non-directive interviews

yielded a mass of information, some relevant, some not; some conflicting, much pertinent in one situation and not in another, but each bit cited by some programmer as useful to him.

Therefore, a second step involved more directed interviews with the program directors of a two-station and a five-station market on the West Coast. This allowed a check on the applicability of the information already derived to given markets, with known competitive situations, involving all three networks as well as an independent. The picture of the program director's approach to his job was becoming more sharply delineated, but it was obvious that there were variables related to such factors as man, management, and market. The possibility of regional differences also remained. Was there a nation-wide pattern, or had the research so far some unsuspected bias?

The third step in the research was the pilot for a national study. An initial pilot list of all identifiable sources of information mentioned by programmers in the preliminary interviews was drawn up. Many of the sources had been mentioned by almost all respondents, some by only one, but no attempt was made to select on the basis of supposed importance. The final number of items on the list was 45. Each was accompanied by an 11-point scale bounded by the adjectives Important-Unimportant. Respondents were asked to rate each item according to its importance in his own decision-making. A brief questionnaire about the programmer himself and the station for which he worked was included. The list and questionnaire were sent to a small sample of 10 stations designed to represent all geographical regions, numbers of competing stations, and net affiliations and non-affiliation. Provision for the addition of items and comments was included in order to check the completeness of the list. However, returns from the pilot study showed care and accuracy in its use, and no criticisms were expressed nor items added. Accordingly, the same form was used for the national study.

When the national mailing was made, there were 521 commercial stations in the United States, excluding satellites and two foreign stations penetrating the markets of Detroit and San Diego. A covering letter was prepared and each 45-item list was randomized and printed out by computer to eliminate any possible effect caused by

an item's position. The survey material was sent to a programmer at each of the 521 stations, using his name and title as obtained from the listings in the 1965 *Broadcasting Yearbook*. By the end of the three-week deadline for returns, 301 usable responses had been received, a 57.8% response. An additional 21 responses up to the deadline were unusable due to scoring omissions, insufficient identification, or refusal to participate. The 301 responses form the basis for the findings reported here. Their geographical distribution varied by no more than two percentage points from the distribution of commercial television stations in the U. S. Census Bureau geographical divisions, and the distribution by market size varied by less than 3%. Competing stations reported ranged from none to five, on the basis of the programmer's own perception of competition. It was interesting to note that the programmers who responded had worked for their stations an average of 8.9 years, and had worked in broadcasting an average of 16.4 years. It also appeared that the programming function is not always exercised by a program director, since respondents included general managers, operations managers, and various combined titles.

Regardless of these personal variables, the basic interest was in *how* they programmed; what information was important to them in decision-making. To generalize from hundreds of individual responses, factor analysis was used.² Factor analysis compares each individual's response on each item with every other individual's response on these items, yielding regularities of response patterns that may be interpreted as showing similarities of usage among items and individuals. Factor loading of individual items can be further analyzed mathematically to determine principle factors around which item responses were grouped.

For example, the first factor to emerge included "Letters from Viewers," "Letters from Community Groups," "Talks with Community Leaders and Groups," "Telephone Calls from Viewers," and "Contacts with People Outside Station." All these items are representative of the station's audience, so this factor was labeled the *Direct Feedback* factor.

The second factor included "Commitments to F.C.C." and "F.C.C. Rules and Regulations," as well as "Station Policy Statement" and "N.A.B. Code." Since all these refer to rules and standards of practice, this factor can be called *Regulatory*.

The third factor to appear included all the items which specifically mentioned ratings. "Local Ratings," "National Ratings," "Ratings from Other Markets," and "Ratings of Program During Network Run" were here, along with "Competition of Other Stations in Market." Another item that appeared here was "Information from Film Salesmen." Interviews had shown that much of the film salesman's pitch is related to the ratings the series received in its initial run and in other markets, so its location here is logical. This factor was called *Inferential Feedback* in the communication jargon, or if you prefer, "Ratings."

Factor four was a puzzling one. Here appeared "Comments of Newspaper or Magazine Critics," "Newspapers and General Magazines," and "Trade Magazines." Along with them came "Viewing Behavior of Your Own Family," and "Opinions of Friends Outside the Station." The unifying idea appears to be criticism and advice from sources that were likely to have some sort of bias, through rivalry or close relationships. The wise programmer would have to take this information "with a grain of salt," so this item has been dubbed *Conditional*.

Fifth among the factors was one which included the opinions of Production Manager, Operations Manager, Producer/Directors, and News Director. These all were production-oriented people within the station, and the factor was accordingly named *Production Staff*.

The sixth factor to emerge included "Instinct" and "Your Own Background and Experience." "Common Sense" and "Knowledge of the Community" were here as well. These can all be interpreted as subjective judgments; the programmer's own feel for his job and his market. This factor was obviously *Personal*.

Factor seven started off with "Sponsor's Opinion," followed by "Sales Potential," "Cost," "Sponsor's Report of Viewer's Comments to Him," and "Sales Manager's Opinion." These items are all related to the station's income and expenditures, and can be called *Financial*.

Eighth and last of the factors to emerge had such items as "Time Period," "Trends in Viewing," "Program Balance," and "Building Horizontal and Vertical Strips." These items refer to methods of program planning, the arrangement of the schedule, and its long-range planning. This factor has been called *Tactical*.

TABLE I
Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings

Item	Mean Score	Factor Loadings							
		I*	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
DIRECT FEEDBACK									
Letters from viewers	5.36	-.81	.04	-.15	.10	-.04	.00	.10	-.05
Viewer's phone calls	6.28	-.69	-.09	-.22	.22	-.17	-.02	.03	.08
Letters from groups	4.77	-.73	.27	-.09	.16	-.18	.03	-.01	.07
Public service	3.32	-.52	.47	-.03	.00	-.19	.23	-.01	.17
People outside station	5.20	-.59	.12	.05	.33	-.14	.22	.08	.12
Community leaders	4.05	-.71	.31	-.03	-.01	-.13	.16	.05	.01
REGULATORY									
Commitments to F.C.C.	2.24	-.09	.74	-.15	.07	-.10	.04	.19	-.01
Station policy	2.41	-.16	.60	-.07	.02	-.22	.17	.09	.26
N.A.B. Code	2.76	-.12	.63	-.08	.13	-.06	.14	-.19	.15
F.C.C. Rules & Regs.	1.93	-.09	.79	-.08	.07	-.01	.07	.12	.00
INFERENCEAL FEEDBACK									
Local ratings	2.37	-.04	.07	-.63	-.10	.00	.07	.20	.01
National ratings	4.44	-.02	.09	-.53	.25	-.07	-.28	.06	.14
Other market ratings	5.42	-.11	.05	-.66	.19	-.05	.00	.01	.14
Film salesmen	6.59	-.18	.01	-.54	.28	.07	.21	.02	-.04
Competition	2.91	-.04	-.03	-.63	.04	.00	.20	.05	.16
Ratings on network run	4.03	-.04	.21	-.62	.18	-.18	-.05	.13	.15
CONDITIONAL									
Friends outside station	7.70	-.43	-.20	-.02	.51	-.10	.12	.00	-.12
Your own family	7.97	-.26	-.16	-.17	.54	-.08	.14	.01	.03
Trade magazines	5.71	-.03	.10	-.16	.62	-.13	-.04	.13	.18
Critics in the press	8.14	-.03	.17	-.24	.68	-.12	.06	.10	-.11
Newspapers & magazines	7.84	-.13	.22	-.15	.65	-.14	.02	.06	.06
PRODUCTION STAFF									
Production manager	5.36	-.12	.09	.00	.19	-.77	.15	.17	.06
Operations manager	4.69	-.11	.06	-.03	.07	-.78	-.04	.06	.11
News director	5.88	-.32	.22	-.20	.16	-.56	.16	.10	-.11
Producer/directors	5.30	-.24	.13	-.04	.23	-.72	.12	.09	-.03

TABLE I—Continued
Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings

Item	Mean Score	Factor Loadings							
		I*	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
PERSONAL									
Knowledge of community	2.17	-.38	.26	.03	-.06	-.05	.53	.06	.28
Instinct	4.61	.00	-.05	-.05	.29	.06	.66	-.10	.00
Your own experience	2.66	-.11	.06	-.14	.00	-.11	.64	.12	.16
Common sense	2.22	-.10	.30	-.02	-.12	-.08	.54	.12	.27
General manager	2.13	.03	.19	-.11	-.11	-.21	.41	.36	-.15
Taste	2.27	-.28	.35	.05	-.11	-.06	.43	.00	.29
FINANCIAL									
Sales manager	3.71	-.06	.12	-.25	.07	-.36	.05	.49	.08
Cost	2.87	-.02	.12	.21	-.06	.00	.25	.62	-.15
Sponsor's opinion	4.52	-.11	.07	.00	.29	-.11	-.13	.71	.10
Sales potential	2.36	.12	.06	-.23	-.02	-.07	.15	.70	.21
Sponsor's relayed feedback	5.13	-.25	.08	.04	.38	-.08	-.07	.53	.24
TACTICAL									
Time period	1.96	.05	.11	-.16	-.12	.08	.23	.18	.61
Program balance	2.63	-.36	.17	.05	-.16	-.15	.24	.13	.49
Strip programming	4.77	-.05	.03	-.22	.21	-.03	.02	.03	.47
Trends in viewing	3.05	-.01	.13	-.36	.17	-.10	.16	-.09	.52
RESIDUAL									
Available audience	2.46	-.08	.26	-.21	-.06	-.25	.33	.12	.25
Color or black & white	4.66	-.04	.18	-.18	.23	-.16	.25	.09	.18
Technical quality	2.62	-.28	.36	-.01	.05	-.12	.08	.28	.31
Your net's programming	3.03	-.16	.12	-.29	.18	-.20	.02	.13	.14
Station owners	4.44	-.13	.28	.06	.28	-.19	.01	.29	-.12

* On an 11-step scale, with the most important item scored "1" and the most unimportant item scored "11." Hence, a *low* mean score is indicative of an important item.

Since the items making up the eight factors are given above, the reader may apply his own labels to them as desired; the contents remain the same. In the remaining discussion, the designations given here will be used. The eight factors isolated indicate types of information that make up basic areas of concern for the programmer in his decision-making. Some of them are obvious and commonly acknowledged, others seldom are considered by those not intimate with the work of the programmer. Of course, this was not the whole answer. Various factors might be given differing weight by individual programmers. Market variables might have an effect. Due to the large number of responses, it was possible to run multiple and simple correlations to determine if certain characteristics of the programmer or his market had any effect upon his use of the factors or specific types of information found within the factors. Some relationships did appear which add to our understanding of the realities of program decision-making.

Direct Feedback by letter, phone, or meeting is one distinct type of information. The responses to the various items included in the list show that group contacts are regarded as being more important than individual calls and letters. "Group Letters" and "Talks with Community Leaders and Groups" was positively correlated with market size, that is, as the market size increased, so did the importance to the programmer of feedback from groups. This may be an indication of the greater size and importance of groups in the larger communities, whereas the small market station will rely on a much more widely scattered audience. Another interesting facet of feedback usage was underlined in the interviews, in that programmers made qualifications of "intelligent" or "unintelligent" and "informed" or "uninformed" in judging audience feedback, as well as considering telephone calls more likely to come from "cranks" and to be more "emotional" than letters. The importance of such individual feedback may also be seen only in the aggregate; telephone calls may simply be tallied by the telephone operator and evaluated as votes "for" or "against."

The items in the *Regulatory* factor were generally scored quite high in importance, those relating to the F.C.C. being highest among them. However, the F.C.C. items showed no relationship with any of the personal or market variables. As might be expected, their sig-

nificance applies equally throughout the country. A different story was found for the N.A.B. Code. This item was positively correlated with both Market Size and Years in Broadcasting. It seems logical to suppose that the larger market station will be more likely to subscribe to and follow the Code. It is also likely that a greater number of years spent in broadcasting will be accompanied in most cases by employment in a larger market, as the general pattern of professional advancement is from the smaller stations to the larger.

The *Inferential Feedback* factor, with its content of ratings and rating-derived information, showed some interesting variation within items. The most important were the local ratings; least important was information from film salesmen. However, the film salesman item showed a positive correlation with Market Size, perhaps because the feature film package is of increasing importance in the larger markets, where competition for the large potential audience is stiff, and the cost of films is high. Related to this is the item "Competition of Other Stations in Market" which increased in importance as Market Size, and the number of competing stations, increased. Ratings, although important enough to be the major component of a factor, show great differences in their importance and use. Chiefly they aid in determining competitive position and as a form of feedback from the station's audience, as can be seen in the high evaluation of local ratings over all other types. One program director noted that a program dropped by the network because of poor national ratings was number one in his market.

The factor called *Conditional* is the least clear-cut of all. As already noted, this was the repository of criticism from newspapers and periodicals, both general and trade magazines, and the viewing behavior and comments of friends and family. Perhaps it is best seen as the repository of information of most dubious worth (the four lowest average scores are included here). An indication of the astuteness of the programmer is seen in the presence of "Opinions of Friends Outside Station" in this category, while "Contacts with People Outside Station" was evaluated as Direct Feedback and received a much higher rating of importance. One programmer said, "I'm a little suspicious of this (friend's opinions). Due to training, background and experience, we seek out people pretty much like ourselves." He cited the joke about the big producer who was asked if

they should run his show at 4:30 Sunday. The producer said, "Certainly not! At 4:30 Sunday afternoon, everybody's playing polo!"

Production Staff, the fifth factor, is an obvious one to the broadcast professional. The decisions of the programmer have direct effect on those involved in their implementation within the station. Operations manager, production manager, producers, and directors necessarily are involved in initial discussion of the practicability of proposed programming; personnel and material costs, preparation and studio time must be entered into the equation of decision. Most of these items show no correlation with any variable of person or station, since all stations must deal with these most basic realities. The one direct relationship shown is by the relationship of the single item "News Director's Opinion" with Market Size. Certainly the size and importance of the news department increases in the larger markets, and the amount of news and public affairs programming also may increase. However, some noted that the news director was consulted when the decision was related to his area, and was not an important information source for other program decisions. Noticeably missing here are the general manager and sales manager. They were the two other station personnel included on the list, but the results show that programmers generally view information from these men as distinctly different in kind from the production group. Sharpness of definition may have been blurred by the number (47) of respondents who were general managers themselves.

The sixth factor was *Personal*. Perhaps this factor should be at the end of the list when explaining the elements of program decision-making, for when all the opinions, ratings, letters, facts, and figures are gathered in, the personal skills and insights of the programmer must do the final evaluation of every side, weigh each piece of evidence, and come to a solitary conclusion. These men know their own background and experience as professional programmers; their tastes, instincts, and plain common sense are very important parts of decision-making. The items in this factor were consistently scored as more important than any others except for the *Regulatory* factor. Many of those interviewed emphasized years of experience in the medium and their communities. Some mentioned a "feel" for what was right; another said, "Experience tells you what to avoid." As might be expected, Years in Broadcasting was closely related to some of these items, as was Years in Community. "Taste" also was positively cor-

related with Market Size. There's a strong suggestion that experience, and the positions in larger markets that often accompany it, allow greater freedom to program with a personal flair, rather than "by the book" (particularly when there is no book). One respondent noted, "You forgot 'luck'; the winners are smart and the losers are unlucky."

As in any business, there is the inevitable factor, *Financial*. Here are located the sales, cost, and sponsor-oriented items. But it was discovered that this item had the highest multiple correlation with the personal and station variables. Most of this correlation is negative and is with Market Size and Time in Community. At the item level, "Sales Manager," "Cost," and "Sales Potential" become less important as Time in Community increases. Strong negative correlations were also shown with Market Size by both "Sponsor's Opinion" and "Sponsor Relay of Viewer's Comments." It seems quite clear that the internal cost and sales items decline in importance as security increases. It is also clear that as Market Size increases, the importance of the sponsor decreases. While the small station may need every sponsor it can get, the larger market station is likely to be more stable financially, and able to exert its own power. Another aspect of this relationship is the presence in the larger market stations of more experienced personnel who are skilled and secure in their jobs. The professional attitude of capable communicators, able to help the sponsor with the power of their stations and the skills of their production staffs, is present in the larger stations. Unfortunately, the smaller stations serve as training grounds in broadcasting, and the staff members may be lacking in the skill and confidence necessary to meet the sponsor as an equal.

Tactical is used to name the factor that includes the programming ploys used by the programmer. Here are the tools of the programmer's trade, as he tries to improve his own station's schedule and counter the moves of the competition. There is a significant positive correlation with Market Size. From this it is apparent that programming techniques grow in importance with Market Size, probably as a dual function of the experience of the programmers (correlations with Years in Station and Broadcasting approach significance) and the more difficult demands of the larger market.

This study of programming has been exploratory and descriptive. Certainly the reader may have thought of instances which seemed to be exceptions to some of these findings. The researcher also found

variations in the methods of individuals during the interview stage, and was intrigued by the differences from market to market and even within markets. That, indeed, is what led to the national survey, for programming is too complex an array of variables to describe on the basis of even a score of interviews. What was perhaps the most significant finding was that it is not, despite the hundreds of individuals and market differences, a completely random process. There are regularities of need and method within the profession that factor analysis brings forth with consistency and clarity. It was gratifying indeed to see such logical and "natural" patterns emerging from the welter of figures on the computer print-outs.

Footnotes

¹ Among the texts that are in common use, but do not devote much space to television programming, are: Ward L. Quaal and Leo A. Martin, *Broadcast Management* (New York: Hastings House, 1968) and Yale Roe (ed.) *Television Station Management: The Business of Broadcasting* (New York: Hastings House, 1964).

² Simple in theory, but requiring lengthy and detailed computations, factor analysis is performed swiftly and reliably when one has use of a high-speed computer such as the CDC 3600 at Michigan State to calculate the necessary hundreds of intercorrelations.

Book Review Index for Volume XIII, 1969

	Issue	Pages
Arlen, Michael J., <i>Living Room War</i>	Fall	433-435
Coleman, Howard W. (ed.), <i>Color Television</i>	Fall	436
Emery, Walter B., <i>National and International Systems of Broadcasting: Their History, Operation and Control</i>	Summer	325-326
Fielding, Raymond (ed.), <i>A Technological History of Motion Pictures and Television</i>	Winter	106-107
Harmon, Jim, <i>The Great Radio Heroes</i>	Winter	108
Larsen, Otto (ed.), <i>Violence and the Mass Media</i>	Summer	328-329
Lasswell, Harold D., Ralph D. Casey, and Bruce Lannes Smith (ed.), <i>Propaganda and Promotional Activities</i>	Fall	435
Lewis, Colby, <i>The TV Director/Interpreter</i>	Summer	327
MacNeil, Robert, <i>The People Machine</i>	Summer	329-330
Mascelli, Joseph V. (ed.), <i>American Cinematographer Manual</i>	Spring	220
Sopkin, Charles, <i>Seven Glorious Days, Seven Fun-Filled Nights</i>	Winter	109-110
<i>Technical Papers Presented at the 1969 NAB Engineering Conference</i>	Spring	220

Authors of book reviews appearing in Volume XIII, 1969 were:

Thomas F. Baldwin, Lynwood H. Bartley, Robert P. Crawford, George N. Gordon, David R. Hunt, John M. Kittross, David J. LeRoy, T. Stephen May, Christopher H. Sterling, and Arthur Weld.)

THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

We recognize radio and television broadcasting as powerful and significant forces in the lives of our people, and the American system of broadcasting as particularly suited to their needs and desires;

We believe that colleges and universities have both an opportunity and an obligation to advance broadcasting, both as an art and as an industry by preparing for the profession qualified men and women alert to their duties as citizens and capable of assuming productive and responsible roles therein;

We recognize the existence of a group of colleges and universities aware of these responsibilities and presently maintaining effective programs of professional broadcasting education; and further, we see growing evidence of increased interest on the part of other colleges and universities in the establishment of such professional programs;

We further recognize an awareness on the part of broadcasters of the necessity of continually improving the professional competency of persons entering the broadcasting industry;

And finally, we believe that many mutual advantages would flow from a continuing relationship established and maintained between such educational institutions and the broadcasters themselves.

To secure these advantages and to foster these ends, we hereby establish the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education, declaring our intent to encourage and maintain in colleges and universities professional broadcasting education that will produce such men and women as can command the respect of the colleges that graduate them and of the industry that employs them.

